

Information, Education, Discussion

BULLETIN in Defense of Marxism

HANDS OFF LIBYA! HANDS OFF CENTRAL AMERICA!.....	1
REAGAN'S NEW FOREIGN POLICY POSTURE by Tom Barrett.....	2
AFTER THE FALL OF MARCOS Excerpts from 'International Viewpoint'.....	5
DEMONSTRATIONS PUT WOMEN'S MOVEMENT BACK ON THE STREETS by Diane Phillips.....	7
<hr/>	
AUSTIN MEATPACKERS' STRIKE SHAKES UP U.S. UNIONS by Dave Riehle.....	9
<hr/>	
<u>Commemorating the Centenary of the Haymarket Case</u>	
ALBERT PARSONS AND HIS COMRADES: Working Class Revolutionaries of 1886 (Part 2) by Paul Le Blanc.....	13
<u>From the Arsenal of Marxism</u>	
TALKING SOCIALISM AT THE HAYMARKET TRIAL by Albert Parsons.....	18
<hr/>	
STAR WARS — THREE YEARS LATER by Mary Scully.....	20
FRENCH ELECTIONS AND THE CRISIS OF THE WORKERS' MOVEMENT by Rafael Sabatini.....	22
ORGANIZING AGAINST U.S. INTERVENTION IN CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN Draft Resolution Adopted by F.I.T. National Conference (Part 1).....	24
REVIEW REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM AND THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL by Steve Bloom.....	28
A GUIDE TO LEON TROTSKY'S BOOKS IN ENGLISH Part 1, to October 1917 by Sam Gregory.....	32
BRITISH EX-HEALYITES RETRACT AGENT-BAITING OF SWP.....	35
LETTERS.....	36

Who We Are

The *Bulletin in Defense of Marxism* is published monthly by the Fourth Internationalist Tendency. We have dedicated this journal to the process of clarifying the program and theory of revolutionary Marxism — of discussing its application to the class struggle both internationally and here in the United States. This vital task must be undertaken if we want to forge a political party in this country capable of bringing an end to the domination of the U.S. imperialist ruling class and of establishing a socialist society based on human need instead of private greed.

The F.I.T. was created in the winter of 1984 by members expelled from the Socialist Workers Party because we opposed abandoning the Trotskyist principles and methods on which the SWP was founded and built for more than half a century. Since our formation we have fought to win the party back to a revolutionary Marxist perspective and for our readmission to the SWP. In addition our members are active in the U.S. class struggle.

At the 1985 World Congress of the Fourth International, the appeals of the F.I.T. and other expelled members were upheld, and the congress delegates demanded, by an overwhelming majority, that the SWP readmit those who had been purged. So far the SWP has refused to take any steps to comply with this decision.

“All members of the party must begin to *study*, completely dispassionately and with utmost honesty, first the essence of the differences and second the course of the dispute in the party. . . . It is necessary to *study* both the one and the other, unfailingly demanding the most exact, printed documents, open to verification by all sides. Whoever believes things simply on someone else’s say-so is a hopeless idiot, to be dismissed with a wave of the hand.”

—V.I. Lenin, “The Party Crisis,” Jan. 19, 1921.

BULLETIN in Defense of Marxism, No. 30, May 1986

Closing date April 11, 1986

Send correspondence and subscriptions to Bulletin IDOM, P.O. Box 1317, New York, NY 10009

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Naomi Allen
Steve Bloom
George Breitman
Laura Cole
Paul Le Blanc
Frank Lovell
Sarah Lovell
Bill Onasch
George Saunders
Evelyn Sell
Rita Shaw
Jean Tussey

To subscribe to Bulletin in Defense of Marxism, send \$24 for 12 monthly issues or \$15 for 6 issues to Bulletin IDOM, P.O. Box 1317, New York, N.Y. 10009.

Back issues are \$3 each.

HANDS OFF LIBYA! HANDS OFF CENTRAL AMERICA!

It would seem to be no accident that Ronald Reagan's provocation against Libya took place less than a week after the defeat of his contra aid package in the House of Representatives on March 20. If he actually made the decision to send ships into the Gulf of Sidra on March 14 as reported, that only means he was anticipating the problems with contra aid which everyone was then predicting.

An article by Gerald M. Boyd on the front page of the March 26 New York Times confirms that the U.S. president deliberately made this move in the hope that U.S. ships and planes would be attacked: "[Key White House officials] said that Mr. Reagan decided to send Navy vessels into the gulf after being told it would almost certainly lead to a military confrontation with Libya." This confrontation, which did indeed take place, created the predictable "rally round the embattled President" response in Congress which will surely ease the way for future efforts at contra aid, as well as other reactionary military programs.

In fact, the very day after the first hostilities in and around Libya, U.S. news media reported an "invasion" of Honduras by Nicaraguan troops -- a report which seems to have been a pure invention by the White House. Reagan used this as an excuse to order an emergency aid package for Honduras, including U.S. helicopters and pilots to fly Honduran soldiers to the Nicaraguan border--with broad support from both Democrats and Republicans in Congress. A few days later the Senate passed the contra aid appropriation.

The Libyan affair seems to be a new twist on an old familiar theme. Usually the U.S. rulers make sure that the "provocation" which "requires" retaliation by U.S. forces comes from those it is most interested in attacking--in this case the Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua. When Lyndon Johnson wanted to escalate the Vietnam war, for example, a very convenient "attack" by the North Vietnamese took place on U.S. ships in the Gulf of Tonkin. This created a patriotic fervor on Capitol Hill. Troops and money for the war were quickly forthcoming. This time Reagan found it more politically expedient to go after a secondary target, Libya, and of course he was more than willing to exercise a little muscle against Qaddafi.

There is considerable testimony to the effect that the North Vietnamese didn't start the shooting in the Gulf of Tonkin, and we may yet discover that the military engagement in the Gulf of Sidra was likewise begun by the U.S. Navy, not the Libyans. But in the final analysis it is really a secondary matter whether the U.S. or Libya fired the first shot.

None of the capitalist politicians or the bourgeois media delves into the most fundamental question: What were U.S. warships doing in the Gulf of Sidra in the first place? The answer is that they were doing the same thing as in the Gulf of Tonkin: reminding people around the globe that U.S. imperialism claims the right to dictate to the entire world, and others had better not do anything to get in the way.

Working people in the U.S. have nothing to gain from this kind of military adventure--not in Vietnam, not in Grenada, not in Central America, and not in Libya. We would all be better off if U.S. military forces in every foreign country were withdrawn, if all U.S. warships were brought back to U.S. ports, and if the billions now spent on weapons of destruction were used instead for schools, hospitals, low-cost housing, and other things that people need to live a decent life.

The U.S. fleets that patrol the Mediterranean, the Atlantic, the Pacific, and other parts of the world aren't there to protect us or our interests. Their purpose is to guarantee the right of the multinational corporations which exploit our labor, poison our air and water, and break our unions to do the same and worse to the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Those in this country who have opposed contra aid, opposed U.S. intervention in Central America and the Caribbean, and demanded an end to support for apartheid in South Africa, those who have worked for the embattled P-9 strikers in Austin, Minnesota, for the TWA flight attendants facing a union-busting campaign by the airline, or in support of other workers demanding their right to a job at decent pay and under safe working conditions, in fact all those in the U.S. who defend basic human rights, must raise the cry for our government to keep its bloody HANDS OFF LIBYA! NO MORE U.S. WARSHIPS IN THE GULF OF SIDRA!

-- March 31, 1986

REAGAN'S NEW FOREIGN POLICY POSTURE

by Tom Barrett

With a flurry of phrases about "democratic revolution" and respect for the will of the people, the Reagan administration, in a matter of weeks, pulled the plug on two right-wing dictators who had enjoyed Washington's support for over twenty years -- Jean-Claude Duvalier of Haiti and Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines. In the case of Haiti, Washington not only had supported "Baby Doc" Duvalier since he first proclaimed himself "president for life"; it also had propped up his predecessor -- Duvalier's father, Francois "Papa Doc" Duvalier.

What's going on? Has there been a great transformation in Washington's policies? Reagan and his State Department spokesmen say no. They say that their abandonment of Marcos and Duvalier represents no change in policy at all. Unfortunately, they are telling the truth. Anti-imperialist fighters in the United States and around the world who may be tempted to interpret these events as a weakening of Washington's drive to dominate the world through military force and repression are going to be disappointed.

One should not forget that one of the first "democratic" politicians whom Reagan chose to support--a politician who actually was a political prisoner under a right-wing dictatorship--was none other than Jose Napoleon Duarte of El Salvador. Yes, Duarte is a liberal. Reagan antagonized the more paleolithic of right-wing Republicans by supporting him against death-squad leader Roberto d'Aubuisson.

There is no basic political difference between Corazon Aquino of the Philippines, for example, and Duarte as individual politicians. The circumstances of Aquino's rise to power--on the crest of mass mobilizations, as opposed to Duarte's being called to power by the U.S. to head off a revolution--will probably limit her ability to defend bourgeois and imperialist interests as openly as she undoubtedly would like. But she certainly deserves no political support from the working class or from socialists. The ruling junta in

Haiti is even more clearly an attempt to simply substitute one proimperialist regime for another.

WASHINGTON'S REAL ROLE

No one should be taken in by the Reagan administration's self-righteous posing. It played no positive role whatsoever in these "democratic revolutions," unless one considers providing Marcos with luxurious accommodations in Hawaii or a plane to fly Duvalier to France to be playing a positive role. Reagan gave no encouragement at all to Aquino in the Philippines until it was clear that Marcos was finished. Even after Marcos's attempt to steal the election was clear to all, Reagan made a public statement that "both sides" had committed election fraud. Only when mass mobilizations combined with defections from the army, raising the specter of civil war, did the president decide that U.S. interests would be best served by providing Marcos with a "golden parachute."

More farsighted elements in the ruling class drew this conclusion earlier. Marcos's usefulness to U.S. imperialism was not indisputable. In many ways he was the most effective recruiter a revolutionary movement could ask for. His cruelty was surpassed only by his greed. The extent of corruption in his regime is only now coming to light, with the revelation of millions of dollars salted away in Swiss bank accounts. With friends like these Washington has little need of enemies. History will number Marcos with Somoza of Nicaragua and the shah of Iran, and the U.S. government hardly wanted a repeat performance of either the Iranian or Nicaraguan revolution in the militarily vital Philippines.

After weeks of people's antigovernment mobilizations in Haiti Washington likewise came to the conclusion that its interests could no longer be served by Duvalier. It leaked a false announcement that the dictator had fled the country--an announcement which was to come true a week later. Duvalier took

up residence in the south of France, in a deluxe suite surrounded by bodyguards and a staff of domestic servants. Washington, however, did nothing to bring about the anti-Duvalier demonstrations, and as for "democracy"--no one voted for the military council which is now in power. There have been no elections. The Haitian people began rejoicing in the streets that Duvalier was gone, as well they should, but for Reagan and gang to pretend that they have lifted a finger for democracy in Haiti is the most transparent hypocrisy, as the most recent demonstrations for the ouster of the junta clearly reveal.

WASHINGTON'S 'DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTIONARIES'

While Reagan's portrayal of the Nicaraguan contras and Afghan opium khans as "freedom fighters" is hardly convincing, Corazon Aquino is seen by many as a genuine promoter of democracy. One can be assured that Reagan and the Republican Party will try to use this to their advantage. She has the added credential of being the widow of Benigno "Ninoy" Aquino, the liberal politician whom Marcos had murdered in 1983. The U.S.-educated Filipina president is already a big hit with the concerned sector of American high society. Working people should be less than enthusiastic about her.

Erik Guyot, writing in the March 26, 1986, issue of The Guardian, does the left a great service by publishing a list of Aquino's cabinet members with brief political histories, entitled "When Aquino calls roll: Who's who--and why." He writes, "Here are some of its more influential members.

"Salvador Laurel--head of the Unido party and former Marcos stalwart, he is now vice president, prime minister and foreign minister. Laurel, who has his own power base and political ambitions, is seen as one of the most pro-U.S. and conservative figures in the Aquino administration.

"Juan Ponce Enrile -- minister of defense, a position which he held throughout the Martial Law years when he served as Martial Law administrator. A political warlord in Northern Luzon, Enrile oversaw considerable vote fraud in his region in this year's election, as well as in local polling in 1984. He is now seen as a possible future leader of Marcos's KBL party. As head of Coconut Planters Bank and other corporations he shared control of the lucrative coconut monopoly. Through a holding company he allegedly owns a \$1.8 million house in San Francisco.

"Jaime Ongpin--finance minister and Aquino's closest economic adviser, Ongpin, president of the Benguet Mining Corp., is highly regarded by foreign bankers. Benguet Corp. has been involved in several land disputes in Northern Luzon and the NPA [New People's Army] has destroyed its equipment. Benguet has allegedly forced tribal Filipinos off their homelands and, according to a Western anthropologist, is regarded by tribal minorities as 'the enemy.'"

The portfolios of defense, finance, and foreign affairs, the most important in any government, are held by men who will hardly inspire worry on Wall Street or in Washington. Whether this Aquino administration will be able to permanently stabilize the Philippine political situation is another question. It still has to cope with the demands and independent mobilization of the masses.

The Filipino bourgeoisie has a charismatic ghost--Ninoy Aquino--and his nearly equally charismatic widow, who they hope can channel mass support for a bourgeois government. Their class counterparts in Haiti don't share that advantage. The military junta--headed by Lt. Gen. Henri Namphy--is not seen as a big improvement over the Duvalier dictatorship, and strikes and demonstrations have not abated; rather, they have increased.

On March 20 the only member of the junta who had opposed Duvalier--justice minister Gerard Gourgue--resigned his post, leading to a reorganization of the new government only six weeks after it came to power. Three who were most closely identified with Duvalier were dismissed as a response to the continuing mobilizations. Even more ominous for Wall Street and the Haitian bourgeoisie, the mobilizations are not only for democratic rights--they include strikes for better wages and working conditions. This should be no surprise in the Western Hemisphere's poorest country. Another demand is that Duvalier and his associates be brought to justice. The consequences of that demand are particularly worrisome to a great many Haitian businessmen.

The return of hundreds of political exiles to Haiti--militants who have gained experience in Africa, Europe, the United States, and other areas of the Caribbean--is enriching the political discussion. Lessons drawn from events in Jamaica, Grenada, Nicaragua, and the U.S. Black struggle will be put to use in the weeks to come. Working people have every reason to be optimistic about future events in Haiti.

To discuss the politics of the dominated countries, among which both Haiti and the Philippines are included, simply in terms of "democracy vs. dictatorship" is to miss the most fundamental point, which is: what class's interests does the government in power represent. On that level Reagan's commitment is unshakable: He is committed to maintaining bourgeois rule throughout the world, using whatever tactics are appropriate to the given situation.

THEIR DEMOCRACY AND OURS

Marxists fight for democracy and against repression, and we fight to win. However, we do so with our eyes open, recognizing that the fight for democratic rights for the working people of the cities and countryside is a big step, but not the whole journey. The fight for democratic rights mobilizes working people and teaches them invaluable lessons about how to carry out mass struggle. Democratic concessions make further struggle easier. It is much easier to fight for workers' rights if trade unionists can meet openly, collect dues freely, and carry out collective bargaining without fear of being arrested or shot in the streets. Though the immediate formal purpose of trade unions is not to fight for democratic rights, the connection between fighting for economic improvements and for basic civil liberties should be obvious.

The capitalist class's political representatives are well aware of that. They understand that democratic concessions have their risks, and when labor "gets out of hand" they have no qualms

about taking civil liberties away. History shows that there is no guarantee of democratic rights for working people as long as the capitalists control the government.

