

# No 'Peaceful Solution' in Central America

By KEVIN FITZPATRICK

In the last few weeks, US intervention in Central America has become even more blatant. Reagan's statement that his thugs and stooges in Nicaragua — the gang of Somozaists and other scum who are engaged in armed conflict with the Sandinista government — are "freedom fighters" (freedom for exploitation, freedom for murder and torture), while he had officially insisted that they were active only to prevent arms shipments to El Salvador, is the clearest aspect of this.

### The Scam

But, right at this moment, there is also a great effort to present the situation as one in which diplomatic and political solutions are on the agenda. This effort comes from the imperialist Democratic Party, and from all those who support it: the Kremlin and all its tools (Castro, the Communist Parties), the Social Democrats of the Socialist International, the centrists.

"War is the continuation of politics by other means," said Clausewitz. The Marxists have always agreed with this statement. In the present situation this statement sheds a great deal of light on the attempts to present a "peaceful solution" as the answer to Reagan's brutality.

The policy — *politics* — of US intervention has been to defeat the revolution in Central America. Through "human rights," as with Carter; through aggressive tactics, as with Reagan and Haig; through military action, as today in Nicaragua.

The position of a "peaceful solution" represents the *same policy*, while in this case the means are presented as "peaceful." There are no differences on the objective — stopping the revolution — there are differences only on how to achieve it.

Since these are purely *tactical differences*, there is more than a little practical agreement. We pointed out in the last issue of *Truth* that the complaints by the liberals about the Salvadoran Army's "9-to-5" war reflected their desire for it to be a more effective counterrevolutionary instrument.

The two most recent steps by the liberal "opposition" (which is really no opposition at all) follow the same pattern.

First, there was the May 3 vote by the Democratic Party-controlled House Select Committee on Intelligence to stop Reagan's "covert action" in Nicaragua by making it into an explicitly "overt" action, which can "overthrow the government" of Nicaragua or any other country, so long as there is no attempt "to conceal US involvement"!

This kind of "opposition" found a similar expression on the House Foreign Affairs Committee on May 11, when this liberal-dominated body masked *continued aid* to the Salvadoran dictatorship with a

formula that made it conditional on the regime's opening up "unconditional negotiations" with the rebels in ninety days. Every single liberal, with the exception of George Crockett, voted for this proposal.

### Significance

Now, aside from the fact this kind of "restriction" isn't worth a plugged nickel — the "Boland amendment" led to Reagan simply saying he wasn't trying to overthrow the Sandinistas, and then the liberals voted to let him do even that "overtly"; the "human rights certification" provision is a scrap of paper — there is something even more important.

This whole scam is based on the rebels' being willing to negotiate. If they refuse, *then there is no barrier whatsoever* to military aid to the dictatorship. In other words, this is pressure on the rebels, not on the imperialist puppets in El Salvador!

The fundamental opposition of workers, youth and the oppressed in the United States to the intervention by Reagan and Company in Central America has nothing in common with this tactical "opposi-

## Lesson of Vietnam: Independence

Almost exactly eight years ago, the war in Vietnam came to a crashing end: Saigon fell to the forces of the Vietnamese Revolution. "Our great spring victory," the Vietnamese called it.

And, for the exploited and oppressed in this country, it was *our* great spring victory, too!

### In the US

More than just a moral victory for those of us who had hoped and worked for that outcome for a decade and more, more than one more example of the international upsurge of that period (the fall of Nixon, that Portuguese Revolution, the end of Francoism), this victory was a body blow to American imperialism. Only we can make the knockout punch, the hit to the head that will finish it off, but the loss of Vietnam did a lot to soften it up for us.

That is why the US government has not been able to send troops to Central America, to bomb it and poison it. This restriction on their power the imperialists call the "Vietnam syndrome," probably because it makes them sick.