So, while the fall of Marcos and the fall of Duvalier are victories, the accession of Corazon Aquino and the Haitian military junta are not. Both new governments are committed to the defense of capitalist rule. Neither will be able -- if indeed they are willing -- to put an end to the exploitation and poverty faced by their countries' people. That will require political power in the hands of workers and their allies. Mass struggles which bring down dictators are often the beginning of socialist revolution, in spite of the intentions of people like Corazon Aquino and Henri Namphy, who must be swept aside if such a revolution is to be successful.

If Ronald Reagan ever had the idea that he could intimidate the working masses of this world, the last several months should have been a sobering experience for him. His invasion of Grenada did not inspire respect for the U.S. It inspired determination to resist, as seen in Nicaragua, South Africa, and now Haiti and the Philippines. Reagan's latest outrage against Libya will also not have the result that he hopes it will from this point of view. The world revolution is not reading from Reagan's movie script, and it won't have the Hollywood ending he has in mind. History doesn't respond to charm or charisma; the class struggle always has the last word. □

Subscribe now!

International VIEWPOINT

International Viewpoint, the official English-language publication of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, is a review of news and Marxist analysis. It comes to you twice a month directly from Paris by air mail.

1 year: \$42 6 months: \$22

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Send to: *International Viewpoint*,
Box 1824 New York, N.Y. 10009

Make checks payable to International Viewpoint.

AFTER THE FALL OF MARCOS

Excerpts from 'International Viewpoint'

The situation in the Philippines remains fluid. At least in the Metro-Manila area, the population has had the experience of "people's power," of the might of a mass upsurge. Tomorrow, the revolutionary left may gather the fruits of this experience.

The new regime has to assume control of the provinces. It is divided between a reformist pole attached to the president's office and a conservative one entrenched in the government. It may be torn by conflicts of interests and personal ambitions. Above all, it is going to have to confront an economic and social crisis without parallel in the region — vital, urgent demands from the masses.

Likewise, relations with American imperialism and negotiations on the US bases established in the archipelago are going to put contradictory pressures on the new regime. More important still, because of the dynamic of the mass mobilization, a new democratic opening has emerged in the country; the repressive vise has been loosened. The mass movements can take advantage of this opening to advance their own political and social demands.

The new administration and the new government enjoy real mass support. Corazon Aquino has won everybody's respect, both by what she represents — as Ninoy's widow — and by the way she continued the fight after the February 7 elections. The new government has acquired a real legitimacy, forged in the democratic uprising and sanctified by the Roman Catholic church. However, it remains a pro-imperialist bourgeois government, as attested by the composition of the government and the support extended by Washington.

The stakes in the period now opening are very great. The success of a bourgeois transition to the post-Marcos era is far from assured. In fact, the orderly transition long hoped

for by the key sectors of US imperialism and of the Philippine ruling classes was scuttled by Marcos' intransigence, the dynamic of the mass mobilization and the contradictions of Reagan's policy.

. . .

The division in the American administration up to the eve of the denouement of the crisis shows that the cleavages that appeared recently and on other occasions have not been definitively overcome. The dilemma is always the same: Should the United States hang onto an allied dictatorship that, although in crisis, is "reliable," or must it take the risk of ambitious reforms that could have dangerous consequences.

In this case, the stakes were particularly high, given the presence of immense US military bases in the islands. Marcos was aware of the divisions in the US administration and Reagan's positions, and he was able to play on them with considerable cunning.

A week before the February 7 elections, the White House was still refusing to face the facts and dump its Philippine protege. Republicans and Democrats in congress had to create a *fait accompli* by supporting the generals going over to Cory to get Reagan to yield. Even then he gave the ousted crooked dictator an almost triumphant reception in Hawaii.

. . .

Corazon Aquino is clearly not the naive and green little mother that she was believed to be. Since the end of 1985 and the start of the election campaign, she has demonstrated considerable political sense, a sense of how to maneuver and also how to make compromises. Her first moves as president show that she is definitely a factor in the new system of rule, and not just a symbolic moral figure.

Just before the electoral slates were closed, she was able to make a compromise with Salvador Laurel whereby she agreed to run under the label of his party, the United Nationalist Democratic Organization (UNIDO), while remaining the candidate for president.

She managed to thwart Marcos' post-election maneuvering by declaring herself the winner on the basis of the first results. She was able to resist those who advocated compromise in the face of Marcos' intransigence.

Moreover, she was able to sidestep the sudden offer of patronage from Enrile when he "rebelled" and took refuge in Camp Crame and invited her to set up her government in General Fidel Ramos' police headquarters. At the same time, she agreed to take on board these dubious last-minute allies.

Above all, throughout the weeks of open crisis, she was able to keep in touch with the democratic mass upsurge and give it impetus. She is using the momentum of this movement today to force through some initial radical measures, such as the release of all the political prisoners.

Behind Cory, therefore, there is a project, if not a program, and a political milieu that constitutes a foundation stone of the new government. The history of the Philippines is different from that of the other countries in Southeast Asia, and the present situation is unprecedented.

A lot of unknowns remain, in particular the evolution of an army that never got a taste of power before the martial-law regime, as well as of the Church and certain sectors of the Catholic hierarchy.

Such sectors of the hierarchy, and then the bishops as a whole when the crisis became too serious, played a considerable role in Corazon Aquino's campaign. Already a moral and institutional power, the Roman Catholic Church has now gone into politics. It is a de facto participant in the new government.

In the new regime, thus, we find what were very traditional elements in Philippine political life before martial law, such as the big families and their regional power; more modern elements, such as the commercial bourgeoisie, as well as more unusual components — the army and the Church. This is in fact part of the legacy of Marcos. He made the army a central axis of the regime and forced the Church to intervene as an arbiter in order to respond to the

We reprint here excerpts from an article on the Philippines by Paul Petitjean which appeared in the March 24 issue of *International Viewpoint*.

major crisis that was opened up by the activity of the army itself.

The institutional Church has been the main formative influence on Cory. As the wife of a politician long imprisoned by Marcos, she was marked by the moderate wing of the defenders of human rights. A member of the country's social elite, she has never broken her class ties. Her political options are polarized on one side by the figure of Cardinal Jaime Sin, the archbishop of Manila, the pivot in a conservative hierarchy but today resigned to reforms; and, on the other side, the currents linked to the "social democrats" and Catholic Action.

These currents have been around for a long time. Already at the beginning of the 1970s, they competed for influence in the student milieu with Marxist currents. But they were paralyzed to a considerable extent by the martial law regime. Only the Communist Party of the Philippines (CPP) was then able to organize multi-form resistance to the dictatorship.

It alone was able to build an underground apparatus rooted in sections of the masses, able to act on a national scale, to absorb the blows of the repression, to extend progressively an armed struggle movement, to combine legal and semilegal struggles with clandestine activity.

The martial-law regime did not leave much space for political "third forces," either of the right, the center or the left. The 1970s were a period of growing bipolarization. However, the government did leave certain semidemocratic openings that allowed various marginalized currents to survive.

The Church could not simply be brought to heel in a country where 85 per cent of the population is Catholic. An army-Church commission, in fact, was established to negotiate the fate of members of the religious orders threatened by the repression.

It was only at the end of the Marcos regime — when formally martial law had been lifted — that the "red" priests and nuns became the target for liquidations. Church social activity could not be eliminated by decree. It was the crucible for very extensive mass work.

The anti-Marcos lobbies established in the United States were powerful, and the regime had to respect a minimum of formal rules in order to forestall criticisms, especially in the universities. The local governments could not be made to march in step in a country that had never known a

centralizing regime. Some provinces remained oppositional.

So, the "social democratic" current maintained itself, although marginally. But it diversified. Its traditional wing, unlike the Marxists, advocated nonviolence. This is true today of the Reverend Father Jose Blanco, a Jesuit priest who was denounced as a "clerico-fascist" as late as September 1985 in a communique of the National Democratic Front (NDF), for his divisive activity within the opposition forces.

. . .

The entire left, even that part that backed Corazon's candidacy, has noted with concern the presence in the new government of a figure such as Enrile. Ed Garcia, representative of the Movement for National Sovereignty and Democracy (KAAKBAY), which is led politically by Jose Diokno and also includes independent Marxists, argues that the "popular will" that brought Corazon Aquino to power has been deflected by the military.

But the entire left, including the part that advocated a boycott of the elections, recognises the popular character of Cory's victory.

In 1985, the Philippine left had begun to prepare its intervention in the 1986 regional and local elections. All the components of the left — including the CPP — were thinking of participating directly or indirectly in the electoral confrontation in a series of regions. But the announcement of the presidential elections confronted the anti-imperialist movement with a difficult tactical choice. Because it was divided it was difficult for the left to intervene rapidly enough to change the opposition candidates. The Aquino-Laurel ticket was bourgeois. But it raised great hopes among the people. The minority currents of the anti-imperialist left got involved in the election campaign. On the other hand the majority, represented by the CPP and the NDF, defended the principle of a boycott.

. . .

In an interview given on February 13, Antonio Zumel, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPP, and chair of the NDF, congratulated Corazon Aquino for the way in which she was continuing the struggle despite Marcos' electoral fraud.

While presenting a sober judgement on the forces of the revolutionary

left in the country and discussing the conditions for a ceasefire in the event of an Aquino victory, Zumel announced that the political and social polarization of the country was going to accelerate still more.

The role of the moderate opposition was going to decline more and more: with "this revolutionary situation that we have ... it is logical that the moderate opposition will tend to contract as forces go to one side or the other." In fact, "today there is hardly any room for reforms."

CPP activists today admit that this error of judgement led them into a blind alley in these crucial weeks and that they now have to reevaluate their tactic. In early March, a debate was in progress in the CPP leadership over adopting a new tactical orientation, while Corazon Aquino was leading a rip-roaring ideological offensive, calling on the guerrillas to lay down their arms. At the same time, she offered the NPA a six-month truce to discuss the possible legalization of the CPP.

. . .

The NPA claims to have 32,000 full-time or part-time fighters. The American intelligence services credit it with about 16,500 members. These figures are not contradictory, since the first includes part-time fighters. The NPA has acquired strong roots in many regions of the country. There seems to be no question of its laying down its arms. But it is possible that there will be a suspension of military operations to give the new government time to demonstrate to the masses what it is going to do and to give time to study Corazon Aquino's concrete proposals.

Today, the left forces, progressives and revolutionaries, have to operate in a new context. They have to reconstitute their unity in order to intervene in the coming months so as to take the initiative on the social and political fronts.

During this watershed period, it is very important to make sure that international solidarity does not flag. It is in fact very likely that the present situation is going to be seized on by anticommunist currents in international Church and social democratic circles in an attempt to isolate the Philippine anti-imperialist left.

Such attempts must be blocked. Today, as before, the independent people's movements need our help. □

DEMONSTRATIONS PUT WOMEN'S MOVEMENT BACK ON THE STREETS

by Diane Phillips

The ramifications of the March 9 and 16 reproductive rights demonstrations in Washington D.C. and Los Angeles are being discussed in the National Organization for Women (NOW) and the women's liberation movement in general. These actions were far more successful than anyone had expected. While police declared eighty thousand participants on March 9 in Washington D.C., the leadership of NOW, which organized the action, estimated 125,000. According to NOW figures, about thirty thousand women and men marched for abortion rights and against two anti-choice referenda on March 16 in Los Angeles.

The police also had a smaller estimate for Los Angeles, but no matter whose figures you use, these actions were the largest outpourings in U.S. history in favor of safe, legal abortion and birth control. By contrast, a national "right to life" demonstration in Washington D.C. several months ago drew only thirty thousand. The combined Los Angeles and D.C. demonstrations represent a magnificent celebration of International Women's Day and Women's History Month. The feminist movement has been significantly strengthened.

In Washington, NOW chapters east of the Mississippi River were represented. Twenty-five hundred Massachusetts NOW members came. New York City NOW sent thirty buses. Columbia-Barnard, New York University, Hunter College, and the People's Anti-War Mobilization organized their own buses from New York City. For many demonstrators, March 9 was the first mass action which they had ever attended, and they were pleased with their experience. There were some labor delegations, as well as participation from Blacks and other oppressed nationalities. However, it was evident that more outreach needs to be done among these groups.

The Los Angeles march and rally, which attracted contingents from up and down the West Coast, were spirited despite a torrential downpour. An article in the Los Angeles Times quoted NOW president Eleanor Smeal as declaring, "There is no way we're going back one inch. We are telling church leaders and political leaders to stop playing with women's lives." According to the Times this drew a warm response from the crowd, which "cheered and bobbed their umbrellas in response."

Perhaps the most exciting aspect of these demonstrations was the massive involvement of young women, particularly students. In building for them, NOW had correctly oriented to the college campuses. High school students also attended. Students and working class women are far more likely than the corporate women--which many NOW leaders have tended to see as the base of the organization--to attend such events. Of course, corporate women can be sympathetic to women's issues, but far too much reliance has been placed on them by NOW in the past. They often show little support for the special problems of poor women and women of color (for example on questions like sterilization abuse).

Though the national NOW convention in July 1985 had overwhelmingly voted for these events, many feminists expressed skepticism about the effectiveness of a mass action approach before March 9. They put more stress on lobbying and working on election campaigns for liberal politicians. But March 9 and 16 were resounding ideological victories for militant feminists, and their impact will be felt in the course of future discussions in NOW and in the broader women's movement about what strategy will best advance our goals.

After these successes it will be more difficult to claim that rallies and marches are outdated and won't draw large crowds. Fears of a lack of volunteers and of tremendous financial losses were likewise shown to have no basis. A couple of hundred organizations endorsed these activities, paving the way for future cooperation. In fact, if some NOW chapters had begun organizing earlier

Diane Phillips is an independent socialist feminist and a member of the New York City National Organization for Women.

and contacted more groups, the results could have been even more spectacular. March 1986 will be remembered as an important month in the continuing struggle for women's rights and social justice.

The consensus of those involved is that more mass actions are needed in order to keep the rights won as a result of Roe vs. Wade--the Supreme Court decision in 1972 that legalized abortion in the United States. Mass action proposals should be considered and adopted at upcoming NOW state, regional, and national conventions. Other issues which are a priority for NOW, such as passage of the Equal Rights Amendment, lesbian rights, and combatting racism, can only benefit from such a mass action strategy. That approach should also be ex-

tended to include participation by NOW in efforts such as opposition to aid for the Nicaraguan contras, for divestment and sanctions against South African apartheid, for solidarity with striking workers like United Food and Commercial Workers Local P-9 in Austin, Minnesota, and the TWA flight attendants.

Through support for and participation in such activities the women's movement can cement its ties with other social forces which are fighting the same enemy--the U.S. government and corporate America which that government represents--and can both win allies for its own struggles and help advance a climate of public opinion which will help everyone oppressed by this system, including women, win their rights. □



AUSTIN MEATPACKERS' STRIKE SHAKES UP U.S. UNIONS

by Dave Riehle

"The sad and highly publicized failure of a strike by Minnesota meatpackers against Hormel is costing most of the workers their jobs," editorialized the New York Times on Friday, Feb. 14. The editors went on to explain that the company stood firm, the "parent" union advised against the course of the local union, and the town of Austin was "rent by bitterness."

"It was a costly lesson," the Times concluded: "for the workers and their community and, because of the national publicity, another blow to the labor movement."

Why does the Times, the premier capitalist daily in the United States, feel "sad" that the labor movement has received "another blow"? Does this mean they are for successful strikes, and in favor of warding off blows to the labor movement?

No epiphanic conversions here. The Times editors were merely writing a homily for the labor lieutenants of capitalism to absorb and repeat as they forgathered in Bal Harbour, Florida, the site of the meeting of the AFL-CIO Executive Council shortly afterwards.

The bureaucrats did not fail to respond on cue; suitably enough in a part of the country where other trained animal acts winter. Nevertheless, they were unable to perform their smug rituals undisturbed. Jim Guyette, president of United Food and Commercial Workers Local P-9, and Ray Rogers, of Corporate Campaign, the two best-known protagonists of the struggle in Austin, showed up on their doorstep. In spite of the intentions of the AFL-CIO top dogs, the most important labor struggle in decades in this country put itself on the agenda.

Many workers across the country noted that while the bureaucrats spurned appeals for solidarity from P-9, they held out the prospect of "associate memberships" in the AFL-CIO to the unemployed, with the lure of reduced rates on Visa cards as an inducement.

The contrast of the union tops sneering at the courageous struggle by P-9 while holding out a ludicrous "solution" to the crisis of labor was not lost on hundreds of thousands of rank-and-file union members.

Hundreds of P-9 members have fanned out all across the country, speaking at enthusiastic support rallies and raising tens of thousands of dollars. Over 1,100 local unions have "adopted" an Austin family for a period of up to three months. A consumer boycott against Hormel products has taken hold and has begun to exert real pressure on the company.

All of these activities have been made possible by an authentic surge of sentiment in the ranks of the unions. Millions, undoubtedly, watched on national television as Local P-9 closed down the Austin plant on Jan. 20, and as the Minnesota National Guard was mobilized to escort strikebreakers into the plant. They also saw P-9 president Jim Guyette debate the UFCW's Packinghouse Division head Lewie Anderson on ABC's "Nightline."

FRUSTRATION AND ANGER GIVEN EXPRESSION

For millions of workers the frustration and anger that they feel as the bosses demand more givebacks while the top union leaders offer no prospect of resistance were given expression on national television. Undoubtedly part of the rapid impact P-9 has made on working class consciousness is because it is occurring in the age of instantaneous electronic communication.

Jim Guyette's uncompromising opposition to concessions, and his favorable contrast with Lewie Anderson, was what the workers wanted to see and hear. The fact that this feeling found an articulate exponent in Guyette, and that this clash of perspectives within the labor movement was considered important enough to be taken up on what amounts to a national forum and was personified by the main actors in a current struggle, could only reinforce the sense of legitimacy of their grievances by the millions of workers watching.

Confirmation that this is not just a passing mood, but something more deep-going, symptomatic, and significant, can be found in the phenomenon of local leadership turnover in the unions. More and more of the old guard who go along one way or another with the do-nothing policies of the bureaucracy are being

pushed out. And this process, already under way, is becoming intertwined with the P-9 struggle. Evidence of this is everywhere. The disregard of the official position of the Wynn leadership of the UFCW -- concurred in by almost every other international union leadership -- by hundreds of local unions who have contributed to the P-9 Adopt-A-Family Fund and publicized the Hormel boycott is certainly most notable proof.

In almost every case this local disregard of national policy has prompted no intervention from above, and the accumulating pressure this represents has begun to register. For example, early this year the UAW International Executive Board voted to send \$20,000 to P-9 -- tacit recognition of the action of many UAW locals sending money to Austin. The UAW leaders have always tended to be more sensitive to shifts in moods within their ranks, but the same pressures are building up in other unions as well.

The most dramatic example of the erosion of the influence of the authority of the union bureaucracies, and the inspiration engendered by the Austin struggle, was the refusal of the workers at the Hormel plants in Ottumwa, Iowa, and Fremont, Nebraska, to cross the P-9 picket lines. Almost 90 percent of the Ottumwa workers refused to cross initially, in spite of the threats of the company and William Wynn's scabherding imprecations. The decision by Hormel to fire 505 workers in Ottumwa prompted two demonstrations by thousands of townspeople, led by the mayor, a union member himself.

As in Austin, the actions in Ottumwa did not come out of nowhere. Although the Hormel plant was opened only in 1976, the town itself was once known as "Little Chicago." At that time it had a population almost twice what it is now (about 25,000) and was dominated by major industry, including a Deere farm equipment plant and a Morrell Co. meatpacking plant. The Morrell local received the designation "P-1" when the United Packinghouse Workers (CIO) was established. The Hormel workers went through a scenario of concessions demands and plant-closing blackmail in the late '70s that enabled them to appreciate and understand the Austin situation as it developed.

The Ottumwa workers remain unrepentant and many have joined their brothers and sisters on the road helping to organize support for the Hormel struggle.

The authors of the editorial on P-9 in the New York Times might have done

well to consult their sister publication, the Wall Street Journal, before drawing their bleak conclusions, if they had been intended as honest commentary. The Journal, more directly addressed to the bosses and their flunkies than the Times, presented a different perspective. The Feb. 5, 1986, issue carried an article entitled: "Meatpacking Industry Faces Shakeout -- Union Resistance to Concessions Widens."

The article said: "When 1,500 workers at the Geo. A. Hormel & Co.'s plant in Austin, Minn., went on strike last August, they seemed to be the only meatpackers resisting wage cuts. Instead, the strike has become dramatic evidence that many meatpacking companies are facing a new round of labor troubles.

"...the Hormel strike and several less publicized disputes have ignited a broader backlash against concessions and forced the international union to take a harder line," the Journal reporter said.

"The backlash spelled doom for leaders of local unions who went along with wage and benefit concession. At Morrell's Sioux Falls (South Dakota) plant, a new slate of officers replaced leaders who had agreed to a \$2.40 an hour cut in wages in 1983. Under the new leadership, 2,500 workers struck for 11 weeks at the end of 1985. They won a \$1 an hour boost in pay.

"Then last month, those new officers were displaced by a group of leaders who are 'more militant.'"

REAL POLICY OF THE WYNN LEADERSHIP

This hardly supports the contention of the UFCW leaders that the P-9 strike was the "wrong strike at the wrong time." On the contrary, it reveals the real policy of the Wynn leadership -- to reach an accommodation with the packers regardless of the cost to the workers in wages, benefits, and working conditions. P-9's resistance to this backroom deal threatens to upset the applecart.

In the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, where organized support for P-9 has been conducted for over a year, the UFCW local in St. Paul, with over 5,000 members, voted in January to adopt a P-9 family, in direct violation of the policy of the International. The local then published a full account in their local newsletter. Such an action would have been unthinkable, even a few months ago.

Even the removal of strike sanction from Local P-9 by Wynn seems to have as yet no appreciable effect on the readiness of local unions to align themselves with Austin. Meeting subsequent to this announcement, the UFCW union at the

Oscar Mayer plant in Madison, Wis., voted to proceed with a food caravan being organized in conjunction with the Dane County (Madison) Central Labor Council slated to travel to Austin April 5. Ten thousand dollars has already been allotted for this.

A striking feature of all this is the inability or unwillingness of many international union leaderships to intervene, as local after local violates the wishes, if not the direct orders, of the higher-ups, with virtual impunity.

It is evident already that, regardless of the outcome of the strike in Austin, the history of the deepening resistance to the capitalist antilabor offensive of the 1980s will be divided into "Before P-9" and "After P-9."

Why this local union with only 1,500 members, in a small Midwestern town, has had the power to place itself at the center of attention of the labor movement in the United States was strikingly expressed at a recent meeting by a P-9 member, who happens to be a native of West Africa. He said there is a saying in Africa that the truth is like a stone in the stomach of a goat; it can't be digested and it can't be passed. Inexorably it comes to dominate the organism of the animal, and even to kill it. The reaction to P-9 says much about the accumulating forces, under the surface, that will eventually precipitate much broader struggles.

P-9 already has its worshipers and its fainthearted critics, as well as its open enemies. Contrary to both, P-9 is neither a model of strike organization and class combat, nor a failure created by the shortcomings and mistakes of its leaders. All those things can be learned, corrected, and improved upon. As important as they are, they are secondary and derivative. The workers who support P-9, and are inspired by them, know this instinctively.

The P-9 fight had to happen somewhere, and what is important at this stage of the class struggle is that the leaders be honest, modest, and uncompromising. This they are.

The power of the Austin workers rests on their democracy, mobilization of the rank and file, and their determination to appeal to other workers for support and understanding. And they simply won't give up. It is this which terrorizes the entrenched bureaucracy in the UFCW and beyond, and infuriates the employers. The American workers can begin to sense their tremendous potential power when they realize they don't have to do what they are told.

This defiance, if generalized,

threatens to undermine the relationship of the union bureaucrats to the employers in a fundamental way. This relationship is based on convincing the bosses that the bureaucrats can control the workers more effectively and economically than the employers can directly. In return for this, the bureaucrats expect agreements that ratify their status and allow them to present themselves to the rank and file as effective defenders of workers' interests. Once it is demonstrated that they are unnecessary, and even an impediment to fighting for the real interests of the workers, their ability to police the ranks in the interests of the employers is drastically curtailed. As their authority is eroded, the bosses find little value in cultivating them and honoring them as "labor statesmen."

BOSSSES WORK BOTH SIDES

Naturally, the employers would prefer to have effective labor lieutenants in the unions, as long as they are compelled to tolerate the unions at all, and the various editorials in the big business press on the Hormel strike reflect this. Nevertheless, given their long range and permanent objective of no unions at all, they are not entirely unhappy with the increasing contempt and hatred being expressed toward the Wynn leadership by workers both in and out of the UFCW.

The UFCW International leaders whine about the negative impact that the P-9 struggle has had on their ability to organize, and blame P-9 for recent defeats in representation elections. This is transparent hypocrisy; it is obvious that if the International had aligned itself with P-9, instead of against it, workers would have been breaking down



the door to join up. However, it is certainly not distressing the packing bosses that the main union they have to contend with is being discredited in the eyes of the workers. Unlike the UFCW bureaucrats, they are quite capable of working both sides of the streets in pursuit of their own interests. If they can't attain their objectives in collaboration with their "partners" in the International, they are perfectly willing to cut their throats if the opportunity presents itself. This is something the Wynn leadership has undoubtedly pondered, and accounts in large part for their frenzied opposition to P-9.

Where does P-9 stand today? Nearly a thousand of the original 1,450 strikers remain out, with about 350 working in the plant, along with 700 scabs hired during the course of the strike. The workers, having continued the strike in spite of the lifting of sanction by the International, now face action to place them in receivership. A hearing is scheduled to take place in Minneapolis on April 7 to make the formal recommendation on this action. Wynn may well proceed from that to sign a contract over the heads of the P-9 members. This would then be utilized to attempt to herd the workers into the plant. Wynn might very well go to court asking for an order removing the pickets from the plant in Austin.

Receivership has been an obvious option for the International since the dispute with P-9 began over a year ago. However, taking such action would have meant shouldering more of the responsibility for the outcome of the fight with the Hormel Co.

Throughout the course of the struggle the Wynn leadership has maneuvered to develop some base of support within the local that could give them a creditable excuse for intervening administratively without seeming to openly defy the will of the majority. That possibility has clearly been discarded. After an overwhelming majority of the remaining P-9 strikers voted to continue the strike following the removal of the International's sanction, it was clear there was only one card left to play.

To make this decision, and to attempt to enforce it, will only further discredit the tattered reputation of the Wynn leadership. But they have been forced here step-by-step based on the logic of the position they took initially, and their irreconcilable hostility and opposition to the Austin local. This move was undoubtedly precipitated by the

launching of the national consumer boycott of Hormel products and the dramatic mobilization of 4,000 trade unionists from across the country in Austin in defense of P-9 on Feb. 15.

Reports reaching P-9 indicate that the Austin plant is operating at much less than 50 percent capacity, with workers averaging 25-hour per week paychecks. The Ottumwa plant is limping along with some 175 workers out of the original 800, with 505 fired and not replaced. Close to 50 workers still refuse to enter the Fremont plant, even though they have the opportunity to do so. The economic cost of continuing this struggle to the Hormel Co. must be immense.

OUTCOME STILL TO BE DECIDED

It is clear from the actions of the company and the International that the objective of Hormel management is still to get the large majority of the original workforce back into the plant. They are not confident that the plant can operate profitably without this experienced and stable group of workers. This is a continuing advantage the Austin workers are well aware of, and as long as it remains true, and the ranks of the strikers are not eroded further, their strike is not over.

It is crucial for supporters of P-9 to be cognizant of this. The Austin strike is not a hopeless, but noble, fight with no concrete purpose. It is a living strike whose outcome is still to be decided. The pressure that can be brought to bear throughout the country, by pursuing the consumer boycott, raising money, and conducting effective and visible solidarity activities, can be a major factor in the favorable resolution of the strike for the workers.

The unbreakable will of the Austin workers to persist has been forged in the tremendous solidarity exhibited by unionists all across the country. Imbued with confidence imparted by the reciprocal inspiration of the strikers and their supporters, the members of P-9 see themselves as the bearers of a historic mission -- the revitalization of the American labor movement. They are now people fighting not only for an immediate objective, but for an overriding principle. There is no way the contribution they have made can ever be erased. It has helped to begin the transformation of the consciousness of millions of workers. The genie is out of the bottle.

-- March 31, 1986

Commemorating the Centenary of the Haymarket Case

ALBERT PARSONS AND HIS COMRADES:

Working Class Revolutionaries of 1886 (Part 2)

by Paul Le Blanc

May Day, the international workers' holiday, originated on American soil 100 years ago. In 1884 and 1885 the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions, the immediate forerunner of the American Federation of Labor (AFL), had passed resolutions demanding "that eight hours shall constitute a legal day's labor from and after May 1, 1886," and calling for a nationwide general strike on that day to force the realization of the demand.[15] Some of the leaders of the Federation -- Adolph Strasser, Samuel Gompers, P.J. McGuire -- had been part of the socialist movement and had not yet abandoned all of their radical convictions. Yet their Federation was then a relatively weak alliance of unions with a combined membership of only 50,000. The far more prestigious 700,000-member Knights of Labor also favored the eight-hour workday. But this organization was led by the domineering Grand Master Workman Terrence V. Powderly, who was anxious to preserve the "respectability" of the Knights and therefore used all of his influence to prevent the local assemblies of his organization from participating in this militant action.

Yet the demand caught the imagination of growing numbers of American workers. They generally worked from 10 to 16 hours a day and experienced deteriorating working conditions and living standards as the "robber barons" of industrial capitalism transformed the U.S. economy in the decades following the Civil War. The enthusiasm for the May Day proposal was part of a general labor upsurge which swept many into the struggle. The table below tells much of the story.

An increasing number of workers' strikes and demonstrations were for the

eight-hour day. By the second week in May 1886, 340,000 workers were united in the "eight hours" battle, and 190,000 actually put down their tools and went on strike for it. Of these, 80,000 strikers were in the city of Chicago.

At first the Chicago International Working People's Association (IWPA) had been inclined to follow the lead of Johann Most in New York City, who dismissed the eight-hour movement as an "unrevolutionary" reform which probably couldn't be won anyway. The only reasonable course of action, Most preached, was social revolution. He urged workers to arm themselves, make dynamite bombs, and prepare to kill the tyrants who oppressed them. But this was irrelevant bombast with little mass appeal. The enthusiastic response of the working class to the eight-hour demand, on the other hand, forced the thoughtful revolutionaries of Chicago to reconsider the question and finally to throw themselves into the upsurge.

The moderate wing of the Chicago labor movement had sought to make the eight-hour movement eminently respectable. The moderates denied that the demand was in any way revolutionary (they were happy to agree with Most on that), and they tried to make it more palatable to the business community by calling for eight hours' work with a consequent reduction in pay. But the radical wing of the movement, led by the IWPA, insisted: "Eight Hours Work With No Reduction in Pay." Historian Henry David has noted that the revolutionaries' "labors were extensive, and were to some degree responsible for the scope and vigor of the movement in Chicago." According to Friedrich Sorge, they virtually "took over the leadership of it in Chicago." [16] Indeed, the city was

Year	Strikes	Establishments struck	Number of workers involved
1884	443	2,367	147,054
1885	645	2,284	242,705
1886	1,411	9,891	499,489

unique because it had the best organized labor movement and the most effective revolutionary working class leaders in the country.

Albert Parsons and other IWPA leaders had concluded that, with the uncompromising demand which they advanced, this struggle did have revolutionary implications. The Alarm, describing a meeting which the IWPA organized for unskilled workers, reported:

"Parsons thought the organization of the vast body of unskilled and unorganized laboring men and women a necessity, in order that they might formulate their demands and make an effective defense of their rights. He thought the attempt to inaugurate the eight-hour system would break down the capitalist system and bring about such disorder and hardship that the Social Revolution would become a necessity. As all roads in ancient times lead to Rome, so now all labor movements of whatever character inevitably lead to socialism." [17]

Parsons and his comrades were explicit about their views and intentions, but they had built up substantial authority among a large sector of Chicago's workers over the years. Meetings and demonstrations throughout March and April drew tens of thousands of participants. On the target day of May 1, over 30,000 Chicago workers were on strike demanding ten hours' pay for eight hours' work. At least 60,000 were in the streets, demonstrating peacefully but militantly for this demand. And the struggle showed every sign of escalating.

While some employers were beginning to capitulate to the intensifying pressure of the workers, however, most were resisting and preparing a counterattack. Leading businessmen formed a special committee of the so-called Citizens' Association of Chicago, a committee which met in almost continuous session "for the purpose of agreeing upon a plan of action in case the necessities of the situation should demand intervention in any way." [18]

HAYMARKET

The capitalists had substantial resources, in addition to their massive economic power. As Henry David has shown, the Chicago police force had been "long used as if it were a private force in the service of the employers." [19] This was augmented by Pinkerton detectives, units from the state militia, and federal troops if necessary. Then there were the newspapers which they controlled and used to shape public opinion.

On May 1, the Chicago Mail editorialized: "There are two dangerous ruffians at large in this city; two sneaking cowards who are trying to create trouble. One of them is named Parsons; the other is named Spies.... Mark them for today. Keep them in view. Hold them personally responsible for any trouble that occurs. Make an example of them if trouble does occur." [20]

May Day passed, but the struggle was clearly not resolved. On May 3, a serious clash between police and workers took place at the McCormick Harvester factory. The police shot a number of workers, setting off a wave of indignation in Chicago's labor movement.

On the evening of May 4, a hastily organized protest meeting was held in Haymarket Square. Spies, Parsons, and Samuel Fielden addressed a crowd of about 3,000. Rain clouds began to gather as the final speaker, Fielden, neared the end of his speech. Many began to leave at that point, including Spies and Parsons. As Fielden was drawing his remarks to a close, a force of 180 police, led by the much-hated John ("Black Jack") Bonfield, appeared in order to break up the rally. Fielden asserted that the gathering was peaceful, then stepped down from the platform. At this point, someone threw a dynamite bomb which exploded in the ranks of the police. They, in turn, opened fire on the workers. Seven policemen and at least seven workers died; many more were injured.

With this, the capitalist counter-offensive began in earnest. Neither the revolutionaries nor the moderates in the labor movement were prepared for what was in store for them.

Labor's "friend," Mayor Harrison, issued a proclamation declaring that since crowds, processions, and public gatherings were "dangerous," he had authorized the police to break them up if they occurred. Indeed, the police did more than this. By May 7 dozens of left-wing offices, meeting halls, saloons, and private homes had been raided, and over 200 arrests had been made. Police Captain Michael J. Schaack, who headed these operations, boasted that "a series of searches kept up night and day for two weeks, and no house or place where an Anarchist or Socialist resided escaped police attention." [21] Indeed not. As historian Harvey Wish later commented: "Homes were invaded without a warrant and ransacked for evidence; suspects were beaten and subjected to the 'third degree'; individuals ignorant of the meaning of socialism and anarchism were tortured by the police,

sometimes bribed as well, to act as witnesses for the state." [22]

The capitalist press whipped up a hysterical campaign. The Chicago Tribune of May 6, for example, declared: "These serpents have been warmed and nourished in the sunshine of toleration until at last they have been emboldened to strike at society, law, order, and government." With the exception of a few labor journals, the reportage and editorials of newspapers throughout the country were the same. Even some of the moderate labor spokesmen were gripped by panic, denouncing "the cowardly murderers, cut-throats and robbers, known as anarchists They are entitled to no more consideration than wild beasts." [23]

In the wave of reaction, hysteria, and fear that followed the Haymarket tragedy, the revolutionary movement was crushed, and the eight-hour and trade union movements were thrown into disarray. Strikes were broken, eight-hour struggles petered out, and state legislatures began passing antilabor bills.

Several years later, Captain Schaack's superior -- Chief of Police Ebersold, with whom Schaack was then feuding -- revealed that the brave captain had "wanted to keep things stirring. He wanted bombs to be found here, there, all around, everywhere.... After we got the anarchist societies broken up, Schaack wanted to send out men to organize new societies right away.... He wanted to keep the thing boiling, keep himself prominent before the public." [24] For a while, at least, Captain Schaack got his way, with the blessing of his friends in the business community. Schaack freely acknowledged that he received "funds...supplied to me by public-spirited citizens who wished the law vindicated and order preserved in Chicago." [25]

TRIAL AND EXECUTION

In this atmosphere, eight men were tried for murder -- Albert Parsons, August Spies, George Engel, Adolph Fischer, Louis Lingg, Michael Schwab, Samuel Fielden, and Oscar Neebe. All pleaded "not guilty" and offered an eloquent defense of their actions and beliefs. But a hostile judge and a hand-picked jury were unmoved. The prosecution, and also the newspapers, made ample use of the most terroristic IWPA utterances to "prove" that the unknown Haymarket bomb-thrower had simply been carrying out the instructions of the defendants.

Soon, the labor movement rallied to their defense. Even moderate Samuel

Gompers of the AFL felt that "Labor must do its best to maintain justice for the radicals or find itself denied the rights of free men." By December the official journal of the Chicago Knights of Labor asserted that "public opinion has turned completely around regarding the eight convicted anarchists...within the past few months." [26]

But little mercy and no justice would be granted. Neebe, a minor figure in the Chicago movement, was sentenced to 18 years in prison. The others were sentenced to death. Lingg died under mysterious circumstances while awaiting execution. Schwab and Fielden appealed for clemency, and their sentence was changed to life imprisonment. Parsons, Spies, Engel, and Fischer were hanged on November 11, 1887.

Two days after the executions, a funeral cortege followed the victims' caskets to Waldheim Cemetery. Six thousand marched behind the coffins, and a quarter of a million lined the streets. Fifteen thousand attended the burial exercises.

In 1893, a new governor, John Peter Altgeld, freed Schwab, Fielden, and Neebe. In his 17,000-word message of pardon, Altgeld demonstrated that the martyrs had been railroaded by a hostile court because of their revolutionary beliefs.

THE LEGACY

In Nevada in 1886 there was a 17-year-old miner who often talked with a co-worker named Pat Reynolds, a veteran

— THE STORY —
— OF —
THE ANARCHISTS
— TOLD —
BY THEMSELVES.
:o:
PARSONS | SPIES | FIELDEN | SCHWAB
FISCHER | LINGG | ENGLE | NEEBE.
The only true history of the men who claim
that they are,
CONDEMNED TO SUFFER DEATH
For exercising the right of Free Speech.
:o:
Also their connection with the Chicago
HAYMARKET AFFAIR
Each man is the author of his own story,
Which will appear only in the
"KNIGHTS OF LABOR"
\$1.00 PER ANNUM.

member of the Knights of Labor. "It was some time before I got the full significance of a remark that he made, that if the working class was to be emancipated, the workers themselves must accomplish it. Early in May, 1886, this thought was driven more deeply into my mind by reading in the newspapers the details of the Haymarket Riot, and later the speeches that were made by the men who were put to trial. The facts and details I talked over every day with Pat Reynolds.... It was a turning point in my life. I told Pat that I would like to join the Knights of Labor." [27] This young miner was William D. ("Big Bill") Haywood, who later led the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW).

By 1898 so prominent a trade union leader as Eugene V. Debs was saying of the Haymarket martyrs: "I would rescue their names from slander. The slanderers of the dead are the oppressors of the living." [28] Debs soon went on to help organize the Socialist Party of America, and as the leader of its revolutionary wing he helped to spread the martyrs' ideas.

When Lucy Parsons joined Debs and Haywood at the founding convention of the IWW in 1905, she voiced the same commitments for which she and Albert Parsons had given so much 20 years before. She now called it revolutionary socialism and concluded, "I hope even now to live to see the day when the first dawn of the new era of labor will have arisen, when capitalism will be a thing of the past, and the new indus-

trial republic, the commonwealth of labor, shall be in operation." [29]

This vision, the ideas, the example of Albert Parsons and his comrades remained vibrant long after they died -- and they continue to reverberate down to our own time. Just as conscious workers have, over the past century, pondered their meaning, so must we.

These were among the finest that our class has produced. But more than this, from a close reading of what they actually said and wrote and did, they represented a revolutionary socialist current having far more in common with the later revolutionary Marxism of Rosa Luxemburg's Mass Strike and Lenin's State and Revolution than has been generally assumed. True, the influence of Johann Most, Bakunin, and others caused them sometimes to veer toward individual-terrorist rhetoric and sectarian "purism," but at the decisive moment they veered back to their touchstone: a commitment to dynamically linking, in practice, the immediate struggles of the working class with the struggle for socialism. Revolutionary theory was grappled with far more seriously by them than by other labor radicals of their time, and its connection with practical politics was intimate.

It is also clear that this practical politics, infused with a revolutionary orientation, assumed a relevance for their own time, for their own class brothers and sisters in Chicago, which has been downplayed if not denied by most commentators. While their outlook

PARSONS

by James P. Cannon

They say he was defeated, he went down
To everlasting failure and disgrace,
On that gray morning when they woke the town
To see him hanging in the market place;
No more will he rebel, long has he lain
In somber silence in the graveyard gloom;
His words and deeds and dreams were all in vain,
The dust of forty years is on his tomb.

And yet his footsteps on the gallows' stair
Resound like drumbeats, quickening the feet
Of men who hear and even now prepare
The march of stern avengers in the street;
And blazoned on their banners overhead
Is the accusing silence of the dead.

This poem is dated Nov. 21, 1929, when the author was 39 years old and living in New York. It was 42 years after the execution of the Haymarket martyrs, and a year after the author had been expelled from the Communist Party for defending "Trotskyism." It has not been published before.

contained not only an inspiring vision but also considerable sophistication which made them a force to be reckoned with, however, it also contained fatal ambiguities and even primitiveness which helped the authorities to reckon with them in a murderously successful fashion. Their hope that the eight-hour movement would generate a revolution did not take into consideration the lack of revolutionary leadership outside of Chicago. Their decentralist predilections helped guarantee that the successes of the Chicago IWPA would not be duplicated in other cities. Their failure to break with and challenge the terroristic bombast of Johann Most (violent rhetoric not backed up with real working class strength) contributed to the irrelevance of the IWPA outside of Chicago, and helped make it vulnerable to repression in Chicago itself.

The tragedy is not that these revolutionary activists made serious mistakes, although they certainly did. But they had great strengths, and one of their finest qualities was a deep thoughtfulness which enabled them to learn from mistakes and move forward. The tragedy is that certain of their mistakes helped the defenders of the status quo to destroy them before they had time to grow even further than they were able to up to 1886. Those who have embraced their legacy can and must learn both from their strengths and weaknesses, but it would have made a profound difference if Parsons and his comrades themselves had enjoyed the opportunity to deepen their revolutionary understanding and continue their work. It is conceivable that this would have resulted in a stronger, more radical working class movement than was actually to develop in the United States.

With the deterministic wisdom of true empiricists, many labor historians have seen their failure as inevitable: they actually did fail, therefore they had to fail. Reality has spoken.

Yet reality often contains more than one possibility. Had these amazingly perceptive and energetic and talented leaders not been eliminated, if they had been able to continue developing, is it a foregone conclusion that they would have been either utterly conservatized (like the leaders of the AFL became) or without influence in the labor movement? The rise and influence of labor radicals in the next two decades -- Debs, Haywood, etc. -- suggests that this should not be a foregone conclusion. If they had remained a potent force in Chicago, with consequent growing national influence, how would this have altered the

course of American labor history? What would have happened if Debs and Haywood had been able to join an already strong left-wing labor current rather than trying to forge one themselves?

This also poses a serious philosophical question: Can the elimination of a handful of individuals, particularly a man like Albert Parsons, really alter history's course? Determinists of both conservative and radical persuasion answer "no" with equal satisfaction. This, however, may be a question to be resolved not by philosophers, but by activists. □

NOTES

15. Philip S. Foner, History of the Labor Movement in the United States, vol. 2 (International Publishers, 1955), p. 98.
16. David, p. 150; Sorge, p. 204.
17. Alarm, April 3, 1886, p. 4.
18. David, p. 161.
19. Ibid., pp. 161-2.
20. Ibid., p. 161.
21. Michael J. Schaack, Anarchy and Anarchists (J. J. Schulte, 1889), pp. 190-1).
22. Quoted in Foner, History, vol. 2, p. 107.
23. Samuel Yellen, American Labor Struggles (Monad Press, 1974), pp. 58-9; David, p. 182.
24. David, p. 192.
25. Schaack, p. 206.
26. David, pp. 344-6; Bernard Mandel, Samuel Gompers (Antioch Press, 1963), p. 56.
27. William D. Haywood, The Autobiography of Big Bill Haywood (International Publishers, 1966), p. 31.
28. Writings and Speeches of Eugene V. Debs (Hermitage Press, 1948), p. 22.
29. The Founding Convention of the IWW, Proceedings (Merit Publishers, 1969), p. 172.

[The first part of this article was published in our April issue.]

CORRECTION

An error occurred in the first part of this article in the April 1986 issue of the Bulletin in Defense of Marxism on page 7. A reference is made to "negative pragmatism." The passage in question should read: "One could argue that there is also a strong tendency among American leftists to denigrate 'foreign doctrines' and glorify 'native pragmatism.'"

FROM THE ARSENAL OF MARXISM

TALKING SOCIALISM AT THE HAYMARKET TRIAL

by Albert Parsons

Although his life was at stake in the Haymarket trial of 1886, Albert Parsons did not neglect to make "propaganda for socialism," along with other things, in his courtroom speech. This is an excerpt from what he said at the trial, where he was sentenced to death. Reprinted from the April 23, 1950 Militant.

I am a Socialist. I am one of those, although myself a wage slave, who holds that it is wrong -- wrong to myself, wrong to my neighbor, and unjust to my fellowmen -- for me to undertake to make my escape from wage slavery by becoming a master and an owner of others' labor. I refuse to do it. Had I chosen another path in life, I might be living upon an avenue of the city of Chicago today, surrounded in my beautiful home with luxury and ease, and servants to do my bidding.

But I chose the other road, and instead I stand here today upon the scaffold, as it were. This is my crime. Before high heaven this and this alone is my crime. I have been false, I have been untrue, and I am a traitor to the infamies that exist today in capitalistic society. If this is a crime in your opinion I plead guilty to it.

Now, be patient with me; I have been with you -- or, rather, I have been patient with this trial. Follow me, if you please, and look at the oppressions of this capitalistic system of industry. As was depicted by my comrade Fielden this morning, every new machine that comes into existence comes there as a competitor with the man of labor. Every machine under the capitalistic system that is introduced into industrial affairs comes as a competitor, as a drag and menace and a prey to the very existence of those who have to sell their labor in order to earn their bread. The man is turned out to starve and whole occupations and pursuits are revolutionized and completely destroyed by the introduction of machinery in a day, in an hour, as it were. I have known it to be the case in the history of my own life -- and I am yet a young man -- that whole pursuits and occupations have been wiped out by the invention of machinery.

What becomes of these people? Where are they? They become competitors of other laborers, and are made to reduce wages and increase the work hours. Many of them are candidates for the gibbet,

they are candidates for your prison cells. Build more penitentiaries; erect more scaffolds, for these men are upon the highway of crime, of misery, of death.

SOCIALISTS AND THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM

Your honor, there never was an effect without a cause. The tree is known by its fruit. Socialists are not those who blindly close their eyes and refuse to look, and who refuse to hear, but having eyes to see, they see, and having ears to hear, they hear. Look at this capitalistic system; look at its operation upon the small businessmen, the small dealers, the middle class. Bradstreet's tells us in last year's report that there were 11,000 small businessmen financially destroyed in the past twelve months.

What became of those people? Where are they, and why have they been wiped out? Has there been any less wealth? No; that which they possessed has simply transferred itself into the hands of some other person. Who is that other? It is he who has greater capitalistic facilities. It is the monopolist, the man who can run corners, who can create rings and squeeze these men to death and wipe them out like dead flies from the table into his monopolistic basket.

The middle classes destroyed in this manner join the ranks of the proletariat. They become what? They seek out the factory gate, they seek in the various occupations of wage labor for employment. What is the result? Then there are more men upon the market. This increases the number of those who are applying for employment. What then? This intensifies the competition, which in turn creates greater monopolists, and with it wages go down until the starvation point is reached, and then what?

WHAT WE SEEK TO ACCOMPLISH

Your honor, Socialism comes to the

people and asks them to look into this thing, to discuss it, to reason, to examine it, to investigate it, to know the facts, because it is by this, and this alone, that violence will be prevented and bloodshed will be avoided, because, as my friend here has said, men in their blind rage, in their ignorance, not knowing what ails them, knowing they are hungry, that they are miserable, and destitute, strike blindly, and do as they did with Maxwell in this city, and fight the labor-saving machinery. Imagine such an absurd thing, and yet the capitalistic press has taken great pains to say the Socialists do these things; that we fight machinery; that we fight property.

Why, sir, it is an absurdity; it is ridiculous; it is preposterous. No man ever heard an utterance from the mouth of a Socialist to advise anything of the kind. They know to the contrary. We don't fight machinery; we don't oppose these things. It is only the manner and methods of employing it that we object to. That is all. It is the manipulation of these things in the interests of a few; it is the monopolization of them

that we object to. We desire that all the forces of nature, all the forces of society, of the gigantic strength which has resulted from the combined intellect and labor of the ages of the past shall be turned over to man and made his servant, his obedient slave forever. This is the object of Socialism.

It asks no one to give up anything. It seeks no harm to anybody. But when we witness this condition of things -- when we see little children huddling around the factory gates, the poor little things whose bones are not yet hard; when we see them clutched from the hearthstone, taken from the family altar, and carried to the bastilles of labor and their little bones ground up into gold dust to bedeck the form of some aristocratic Jezebel -- then it stirs me and I speak out. We plead for the little ones; we plead for the helpless; we plead for the oppressed; we seek redress for those who are wronged; we seek knowledge and intelligence for the ignorant; we seek liberty for the slave; Socialism secures the welfare of every human being. □

ARNE SWABECK

As this issue was about to be printed we learned that Arne Swabeck, at the age of ninety-six, had died in Los Angeles on March 13. He was a founding member of the Communist League of America (Left Opposition)--the forerunner of the Socialist Workers Party--and remained a member of the SWP until 1967. Our next issue will contain a tribute to Arne Swabeck which was given by James P. Cannon in 1953.

JEAN VAN HEIJENOORT

As we are going to press we have news that Jean Van Heijenoort, one of Trotsky's secretaries, is dead. We will try to have more information in our next issue.

STAR WARS - THREE YEARS LATER

by Mary Scully

On March 23, 1983, President Reagan announced the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), or "Star Wars," a space-based antimissile system. In his speech, Reagan said that this still hypothetical system would eliminate U.S. reliance on the threat of mutual destruction to prevent nuclear war and in fact would "render nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete."

As conceptualized, Star Wars would employ space satellites to beam lasers against Soviet missiles, stopping them midcourse. Supporters of the system claim it is a "defensive technology" and pose it as an alternative to the offensive nuclear arms race. Business Week (June 20, 1983) called this "the most radical change in strategic policy since World War II."

Although the first Star Wars test was reported by the Pentagon on Sept. 13, 1985, it should be emphasized that the system is still in the earliest stages of research and development and remains technically speculative.

There is a large and growing debate on Star Wars, focusing primarily on whether or not it can work. Scientific opinion is sharply divided, with many reputable scientists viewing the concept as impossible and even nonsense. Whatever the scientific judgment on technical feasibility, the Reagan administration remains committed to the program and has already allocated over \$4 billion. Cost estimates for full deployment of the system range up to \$1 trillion.

Pointing out the technical fallacies of Star Wars is important, but the fundamental debate should focus on the political questions, not merely the technological. Through a narrow feasibility approach, opponents of the arms race are led to looking for the wrong things in the wrong places.

Almost all participants in this debate have started from the same false premise as Ronald Reagan: the presumed need for the U.S. to protect itself from possible attack by the Soviet Union. Cold War rhetoric notwithstanding, the Soviet Union has no interests which would cause it to launch an offensive attack against the U.S.A. The ideology of the Soviet bureaucracy, on which its foreign policy rests, is "peaceful co-

existence" -- i.e., the Soviet government seeks to accommodate world imperialism, not to provoke war or promote revolution.

Soviet nuclear policy is a defensive one based on keeping pace with the U.S. The initiator of every new step in nuclear weaponry has been the U.S., which uses the nuclear threat to intimidate the Soviet Union and which still cherishes the hope of destroying it.

That is the basic nuclear strategy of the U.S. government -- and Star Wars heralds no change. To mask this underlying reality, past administrations have resorted for 30 years to the concept of "Mutual Assured Destruction" (MAD), which attempts to shift the burden of escalation to the Soviet Union. By employing this concept, which has been called the "strategic basis of U.S. nuclear policy," the U.S. government asserts it can "contain" the Soviet Union through threats and justifies arms expenditures to the American people. MAD is a defensive formulation of an offensive policy. Star Wars represents the exact same thing.

James Schlesinger, former U.S. Secretary of Defense, and Fred Hoffman, an SDI spokesperson for the Pentagon, in separate articles in the publication International Security (Summer, 1985, Vol. 10, No. 1) inadvertently reveal what is really behind the premise of Star Wars held out by President Reagan.

Both writers take up the question of Mutual Assured Destruction. Schlesinger's concern is with those supporters of Star Wars who fatuously took Reagan at his word and believed that MAD (or what Schlesinger calls "deterrence") was being scrapped. Reagan's speech, he hints, was intended for the American people, not policy makers. He argues that Star Wars will not lead to abandoning "deterrence" but in fact is intended to strengthen it.

Hoffman wants to reject MAD, and attempts to distinguish MAD from an overall concept of deterrence. No matter how adroit or evasive his argumentation, however, no meaningful distinction emerges. As both writers define it, MAD rests solely on offensive weapons; deterrence rests on a combination of offensive and defensive weapons. Such

distinctions are worthy of metaphysicians and medieval theologians.

What is really at the heart of Hoffman's concerns is the increasing public fear of nuclear war, the fact that "a broad and increasing segment of the public is questioning the morality and prudence of threats of unlimited destruction." This, he says, makes it difficult to continue the arms race!

MAD, as a propaganda concept, was meant to justify the arms race to the American people but it is now backfiring and increasing opposition to nuclear escalation. "Deterrence" is a semantic evasion around this problem. Star Wars is not a new nuclear policy. There is no actual shift in U.S. nuclear policy but simply a shift in demagoguery supporting a new major escalation.

John Bosma, now editor of Military Space, was retained by High Frontier, a pro-SDI group, to develop a plan for selling Star Wars to the American public. His report was republished in Harper's (June 1985). In his cynical proposal Bosma recommends that the debate be oriented away from a focus on technology, cost, and Soviet countermeasures and toward its allure as a new strategic posture, a new approach to arms control. By presenting Star Wars as necessary to achieve a nuclear freeze, a build-down, and permanent disarmament, the antinuclear movement could be disarmed and public opposition undercut.

The promise of Star Wars as a stimulus to disarmament is a lie. The antinuclear movement is called upon to unmask it and oppose it. Conceptual gymnastics and Madison Avenue techniques notwithstanding, it is a very serious threat to the survival of the human race. Star Wars will not render nuclear weapons obsolete; it will, however, through the staggering allocations to developing military technology, add new and more dangerous weapons to the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

In fact, in the event it should actually work, an antimissile system in the hands of the U.S. ruling class would make them feel free to use their own nuclear weapons as they pleased around the world, or to launch a conventional warfare attack against the USSR--without any fear of retaliation. And that, given the history of the U.S. government as the only one ever to use nuclear weapons against another people, is a very chilling prospect indeed. □

TWO PAMPHLETS

Permanent Revolution, Combined Revolution, and Black Liberation in the U.S.

by Larry Stewart

\$1.25

DON'T STRANGLE THE PARTY

*Three letters and a talk
by James P. Cannon*

\$1.25

Introduction by George Breitman

Write: F.I.T.
P.O. Box 1947
New York, NY 10009

FRENCH ELECTIONS AND THE CRISIS OF THE WORKERS' MOVEMENT

by Rafael Sabatini

The French national legislative elections held in mid-March, and the political campaigns around them, reflect an intensification of the overall class struggle as well as the fight for a revolutionary proletarian vanguard in France.

President Francois Mitterrand's Socialist Party (SP) lost the parliamentary majority it has enjoyed since 1981, though not by nearly so wide a margin as most observers had expected. In anticipation of such a defeat Mitterrand, whose term as president of the Republic runs to 1988, had publicly spoken of "cohabitation" with a victorious bourgeois opposition.

The decline of popular support for the SP is a direct result of the pro-capitalist policies it and the Communist Party (CP) have followed over much of the last five years. The decline in the vote for the CP is even more dramatic. In this election it polled just under 10 percent, while in 1981 it gained 15 percent. Previously it had enjoyed an even larger portion -- 20 percent and more throughout the 1960s and 70s.

ROOTS OF THE CURRENT CRISIS

The historic SP-CP victory of May 10, 1981, ushered in a period of tremendous expectations amongst the working class. Indeed, the initial actions of the government were positive. The workweek was shortened to 39 hours, key industries were nationalized, the retirement age was moved up to sixty years, the death penalty was abolished, etc. However, shortly thereafter, the government began to reveal its true role as aggressive administrators of the capitalist state. Wages were kept low and escalator clauses were dismantled. Key industrial sectors, notably in the steel industry in the east, were deemed unprofitable and abandoned, throwing thousands out of work. Unemployment currently stands at an official 10 percent. The government's refusal to fulfill its promise of lowering the period of obligatory military service from 12 to 6 months was particularly unpopular with the youth.

Internationally, the SP-CP government proved to be a reliable partner to France's imperialist allies. French

troops participated in the multi-national imperialist occupation of Lebanon. French armed forces intervened in Chad and threatened anticolonial uprisings in New Caledonia. The French secret service blew up the ship of Greenpeace when it challenged France's nuclear presence in the South Pacific.

By the summer of 1984 the SP-CP governments had been so discredited in the eyes of the working class that the CP, which at one point had four ministers, felt obliged to leave the government. Since then, the CP has been among the SP's greatest detractors. However, rather than constructing a genuine working class alternative to the SP betrayals it has launched into a campaign of seemingly militant factory actions--which in fact enjoy no real base among the workers and are little more than ultraleft binges--in order to bolster its declining electoral strength with dissatisfied SP votes.

While any fears the French bourgeoisie may have had in May 1981 have been largely mollified by the behavior of the left governments, the bourgeoisie in France as everywhere prefers to rule with a government it controls directly. Thus, the various bourgeois political formations, most notably those of Barre, Chirac, and Giscard have been quick to exploit the erosion of support for the Mitterrand regime.

The procapitalist policies followed by the government and the increasing confidence of the bourgeois opposition has encouraged many of the noxious reactionary elements long present in French political life. Primary among these is a particularly virulent brand of racism aimed, for the most part, at North African immigrants and their offspring. This racist impulse has found political expression in the National Front (NF) of Jean-Marie Le Pen, a former French army officer widely suspected of torturing liberation fighters during the Algerian war of independence. The NF won 35 seats in the chamber of deputies as a result of the election, and constitutes a serious right-wing threat. Much of Le Pen's appeal is a result of his "program" of scapegoating immigrant labor as the cause of France's serious unemployment problems. There are re-

ports that even more openly racist slogans have begun to appear on the streets of Paris since the election.

This so-called "France for the French" campaign has objectively received aid from unexpected quarters. Rather than building class-wide solidarity and educating the workers as to the real causes of unemployment--the capitalist profit system--both the SP and the CP have adapted to these reactionary ideas. In one instance, the CP had so disarmed its supporters on this question that the NF was able to take over the municipal government in the northern town of Dreux, a longtime CP stronghold. The most recent SP government, that of Laurent Fabius, has agreed to several anti-immigrant measures originally proposed by the right.

THE REVOLUTIONARY LEFT

The dilemma of the imminent defeat of discredited reformist class-collaborationist workers' parties at the hands of right-wing bourgeois parties poses many challenges to the "far-left" or "extreme-gauche" as it is known in France--a general term which includes all those currents to the left of the CP.

The Ligue Communiste Revolutionnaire (LCR), French section of the Fourth International, held a special congress last October 31-November 3. The question of the coming elections was prominent among the issues dealt with by the organization. After a broad discussion and debate the congress adopted a set of motions which guided the Ligue through the March elections.

The LCR called for an "anti-capitalist force" to "the left of the (SP-CP) left" which could denounce the betrayals of the SP and CP while barring the return of a revanchist right. They campaigned around the following program: No to austerity and unemployment; no to racism; equal rights for immigrants; against women's oppression and the reactionary campaign against women; for international solidarity from Poland to Nicaragua; for the independence of Kanaky (New Caledonia) and all those oppressed by French imperialism; against the military strike force, nuclear power, and the destruction of the environment.

The LCR had hoped to run a joint campaign with other "anti-capitalist" forces, particularly the environmentalist Greens and Lutte Ouvriere (LO), a revolutionary organization roughly equal in size to the LCR with whom the LCR had run joint electoral efforts in the past.

However, LO declined the LCR offer and ran separate slates in the elections.

Nevertheless, the LCR put forth its program throughout the country and appeared on the ballot in at least 25 departments (roughly 30 percent). Where the LCR was not on the ballot it called for votes to any formation to the left of the SP and CP. In cases where only the bourgeois parties and class-collaborationist workers' parties appeared on the ballot, the LCR called for a SP-CP vote with the explanation that they will do nothing to help the right return to power.

In mid-1984 the Parti Communiste Internationaliste (PCI) of Pierre Lambert, which along with the LCR and LO constitute the three largest far-left formations in France, launched a project for the construction of a new organization: the Mouvement pour un Parti des Travailleurs (MPPT). Citing the betrayal of the workers by the SP and the CP, the Lambertists set up support committees to construct the MPPT -- "an honest party" it claimed; a "party of the workers, for the workers."

Besides their own forces the Lambertists drew in many former SP and CP members, a group called Socialisme Maintenu which claims to stand for the pre-1981 "socialist" (i.e., Social Democratic) policies of the SP and a number of officials of Force Ouvriere (FO) -- France's third largest union confederation. The PCI weekly Informations Ouvrieres devoted a section to the MPPT, a column "Debats Communiste" to pro-MPPT former CPers, and a column "Reflexions" to former SPers sympathetic to the MPPT. Though a supposedly independent instrument of the workers the most cursory glance at the MPPT reveals it to be tightly controlled by the Lambertists. For example, after the founding congress of the MPPT held last November 31-December 1, Informations Ouvrieres whose masthead had formerly described the paper as "Central organ of the PCI" became Informations Ouvrieres, "weekly of the MPPT." The format as well as the editorial board remained unchanged.

In spite of the organizational gains of the MPPT (it fielded candidates in nearly all departments), the PCI, which describes itself as Trotskyist, has agreed to some questionable political formulations in the program of the new organization, arguably pointing in the direction of class collaboration. This stands in stark contrast to the platform of anti-capitalist demands against war and unemployment in the framework of international working class solidarity put forward by the LCR. □

ORGANIZING AGAINST U.S. INTERVENTION IN CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Draft Resolution Adopted by F.I.T. National Conference (Part 1)

February 16, 1986

The predatory actions and policies of the U.S. government in Central America and the Caribbean have been described and documented by a wide range of sources, including the government itself. Many thousands of Americans have visited the region, participated in fact-finding commissions, lived and worked in Central American and Caribbean countries, and have been part of tours organized by labor, human rights, and solidarity groups. They have come back to the U.S. with reports, photographs, films, and slide shows--exposing murderous assaults on Salvadorans by government police forces funded and trained by the U.S. and bringing attention to the crimes of the U.S.-backed contras operating against the Nicaraguan people. They have shown how the 1983 U.S. military invasion of Grenada dealt a death blow to the revolutionary process launched by the overthrow of the Gairy dictatorship in 1979. They have refuted U.S. government lies about Cuba. They have uncovered the repression and poverty in Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, and Panama--problems which persist while the U.S. pours hundreds of millions of dollars into propping up oppressive regimes, building up police forces to be used against the indigenous populations, supplying armaments and military training, and utilizing these countries for U.S. military bases and operations.

The reaction to U.S. intervention has also been well documented. Every public opinion poll and study has shown that the overwhelming majority in this country is opposed to the U.S. government's actions and policies. Within this general opposition, there are solidarity groups, human rights formations, and committees challenging U.S. intervention in Central America and the Caribbean--with local and regional variations in the level of activity.

This movement around Central America needs to have a life and vitality of its own but, at the same time, its concerns are connected with those raised by

the broader and older antiwar movement--which includes the peace and antinuclear movements, draft resistance, and pacifist forces.

The overlapping of anti-intervention and more general antiwar sentiments has grown with the rising consciousness of the "deadly connections" between conventional war and the nuclear destruction of our planet. Within the draft resistance movement, military processing centers have been called "gateways to Central America." Both the anti-intervention and antiwar movements address common concerns over the effects of the military budget on the many problems plaguing the U.S. population: cutbacks in social programs, loss of jobs, erosion of gains won by oppressed minorities and women, etc.

However, in practice, the leadership of the traditional peace movement, largely dominated by pacifists and Stalinists, has seen the building of a broad and united anti-intervention movement with a mass action perspective as a threat to its authority and counterposed to its political perspectives. It has consistently attempted to coopt the Central America movement, and divert it into multi-issue coalitions centered on influencing bourgeois politics. We must fight for a mass-action oriented Central America movement, independent of multi-issue coalitions, though we hope that such multi-issue coalitions and the organizations involved in the peace movement will be part of united front actions in opposition to U.S. policies in Central America

It is important to understand all of these factors: 1) the objective interconnections between the anti-intervention and antiwar struggles, 2) the tensions and political disagreements that have stood in the way of realizing those connections up to now, and 3) the distinctive developments, activities, and aims of the anti-intervention movement in and of itself.

THE CURRENT SITUATION IN THE ANTI-INTERVENTION MOVEMENT

A historical survey of the anti-intervention movement would have to start with the solidarity sentiments and efforts directed toward the 1959 Cuban

revolution. The most important chapter, of course, was written during the anti-Vietnam war period of the 1960s and '70s. Activities during the 1980s have been primarily motivated by the revolutions in Grenada and Nicaragua, and the U.S. involvement in the civil war in El Salvador.

In some ways the Grenadan revolution was more accessible and appealing to North Americans because Grenada was an English-speaking nation and because the population was Black. It is possible that a larger solidarity sentiment could have been built up over a period of time but the 1983 U.S. invasion of the island cut short such a process. Within the U.S., protests against the direct use of American military forces were small, scattered, and short-lived.

The Nicaraguan revolution has received much more attention--both from the U.S. government which is set on destroying it and from the anti-intervention movement which defends the Nicaraguan's right to self-determination. The Reagan administration has employed a variety of tactics in its efforts to harass and overthrow the Sandinista government.

The demand to stop U.S. moves against Nicaragua has been expressed through picketlines, rallies, meetings, letters and petitions, marches, and various kinds of demonstrations. The April 20, 1985, mobilizations for peace, jobs, and justice were flooded with banners and signs protesting U.S. intervention in Central America; this had a significant impact on Congress which temporarily rejected President Reagan's request for \$14 million in aid to the contras. The coming together of anti-intervention forces on April 20 was not sustained, however, and the movement responded weakly to the subsequent Congressional approval of aid, the embargo against Nicaragua, and passage of the Foley Amendment which opened the door to sending U.S. troops into that country.

In El Salvador, a repressive regime is battling the people's just struggle for the right to run their own affairs. Both sides in this civil war have their

supporters in the U.S.: Duarte is backed by the U.S. government with armaments, military advisers, political support, and a cover-up of the Salvadoran regime's crimes which makes Watergate look like a polite tea party. From time to time, a brutal incident breaks through this thick layer of whitewash--for example, the 1981 death squad murders of two U.S. labor advisers and a leader of El Salvador's land-reform movement. Such crimes have fueled the support extended to the Salvadoran people by many sections of the U.S. population--organized labor, the religious community, civil libertarians, human rights advocates, and Latinos.

The acute situation in El Salvador led to the creation of the sanctuary movement, the fight to win political asylum for the victims of the Duarte regime, marches and rallies, candlelight vigils, civil disobedience, picketlines, conferences and meetings, lobbying against aid to the Salvadoran government, petition campaigns, and many other events and activities. Even more significant: it led to the first break in the once-solid support of the trade union leadership for U.S. foreign policy, with the formation of the National Labor Committee for Democracy and Human Rights in El Salvador.

The further growth of labor opposition to U.S. government policy in Central America was expressed during the national AFL-CIO convention, held at the end of October 1985. For the first time a resolution was adopted which included substantial criticism of U.S. government policies in El Salvador and Nicaragua, though it did so in the context of overall support for the goals and objectives of U.S. foreign policy. This development was especially significant since it followed a period of relative downturn in the movement--small and scattered protests in opposition to U.S. war moves against Nicaragua -- and came just a month after the limited success of the September action calling for an end to the bombing of the civilian population in El Salvador (with U.S. piloted reconnaissance planes selecting the targets).

OTHER CENTRAL AMERICAN COUNTRIES

Compared to El Salvador and Nicaragua, Americans are not as informed about nor conscious of the oppressive conditions of life for the peoples of Honduras, Guatemala, Costa Rica, and Panama--conditions made worse by the role of the U.S. government.

In Honduras, the U.S. Army took over thousands and thousands of acres of

farmlands causing the eviction of many poor farmworkers who were concentrated into camps where curfews were strictly enforced. Honduras is being converted into a base for U.S. military purposes. Seven airstrips have been upgraded or constructed (funded largely without Congressional approval); two radar stations have been set up; operations centers

have been established for joint Army, Navy, and Air Force task forces, large-scale military exercises have been conducted over the last three years involving thousands of U.S. troops, antitank maneuvers, and the U.S. Navy.

In July 1985, the Reagan administration announced plans for a major expansion of aid to the internal security forces in Honduras, Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Guatemala. The Guatemalan military regime was so notoriously bloody that U.S. security aid was cut off in 1977 when the massacres of civilians were exposed. Rural workers have been relocated to the interior of Guatemala as a result of the regime's "scorched earth" policy.

Other workers are in strictly controlled "model villages" or concentration camps, as are 50,000 of the Guatemalan Indian population. The indigenous

people, who make up the majority of that country's population, have been brutally victimized by the regime. Entire villages have been razed by the army, and about 1 percent of the Indian population has been killed in the counterinsurgency campaign. Over 40,000 have fled to refugee camps in Mexico or to the U.S., along with tens of thousands of other Guatemalans. Thousands of the country's residents have also moved into zones controlled by the insurgents.

Protest actions in the U.S. against these conditions and events have not been as vigorous or frequent as those centering on Nicaragua and El Salvador because of the lower level of resistance by the masses. But they are certainly part of the U.S. government's plans for the region, and must be included in the thinking of the anti-intervention movement.

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE CURRENT SITUATION IN THE ANTI-INTERVENTION MOVEMENT

The anti-intervention movement remains fragmented and continues to respond unevenly to the increasingly aggressive policies and actions of the U.S. government. At the same time, organizations across the nation continue to hold events opposing U.S. intervention, to solidarize with Central American and Caribbean peoples struggling against reactionary governments, and to support the Nicaraguan and Cuban revolutions. The national mobilizations on April 20, 1985, showed the opportunities and the limitations of the anti-intervention movement as it exists today.

These actions, in Washington D.C., San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, and Houston, were large and vigorous, and provided a focus for the overwhelming opposition to U.S. intervention in Central America and the Caribbean. Although four points of unity were promoted, the demand to stop U.S. intervention in Central America received major emphasis. The mobilizations showed the potential for organizing anti-intervention sentiment on a united front basis for mass actions in the streets. The failure to carry the momentum forward into fall mobilizations, however, points to the limitations which continue to hamper the movement.

The majority of the U.S. population continues to resist the Reagan administration's attempts to "Rambo-ize" the nation. How can this majority significantly exert its power on the government? Appeals to the administrative and legislative branches have not stopped aggressive moves against Cuba and Nica-

ragua, nor support to repressive regimes in Central America. Electing "good" politicians has not helped--as confirmed once more by the bipartisan votes in late 1985 for aid to the contras. Dedicated activists have been jailed, engaged in repeated candlelight vigils, held meetings and rallies, and risked imprisonment by giving sanctuary to Central American refugees. These activities have brought public attention to the issues and help keep the anti-intervention movement alive. But they have not compelled the government to end its interventionist policies and actions.

In their frustration, many have proposed more "dramatic" events or something entirely new which will have the desired impact. In searching for more effective methods, the anti-intervention movement can find valuable lessons from the past--the fight to organize unions, the civil rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s, the student revolt, the women's liberation movement, the Chicano struggles of the 1970s, the gay and lesbian movement, and--most of all--the successful campaign to end the Vietnam war. All of these movements used a variety of tactics but derived their greatest strength and victories by utilizing the power of mass action. This was the basis for the successes of the sit-in strikes of the early CIO unions, the Montgomery bus boycott and March on Washington, the free speech and student rights campaigns, the women's liberation movement, and the effort to force withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam.

The anti-intervention sentiments of

the majority must be made visible through mass action--repeated mass action--which bring together all those opposed to U.S. intervention in Central America and the Caribbean. A united anti-intervention movement would have the power and authority to call for and organize such massive and persistent demonstrations. There is a lot of steam in the anti-intervention kettle, but it

is bubbling up in a diffused manner rather than being directed in a concentrated scalding stream on the war plans and counterrevolutionary efforts of the U.S. government. The challenge facing the movement is to come together on a united basis in broadly supported mass mobilizations time after time until the goal is achieved: U.S. hands off Central America and the Caribbean! □

iINTERNATIONAL MARXIST REVIEW

2 rue Richard Lenoir
93108 Montreuil
France

Dear Reader:

As a reader of *Bulletin in Defense of Marxism* you will be interested in the relaunching of *International Marxist Review*, the English-language theoretical journal of the Fourth International.

The new journal will aim to complement *International Viewpoint's* coverage of world events as they happen with in-depth analytical and theoretical articles written by leading members of the Fourth International and its sections, as well as publishing documents of its leading bodies.

International Marxist Review will be published three times a year in conjunction with the French-language *Quatrieme Internationale*.

Articles appearing in the first issue focus on the theory and strategy of permanent revolution today, including:

- The Fourth International's position on the current stage of the South African revolution.
- "What is the theory of permanent revolution" by Ernest Mandel.
- "The land question in Latin America today" by Margarito Montes Parra.
- "Reflections on the Polish revolution" by Zbigniew Kowalewski.

Special introductory offer!

Readers of *Bulletin in Defense of Marxism* whose orders for the new magazine are received before April 28 will be entitled to subscribe at the following special introductory rates:

	For three issues	Normal rate	Introductory rate
U.S.A. and Canada	airmail	\$18	\$16
U.S.A. and Canada	surface	\$14	\$14

(All checks to be made payable to PEC.)

Please send all subscriptions and inquiries for bulk rates to:

IMR(I),
2 rue Richard Lenoir,
93108 Montreuil,
France

REVIEW

REVOLUTIONARY MARXISM AND THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

by Steve Bloom

"In defence of the Fourth International --against the split of the Australian Socialist Workers Party," by Ernest Mandel, special issue of International Viewpoint, 31 pp., \$1.50.

Every struggle over fundamental questions in the revolutionary workers' movement provides a valuable school for those who participate in it. It seems to be inevitable that each generation of revolutionary Marxists will have to find the solution for new problems, or for old problems in new forms, through a process of conflict and debate with those who would abandon the lessons of the past and retreat from the fight for proletarian power.

One of the most important aspects of these fights is that they leave behind a legacy for future generations. Many, if not most, of the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Trotsky which we use for education and reference are precisely a result of such struggles in defense of Marxism against utopianism, anarchism, reformism, Stalinism, liquidationism, ultraleftism, and a few dozen other isms which represent ideologies to derail the working class and its allies.

Today, there is once again a crucial battle taking place to defend the program of revolutionary Marxism; and, as in the past, this is providing the basis for a further clarification and development of our program. This conflict has now led to a split in the Fourth International--with the decision of the Australian Socialist Workers Party to formally sever all relations with that world organization. It is in response to this development that Ernest Mandel has written a pamphlet-length article, "In defence of the Fourth International--against the split of the Australian Socialist Workers Party," which is available as a special supplement to International Viewpoint, the fortnightly English-language newsmagazine published by the FI in Paris.

Mandel's effort is one of the most important contributions to have been made in the course of the present struggle, both for the education of the current generation of revolutionary Marxists and of generations yet to come. In it, he takes on in a consistent and systematic manner each of the major arguments presented by the Australians in support of their position, and ex-

plains how each of them can only lead to a dead end and the ultimate demise of those who follow a liquidationist course.

ROOTS OF THE PRESENT CRISIS

For a number of years (at least since 1981) the ideological tendency of which the Australians are the most extreme wing has been developing in the Fourth International. This current became disoriented by the failure of the working class in the industrialized countries to respond as quickly as one might like to the ruling class's austerity offensive. It began to question, and then progressively abandon, the basic perspectives of international proletarian revolution which the Fourth Internationalist movement has stood for and fought for since the definitive degeneration of the Communist International in the early 1930s. It sought an alternative in the ideas of the Castroist current internationally, citing the fact that the Castro leadership has maintained itself in power in Cuba for more than a quarter of a century without degenerating and that similar forces are leading courageous revolutionary struggles in Central America.

The ideological spearhead of this perspective within our world movement came from the leadership of the U.S. Socialist Workers Party. (The U.S. SWP is not a member of the FI due to reactionary legislation, but it remains in fraternal solidarity with it.) This leadership, headed by party national secretary Jack Barnes, now rejects all of the basic programmatic positions which, taken individually and collectively, distinguish the Fourth International from every other current in the workers' movement: our concept of permanent revolution; the fight for political revolution in the bureaucratized workers' states; our belief in the necessity of proletarian democracy in the workers' movement as a whole, and in the revolutionary party in particular; as well as the application of the transitional method and the united front within the struggles of the working class and its allies.

The leadership of the Australian Socialist Workers Party developed along similar lines, at first under the influence of the U.S. SWP, though it

didn't draw all of the same conclusions as the Barnes group and later the U.S. and Australian organizations became fiercely hostile to one another. In August 1985, several months after the 1985 World Congress of the FI where their viewpoint had been decisively rejected, the National Committee of the Australian party made a formal decision to leave the International.

In taking this action the NC adopted a report by Doug Lorimer, one of the Australian SWP's central leaders along with Jim Percy, where he outlines in graphic detail their rejection of the entire history and traditions of the FI. The article by Mandel is a direct answer to Lorimer's report and is a stark contrast to the narrow and self-contradictory pragmatism of the Australians. It provides a vivid exposition of the broad sweep and bright vision of Marxist historical materialism.

POLEMIC WITH U.S. SWP

Though Mandel doesn't deal explicitly with the programmatic positions of the U.S. SWP, the main thrust of these positions is identical to the viewpoint of the Australians, as we have noted, and the fundamental considerations Mandel raises apply with equal force to the North American variety of empiricism, adaptationism, and liquidationism.

For example, we find this defense by Mandel of the theory of permanent revolution: "The specificity of the permanent revolution strategy is above all the fact that the solution of the classical tasks of the national-democratic revolution--solution of the agrarian question, solution of the national question, solution of the question of modernisation as a whole--requires the conquest of power by the proletariat supported by the poor peasantry.... If we reject the idea of 'revolution by stages' it is not because we deny in any way the primacy of national-democratic tasks at the beginning of the process of permanent revolution. Rather it is because we deny categorically the possibility of accomplishing these national-democratic tasks under other forms of government and state power than those of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

To anyone familiar with the speeches and writings of U.S. SWP leaders over the past five years this statement will seem like a direct response to Jack Barnes on Nicaragua (the Sandinista revolution in 1979 was, supposedly, not a socialist revolution because the government didn't immediately expropriate capitalist property) or South Africa

(which is not considered ready for a socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, but only for a bourgeois-democratic stage).

Another example can be seen in Mandel's discussion of socialist democracy: "The Australian SWP's growing hesitations and retreats with respect to the anti-bureaucratic political revolution have been marked by an increasing opposition to our programme of socialist democracy.... The Lorimer report reproaches us for identifying socialist democracy with the existence of party pluralism and insisting on the fact that only when this pluralism really exists can you have real socialist democracy.

"...True, in an ideal world, where the proletariat is totally homogeneous, where no hostile social pressure is exerted against it, where it is non-stratified economically, where it is continually and totally politically active, where the revolutionary Marxist party is perfect, never makes mistakes and is 100 percent democratic--in such an imaginary world there would obviously be only place for one party during the dictatorship of the proletariat, since by definition it would represent the whole of the proletariat.

"Unfortunately, this world of perfect universal harmony inside the proletariat has not existed in the past. It exists nowhere today. Our modest opinion is that it will never exist in the future either."

It is obvious that Mandel's polemic applies with full force to the attempts of the U.S. SWP, like the Australians, to rationalize the lack of genuine proletarian democracy in Cuba and idealize the Castroist model of a monolithic party and the outlawing of other forms of political expression for the Cuban workers and peasants. Because the Cuban CP is genuinely concerned about and responsive to the needs of the masses, these currents argue, and because it has set up institutions which (at least to some extent) give a voice to the concerns of the masses, this is sufficient to proclaim that real workers' democracy exists in Cuba. For the majority of the FI, however, this approach is completely one-sided. Proletarian democracy exists to only a limited degree in Cuba, and this limitation represents a serious threat in the long run to the Cuban revolution.

For those who have been following the debate in the FI, a brief listing of some of the other subheadings in Mandel's article will make clear to what extent the liquidationist ideas he is polemicizing against reflect the views

of the U.S. SWP as well as those of the Australians: "The unity and dialectic of the three sectors of the world revolution," "Reform or revolution in the bureaucratized workers' states," "'Campism' and the present world situation," and "The balance sheet of Stalinism and the historical justification for the Fourth International."

MOST IMPORTANT QUESTION

This last point, the historic function and importance of the Fourth International since its founding in 1938, is one in which the U.S. SWP leaders believe that they differentiate themselves qualitatively from the Australians. A long polemic by Doug Jenness, which reflects the considered opinions of the U.S. SWP's central leadership team, appeared in Intercontinental Press (Vol. 23, No. 18, September 23, 1985) shortly after the Australian party announced its departure from the FI. It is interesting to contrast Jenness's effort to Mandel's article.

His primary focus could not be on the wrong programmatic views of the Australian SWP, as Mandel's is. Jenness and the U.S. SWP leaders agree fundamentally with the Australians on these questions. As a substitute, Jenness concentrates on the Australians' organizational split from the FI and their falsification of the history of the Trotskyist movement. That falsification is real, and Mandel, too, takes the Australians to task for it. The Australians have distorted the history of the FI in order to justify their conclusion that its very creation was a drastic mistake, one which isolated the Trotskyist movement and forced it into a sectarian path.

But Jenness is unable to address the real problem squarely. The U.S. party leaders agree that the FI has been sectarian, but for them the source of the problem is not an organizational one. It lies instead in Trotsky's "ultra-left" theory of permanent revolution. The Barnes current hasn't yet drawn the same organizational conclusion as the Australians. But the Australians show the Barnes current its future, and this explains, at least to some extent, the extreme hostility of the U.S. SWP leaders toward the Australians.

Currents which are in retreat from revolutionary Marxist positions are, as a rule, extremely reluctant to look at their own future. The logic of the U.S. SWP's political views (which reject all of the programmatic perspectives that distinguish the Fourth International

from other currents in the workers' movement as we have noted) is ultimately to come to the same organizational conclusion as the Australians. The sole alternative for the U.S. SWP leadership is to retreat from their revisionist course and return to a revolutionary Marxist perspective. Only a distinct political program can in the end justify a distinct political organization. Any other approach can be nothing else but blind sectarianism.

This contradiction of the U.S. SWP is laid bare by the fact that Jenness, in the name of defending the Fourth International in his Intercontinental Press article, could only attempt this by leaving out whole portions of the actual history of the International and by resorting to outright distortions regarding other parts. (For one example of this see "How History Is Rewritten on West Street," by Chester Hofla, Bulletin IDOM No. 27, February 1986.) Mandel's approach, which defends the FI by defending its program and explaining its real history, is the only consistent one, and the only one which can stand up to the test of future events.

ONE PROBLEM

We do have one dispute with Mandel's effort, though it remains a minor one in the context of our overall agreement. He insists on following the recent practice of the central leaders of the majority of the Fourth International which makes an identity between the concept of the "workers' and farmers' government" and the schematic, incorrect application of this term by the Barnes and Percy-Lorimer currents. As used by the U.S. and Australian leaders, the idea of the workers' and farmers' government has become a substitute for the proletarian revolution, a "necessary stage" which is counterposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

But that idea is not inherent in the workers' and farmers' (or workers' and peasants') government itself. It is rather a recent invention of Barnes, who created it in order to give himself the appearance of basing his new theories on Marxist tradition. The idea of the workers' and peasants' government has a history going back to the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, the early years of the Comintern, and the Trotskyist movement long before the term was picked up and distorted by Jack Barnes.

This is a valuable and useful concept--in the two senses in which it was explained by Trotsky in the "Transitional Program," and which Joseph Hansen

attempted to develop further after the Second World War. (See "The Workers' and Farmers' Government and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat," by Tom Barrett and Steve Bloom, Bulletin IDOM No. 28, March 1986.)

HEADED FOR DISASTER

Having severed its ties to the Fourth International, the Australian SWP is headed for disaster, as Mandel clearly demonstrates. No party, no matter how militant, how active in the class struggle, how sincere in its objectives, can survive as a revolutionary organization if it cuts itself off from other revolutionaries around the world.

There is not and cannot be any substitute for the Fourth International today. The Australian SWP has proclaimed its search for such an alternative by its organizational split. Jack Barnes and the leaders of the U.S. party have also announced their search for the same utopian dream in various resolutions and articles, as well as with the title of their theoretical journal launched in 1983: "New International." The Australians are by far the more consistent in following the logic of their political positions through to the end. The Barnes group shows a better grasp of empirical necessity.

But neither current will be able to find what it is looking for, no matter

what tactics it may follow with regard to the FI. There is no "New International" on the horizon, and any qualitative growth of the revolutionary Marxist current in the world working class is unlikely without dramatic events in the international class struggle itself.

Without doubt these events will take place. When they do proletarian revolutionaries will be called upon to provide strong leadership and a clear ideological perspective. Our task today is to accumulate the cadres which can help provide that leadership and that perspective. And this, in turn, requires more than anything else the continued strengthening of the Fourth International and the maintenance of its historic program--for the overthrow of capitalism and class exploitation on a world scale.

Mandel's answer to the split of the Australian SWP is part of this essential process of strengthening and defending the FI today. It will be read and appreciated by those attempting to understand the foundations of revolutionary Marxism long after the theoretical schematism of Percy, Lorimer, and Barnes will have been forgotten--or will be remembered simply as one more example, among the many in the history of the international workers' movement, of shameful ideological rationalizations by previously revolutionary leaders in rapid retreat from their own past. □

Published in English as a special 31-page supplement to *International Viewpoint*, No. 93, Feb. 24, 1986

BY ERNEST MANDEL

Anatomy of a Split: Why the Australian SWP Left the Fourth International

On August 17, 1985, the leaders of the Australian Socialist Workers Party (SWP) decided to break with the Fourth International. This decision came after several years in which political and organizational differences continued to deepen. In response to this challenge to the programmatic gains and perspectives of the revolutionary Marxist movement, Ernest Mandel, a leader of the Fourth International for many years, restates the political foundations of the International, as well as its views on the orientation and tasks of revolutionists today.

\$1.50 plus 50¢ for mailing and handling

Send orders to International Viewpoint,
P.O. Box 1824, New York, NY 10009

A GUIDE TO LEON TROTSKY'S BOOKS IN ENGLISH

Part 1, to October 1917

by Sam Gregory

This survey is a brief guide to the books of Leon Trotsky (1879-1940) which have been published in English, designed for readers not already familiar with his writings. It lists books published across the English-speaking world -- in the United States, Britain, and the Indian Ocean island of Sri Lanka. The publisher's name and year of publication appear at the end of each item; "OP" indicates that the book is out of print, although available in some libraries.

Part 1 of the guide covers the period from 1903, when Trotsky was 23, through the Russian revolution of October 1917. Most of his writings in this period have never been published in English. Parts 2 (1918-1929) and 3 (1929-1940) will appear in future issues of the Bulletin IDOM. They will be longer because more of Trotsky's writings in those years is available in English.

Report of the Siberian Delegation. Trotsky escaped from Siberian exile to Western Europe in 1902, and served as one of two delegates from the Siberian Union to the second congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party, held in Belgium and Britain in 1903. This was the famous congress that split into Bolshevik and Menshevik factions. Trotsky sided with the Mensheviks at the congress, and remained with them for a year. After that he assumed an independent role and spent the next decade trying to bring about a reconciliation of the two wings of the RSDLP. This pamphlet contains his report about the second congress in 1903, written from an anti-Bolshevik point of view. New Park Publications, London, 1979.

Our Political Tasks. Trotsky published this in Geneva in 1904, a year after the RSDLP's second congress. While castigating both factions for the 1903 split, Trotsky polemicized against Lenin's concept of a disciplined vanguard party of professional revolutionaries in Russia; against Lenin's view of the intelligentsia as a transmission belt for socialist ideology into the working class; and against the "Jacobinism" of the Bolsheviks (i.e., Trotsky's assertion that Lenin conceived of a party standing above and apart from the workers). But by the time Trotsky joined the Bolshevik Party in 1917, he had completely come over to Lenin's position on the character and organization of the revolutionary party, just as Lenin, and under his influence the majority of the Bolsheviks, came to agree with Trotsky's analysis of the character of the Russian revolution. When the Soviet state publishers began publishing Trotsky's collected works in the 1920s, Trotsky did

not include Our Political Tasks among his youthful works to be reprinted. But the Stalinists circulated it widely later in the decade to prove that Trotsky was anti-Leninist. New Park Publications, London, 1979. For some reason, this edition lacks Trotsky's final chapter.

Results and Prospects. Written while Trotsky was in prison awaiting trial for sedition following the arrest in December 1905 of the Petersburg Soviet, of which he was president. This analysis of Russian social history and prognosis of the course of the Russian revolution was probably the most important political document Trotsky wrote before the 1917 revolution. In My Life he later said it "represents, for that period, the most finished statement in proof of the theory of permanent revolution." Isaac Deutscher said, "This was the most radical restatement, if not revision, of the prognosis of Socialist revolution undertaken since Marx's Communist Manifesto, that is since 1847." It is available in English in the same volume as Trotsky's 1929 work The Permanent Revolution. Pathfinder Press, New York, 1969.

1905. Written in 1908-09 when Trotsky lived in Austria during his second, 10-year-long exile from Russia. It is the account of a "witness and participant" in the first Russian revolution. The first part analyzes the economic and social conditions and class relations in Russia at the time. The book recounts the major events of the year, concentrating on the last three months, and especially the activities of the Petersburg Soviet of Workers' Deputies, the prototype of the representative assembly

of the working class in 1917 (and after). Trotsky demonstrates how the experience of 1905 confirmed his prognosis, formulated beforehand, of the role the proletariat would necessarily play in the revolution. The book concludes with a description of the arrest and trial of the Petersburg Soviet, and the popular pamphlet There and Back (also called To Siberia and Back, My Round Trip, etc.). This was Trotsky's report on his escape from Siberia, to which he was banished following the trial of the Soviet. Random House, New York, 1972, OP.

Our Revolution. Subtitled "Essays on Working-Class International Revolution, 1904-1917." It was the first compilation of Trotsky's writings in English. It was edited by M. J. Olgin, an early member of the American Communist Party, who later became a virulent anti-Trotskyist. It includes "The Soviet and the Revolution," also called "Fifty Days," Trotsky's estimate of the role of the Soviet in 1905 and its future role, from a compilation of articles written in prison by members of the Petersburg Soviet in 1906 and edited by Trotsky. It also includes a portion of Results and Prospects under the title "Prospects of a Labor Dictatorship," and four articles written in New York in March 1917, after the February revolution had overthrown tsarism. Henry Holt, New York, 1918, OP. Virtually the whole book was reprinted in two pamphlets, 1905 -- Before and After and 1905 -- Results and Perspectives, by Lanka Samasamaja Publications, Colombo, 1953 and 1954.

The Balkan Wars, 1912-13. This was the first of a projected two-volume set in English called "The War Correspondence of Leon Trotsky"; the second, containing Trotsky's World War I correspondence, has not been published yet. The book is a compilation of newspaper articles, many of them for the paper Kievskaya Mysl, an influential and legally published daily in the south of Russia, for which Trotsky was Vienna correspondent. With military conflict in the Balkans imminent in 1912, the paper asked Trotsky to go there as its war correspondent. The first section consists of articles from 1908-12, the period leading up to the two Balkan wars. The remainder are pieces written during the wars and Trotsky's sojourn in Romania immediately after. This edition includes an excellent background history of the period in the introduction by the

late George Weissman. The book is important for Trotsky's insights into the relation of the Balkan conflicts to the schemes of the European imperialist powers and as the precursor to World War I, and for his descriptions of the contemporary Social Democratic parties in the Balkans. Trotsky's experiences as a war correspondent were also important preparation for what lay ahead. As he wrote in My Life, "The years 1912-13 gave me a close acquaintance with Serbia, Bulgaria, Roumania -- and with war. In many respects this was an important preparation not only for 1914, but for 1917 as well." Pathfinder Press, New York, 1980.

The Bolsheviki and World Peace. A New York publisher made up this title in 1918 because he thought it would sell better a few months after the hardly known Bolsheviks took power in Russia. Trotsky wrote it, under the title The War and the International, in neutral Zurich in 1914, after being expelled from Austria when World War I began, and after most Social Democratic parties voted war credits to their "own" imperialist rulers. Here Trotsky presented the Marxist analysis of the causes of the imperialist war, the reasons for the collapse of the Second International, and the need to build a new revolutionary International. When copies were



circulated in Germany, they earned him a prison sentence (in absentia). Gregory Zinoviev, Lenin's closest collaborator at the time, called Trotsky's pamphlet correct on all fundamental issues. Boni and Liveright, New York, 1918, OP. It was reprinted under Trotsky's own title by Young Socialist Publications, Colombo, 1971.

Political Profiles. A collection of biographical sketches, primarily of leading members of the Second International, most of them written before 1917. These vignettes give the reader an insight into the individuals and the circumstances in which they lived and struggled, as well as showing Trotsky to be an acute observer of human character. New Park Publications, London, 1972.

The Proletarian Revolution in Russia. This compilation of articles by Lenin and Trotsky from 1917-18, edited by Louis C. Fraina, a founder of American Communism, was influential in bringing the ideas of the Russian revolution to U.S. socialists. Lenin commended Fraina for "publishing a big volume containing a series of articles by Trotsky and me and thus giving a handbook of the history of the Russian Revolution." Communist Press, New York, 1918, OP. The Lenin articles can be found in his Collected Works. Trotsky's were reprinted in two pamphlets, The Struggle for State Power and What Next?, by Young Socialist Publications, Colombo, 1966 and 1967.

Other books which contain some of Trotsky's writings from 1917 and before are:

The Age of Permanent Revolution: A Trotsky Anthology, edited by Isaac Deutscher with the assistance of George Novack. Dell Publishing Co., 1964, OP.

The Basic Writings of Trotsky, edited by Irving Howe. Vintage Books/Random House, 1965, OP.

Leon Trotsky on Literature and Art, edited by Paul Siegel. Pathfinder Press, 1970.

Leon Trotsky Speaks, edited by Sarah Lovell. Pathfinder Press, 1972.

Trotsky's Writings on Britain, vol. 1, edited by R. Chappell and Alan Clinton. New Park Publications, London, 1974.

Lenin's Struggle for a Revolutionary International, edited by John Riddell. Monad Press, 1984.

Of Trotsky's writings after 1917, My Life (Pathfinder Press, 1970) and The History of the Russian Revolution (Monad Press, 1980) are especially useful in providing the background for the writings up to 1917. The reader is also directed to the first of Deutscher's three-volume biography, The Prophet Armed (Oxford University Press, New York and London, 1954). For a detailed study of Trotsky's works as a whole, see the monumental Leon Trotsky: A Bibliography by Louis Sinclair (Hoover Institution Press, Stanford, 1972).

=====
Publishers' Addresses

Pathfinder Press, 410 West St., New York, NY 10014. Pathfinder also distributes Monad Press Books.

The U.S. distributor of New Park Publications is Labor Publications, Inc., P.O. Box 33023, Detroit, MI 48216.
=====

CORRECTION

On page 21 of the *Bulletin In Defense of Marxism* No. 26 the following paragraph appears:

The SWP is not, formally, a *member* of the FI, but if it takes its relationship with others in our world movement seriously it is *duty bound* to have the same attitude toward the decisions of the highest body of the FI as if it were. These decisions have the same force on an international scale as the decisions of an SWP convention should have on the party as a whole — not in a schematic sense implied in Barnes's question about "orders," but in the political sense that the failure of the SWP to carry out the decisions of the world congress poses the same problem for the FI which would be posed for the SWP if a branch of the party refused to carry out a decision of its convention.

This paragraph is false because the SWP is not a member of the FI, either formally or informally. This paragraph should have read:

The SWP is not a *member* of the FI, but if it takes its relationship with others in our world movement seriously it is *duty bound* to have the most serious attitude toward the decisions of its highest body. These decisions have the same force on an international scale for those who are members as a decision of an SWP convention should have on the party as a whole. This truth affects the SWP as well, even though it is not a member — not in the schematic sense implied in Barnes's question about "orders," but in the political sense that the failure of the SWP to carry out the decisions of the world congress poses the same problem for the FI which would be posed for the SWP if a branch of the party refused to carry out a decision of its convention.

BRITISH EX-HEALYITES RETRACT AGENT-BAITING OF SWP

Recently the Workers Revolutionary Party (WRP) in Britain underwent a split, with a majority of the organization, led by Michael Banda, expelling long-time leader of the group Gerry Healy. Since that time, the Banda organization has undertaken a substantial reconsideration of the past practices and policies of the WRP under Healy's leadership. One of the most important developments has been their decision to reject the charges made in the mid-1970s by Healy that Joseph Hansen and George Novack were agents of the FBI and the Soviet secret police and had conspired in the murder of Leon Trotsky. Later, similar frame-up accusations were expanded to include the entire leadership of the U.S. Socialist Workers Party. The excerpts below are from several documents published in recent months by the Banda group. We reproduce them here from texts published in *Intercontinental Press* of March 10, 1986.

For those not familiar with the terminology of the Healyites or some of the personalities involved: the International Committee (IC) is the international organization created by Healy as his alternative to the Fourth International; "Security and the Fourth International" is the name given by Healy to his slander campaign against Hansen, Novack, and the SWP leaders; David North is the leader of the Workers League in the United States, who was a follower of Healy until the split in Britain and then allied itself with the Banda group, but refused to go along with Banda's repudiation of the slander campaign against the SWP; the Gelfand case is a lawsuit in California, in which the Workers League is using the capitalist courts in an effort to disrupt the Socialist Workers Party.

FROM RESOLUTION BY CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF WRP, JANUARY 26:

12. That we recognise that Security and the Fourth International was a substitute for a real struggle against revisionism and for Trotskyist principle. That all evidence presented and conclusions drawn be reexamined, together with material published by the American SWP or anybody else on this question. That such an investigation, including a full financial account, be carried out internally at this stage.

13. That we recognise that the Gelfand case, while having revealed important facts about Sylvia Franklin etc., has set an extremely damaging precedent in calling on the state to determine the membership of a working-class political organisation; that the IC strive to find a means to resolve this outside the courts including an approach by the Workers League to the SWP. □

FROM ARTICLE BY MICHAEL BANDA, WORKERS PRESS, FEBRUARY 7:

27. No examination of the IC would be complete or honestly objective if it didn't include the most sinister and reactionary manifestation of Healyism in the IC — Security and the Fourth International. No one who honours Trotsky's impeccable and scrupulous regard for absolutely verifiable facts and irrefutable evidence will have anything more to do with this monstrous frame-up based entirely on circumstantial evidence and political innuendo. The IC proved nothing which we didn't already know about Sylvia Callen [Caldwell] or [Mark] Zborowski. The letters on Hansen prove nothing either.

It is entirely possible, nay probable, that Trotsky did advise Hansen to "play ball" with the GPU agent as part of a plan to elicit information and that he also advised him to contact the FBI. Even if he didn't it doesn't prove that Hansen was guilty. North, I fear, is hoist on his own petard and faces the charge of being an accomplice with Healy and the execrable Mitchell in the murder of Trotsky's finest tradition.

Two further questions arise:

When North contends that the struggle against revisionism was abandoned he is only half right. History records that the anti-revisionist struggle was *transformed* for over a decade into a manic witch-hunt, a desperate forensic diversion to be precise, to satisfy Healy's paranoid schizophrenia as well as his anti-theory empiricism. In this respect Hansen's charge against Healy was right. Never in the history of intelligence work of state bodies has any agent devoted *the whole of his life* — as Hansen did — to building a reformist party. That is *not* the style of the GPU or FBI. Hansen lived and died a revisionist. A GPU agent — never!

There is an even more damning question I would like to address to Healy's political bloodhounds, North and Mitchell. Why is it that not a single radical intellectual, not one conscientious professor, trade union leader, or dissident Stalinist responded to the call for an inquiry into the murder of Trotsky by [Ramon] Mercader and presumably, Hansen and Novack? To ask the question is to answer it.

No one except the paranoid North and his cronies in the IC will believe this damnable fantasy which paradoxically ended with a similar charge against North adduced by none other than Healy! It is incredible that North should now point to [Louis] Budenz's testimony that Hansen was a GPU agent. Applying North's own rotten yardstick how are we not to presume that Budenz was doing this as part of his own filthy deal with FBI and State Department?

As for North's amazing revelation that the entire leadership of the present SWP was recruited from the same Midwestern college, I can only retort: So what? Where is the concrete evidence of their work for the FBI? Put up or shut up North! □

FROM ARTICLE BY DAVE GOOD, WORKERS PRESS, FEBRUARY 7:

The third aspect of the IC's work is Security and the Fourth International, with the Workers League's involvement in the Gelfand case in the U.S. This is a very touchy subject for North. The WRP Central Committee has called for a reevaluation of the whole of Security and the Fourth International, and most leaders of the WRP are of the opinion that the whole thing is a frame-up of Hansen and Novack, whose only "crime" was to revise Marxism, not spy for the FBI/CIA or GPU. This has caused panic in the leadership of the Workers League.

The "forensic science" of Healy, Mitchell, and North will have to be reevaluated. It is untenable to contend that "Security and the FI" is the high point of the international struggle of the working class against the capitalist state, as North does and indeed the WRP used to.

The position of the WRP Central Committee is that we will not subordinate ourselves to these traditions. Anyone who will defend the work of the IC as the "continuity of Trotskyism" is no Trotskyist. □

SPECIAL ISSUE OF IV	\$6.00
Containing Resolutions of	(includes
12th World Congress	postage)

Make all checks or money orders payable to International Viewpoint.

Mail to International Viewpoint, P.O. Box 1824, New York, N.Y. 10009, USA.

LARRY STEWART AND THE COMINTERN

On page 24 of the F.I.T. pamphlet Permanent Revolution, Combined Revolution, and Black Liberation in the U.S., Larry Stewart wrote:

"I am not an authority on Comintern literature [in Lenin's time -- 1919 to 1924], but what I have read of its treatment of the Black struggle, the trade unions, and women's liberation convinces me that while most of this literature was valid and progressive at that time, it also contains false starts and errors that can do us big damage today if we do not read it critically -- the way Lenin encouraged us to do, the way the Barnes group discourages us from doing."

Since Comrade Stewart is dead now, he cannot answer my question, but perhaps somebody else can. It is: What specifically did he have in mind when he criticized the early Comintern positions on the Black struggle, the unions, and the women's movement?

Student
New York

Ed. reply: Larry Stewart did discuss some of these questions with fellow editors of the Bulletin in Defense of Marxism, and we can answer the question, at least partly.

First we would like to remind readers of the context in which the above quotation occurred. It is preceded in the pamphlet by a much longer number of paragraphs praising the contributions of the Comintern in the Lenin years for cleaning away the muck with which the revisionists and reformists of the Second International had covered and almost buried authentic Marxism, and for clarifying many crucial questions misunderstood by even left wingers in the Second International prior to the foundation of the Comintern.

Stewart thought that it was a bad mistake for the Comintern to have set up its own international trade union federation as an affiliate and subordinate of the Comintern. He thought that the Comintern's opposition to the formation of any independent women's movement (a hangover from the Second International) was sectarian and harmful to both the women's and the Marxist movements. And he demonstrated in the pamphlet how far ahead of the Comintern as a whole Lenin was in taking abstract principles about the national question that everybody voted for at Comintern congresses and applying them creatively to the Black struggle in the U.S.

CARRYING ON THE TRADITIONS

Congratulations on the production of your monthly, the Bulletin in Defense of Marxism. We are extremely pleased to see that you are carrying on the traditions of Cannon. We were worried for a while that the whole continuity of Marxism in the United States might break down with the betrayal of Trotskyism by the leadership of the Socialist Workers Party.

After reading your Bulletin we could see that the ideas of Trotskyism are in good hands.

Cannon saw many times the process the SWP leadership has gone through. People that get tired, people that look for short cuts. And, as Cannon would say, people that look for "get rich quick policies."

The objective basis for the growth of Trotskyism has never been more favorable. After all, Trotskyism is the highest form of scientific analysis which clearly shows us the way forward to a socialist society.

As soon as we can we will send you a small donation to aid your work.

Yours in solidarity
A reader from England

NOTICE

The three groups formed by individuals who had been expelled by the SWP — Fourth Internationalist Tendency, Socialist Action, Socialist Unity — have at various times written things which stated or implied that members of these organizations remained members of the SWP after they were expelled or resigned. These include references to a "public faction" of the SWP, three or four "separate components of the SWP" and a request in a letter sent by the FIT to the United Secretariat urging the FI to recognize that the expellees "remain members of the party." All such statements were and are untrue. We are not, and never have been, a "public faction" of the SWP.

The FIT, SA, SU and the SWP each state that they are in fraternal solidarity with the Fourth International but there is no organizational connection between these organizations. The SWP is not responsible for the actions or statements of any of the other three organizations, nor are any of the other three organizations responsible for the actions or statements of the SWP.

Whatever differences of opinion about political line and organizational norms we may have with the SWP, we reject any challenge to the right of the SWP membership to organize their party as they choose and to decide all questions of party policy. This right necessarily includes the right to decide who is, and who is not a member of the SWP, and who speaks and acts in the name of the SWP.

F.I.T. DIRECTORY

Bay Area:

P.O. Box 971
Berkeley, CA 94701

Boston:

George Saunders
RFD 1, 7 Liberty
Sandwich, MA 02563

Cleveland:

4510 Warrensville
Center Rd #114B
Cleveland, OH 44128

Los Angeles:

P.O. Box 480410
Los Angeles, CA 90048

New York:

P.O. Box 1947
New York, NY 10009

Pacific Northwest:

P.O. Box 17512
Seattle, WA 98107-1212

Philadelphia:

P.O. Box 28838
Philadelphia, PA 19151

Pittsburgh:

Paul Le Blanc
840 Heberton
Pittsburgh, PA 15206

Twin Cities:

P.O. Box 14444
University Station
Minneapolis, MN 55414

SUBSCRIBE TO THE **Bulletin** In Defense of Marxism

12 Issues: \$24 6 Issues: \$15

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ Zip _____

Make checks payable to: *Bulletin IDOM*
Mail to: P.O. Box 1317
New York, N.Y. 10009

Don't Delay — Subscribe Today!

A FREE COPY

of a list of major articles in previous issues of
Bulletin in Defense of Marxism will be mailed to
those who ask for it. Write

BULLETIN IDOM,
P.O. BOX 1317, New York, NY 10009

Copies of BACK ISSUES are available
at \$3.00 per copy.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS FROM THE F.I.T.

Don't Strangle the Party

by James P. Cannon **\$1.25**

Permanent Revolution, Combined Revolution, and Black Liberation in the U.S.

by Larry Stewart **\$1.25**

George Lavan Weissman's Last Three Articles **85¢**

Leon Trotsky and the Organizational Principles of the Revolutionary Party

by Paul Le Blanc, Dianne Feeley, and Tom Twiss **\$5.00**

Permanent Revolution in Nicaragua

by Paul Le Blanc **\$3.00**

Platform of the Fourth Internationalist Tendency **75¢**

The Cuban Revolution, the Castroist Current and the Fourth International

by the International Executive Committee, FI **75¢**

Why We Oppose the SWP's New Line on Castroism

by Steve Bloom **75¢**

The Iranian Revolution and the Dangers That Threaten It

by Steve Bloom and Frank Lovell **\$1.00**

Poland, the Fourth International, and the Socialist Workers Party

by Steve Bloom **75¢**

Theses on the Workers' and Farmers' Government

by the Fourth Internationalist Caucus

and

The Workers' and Farmers' Government and the Socialist Revolution

by Steve Bloom **\$2.00**

Crisis in the Socialist Workers Party: An Answer to Jack Barnes

by Cliff Conner **60¢**

Write: F.I.T.
P.O. Box 1947
New York, N.Y. 10009