But, at the same time, the US, just eight years after Vietnam, is once again back in the middle of a colonial war. This shows that the promises that the "lessons of Vietnam" had been learned, that American imperialism would not make any more "mistakes" like that, were lies. In addition, it shows that the anti-war movement in the US had serious weaknesses, weaknesses that caused it to lose the initiative,

### United States aid to Central America

(fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

	1982	1983*	1984**
<b>El Salvador</b>			
Military	82.002	26.300	86.300
Economic	186.190	204.960	195.480
<b>Costa Rica</b>			
Military	2.058	1.125	2.150
Economic	50.590	160.360	105.040
<b>Guatemala</b>			
Military	0	0.200	10.250
Economic	13.520	38.120	64.480
<b>Honduras</b>			
Military	31.275	20.300	41.000
Economic	78.090	58.770	83.200
<b>Nicaragua</b>			
Military	0	0	0
Economic	6.150	0.330	0.350
<b>Panama</b>			
Military	5.401	5.450	5.500
Economic	13.060	12.340	13.320

\*approved to date \*\*requested by the Administration

tion." *We want the US out of Central America.* The liberals want the US to defeat the revolution, "by other means."

weaknesses that enabled the imperialists to recover some ground (even if painfully and slowly).

The Vietnam War produced a social crisis in the US itself, beginning with the youth, spreading to the minorities and threatening to involve the great bulk of the working class. In response to this crisis, as well as to the military situation itself, there was a *split in the ruling class*.

Such a development is always not just a sign of crisis, but an element intensifying it. The working class, if it has a revolutionary leadership, seeks to take advantage of this split to put forward its own power.

Instead of following this path of independence, the leadership of the anti-war movement — and we are particularly talking about the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) and Communist Party (CP) — made an alliance with the liberal wing of the ruling class to "end the war"; that is, on terms acceptable to imperialism.

While the CP came out openly for a deal — supporting the idea of negotiations and the 1973 Kissinger treaty — the SWP preserved a formal position for immediate and unconditional withdrawal. But in practice it turned the anti-war movement over to the liberals, demanded that they be able to speak, excluded radical demands and elements that the liberals opposed, etc.

Thus, its position on negotiations became very vague and toothless; it was the SWP's position, but it didn't insist on it — almost as if it was a question of smoking or not.

The only way to attain peace in Central America is for the US to get out. That's our position. And to do that no more negotiations are necessary than were needed when it began to intervene — none at all.

Even more, when we swallow this line about "negotiations," it leads us into supporting — in practice, even if through "pressure" — the liberals whose goals are opposed to ours. We cease to be an independent anti-imperialist force and become mere pawns of one or another element in the ruling class.

As an anti-imperialist force, our direction is entirely different. It consists of building an independent movement in the US that can force Reagan to get out. It likewise means coming to the aid of the revolutionary forces in Central America — the rebels in El Salvador, the government in Nicaragua — by all means available to us: boycott of arms to the reactionaries, arms for the revolutionary forces, etc.

*Because we want the US out of Central America*, we repudiate any collaboration with the "peace" deception of the imperialist liberals.

### Lessons Today

This alliance with the liberals on their terms became in practice subordination to the liberals. That's why the anti-war movement didn't exist after 1973. That's why the social crisis did not find a revolutionary outcome, but reached a dead end. And that's why the ruling class was able to cut its losses, heal its split, and once again engage in counterrevolutionary interventions overseas.

Thus we reach a conclusion: any movement in the US that is not independent of the ruling class (in most cases, the Democrats) *will die*.

Today, as the intervention in Central America likewise enters into the growth of the social crisis in this country, the lessons of Vietnam become extremely pointed.

The SWP and the CP are trying, without actually saying so, to imply that today the Democratic opposition to Reagan is a new split in the ruling class. On this basis, they again try to form an alliance with the liberals — to subordinate the movement of youth, and increasingly of workers, to the Democratic Party.

That is the basis on which the SWP no longer even formally opposes negotiations, instead "demanding" that Reagan negotiate.

The problem is that today, as *Truth* has repeatedly shown, there are only *tactical differences* among the rulers. A bloc with one wing now means an attempt to *forestall* the development of a real split, which will come about under the blows of mass opposition only.

In addition, just as before, such a bloc will mean the destruction, first, of the movement's independent character and, second, of the movement itself.

The lesson of Vietnam today is the complete independence of the movement against imperialist war from any section of the imperialists.

Thus the fight for an independent labor candidate for president in 1984 is as important for the struggle against US intervention in Central America as it is for any other.

K.F.

**US Out of Central America!  
Independent Labor Candidate  
for US President!**

MARCH — JUNE 18 — DETROIT

12 NOON — GRAND CIRCUS PARK TO KENNEDY SQUARE

## Conference of Youth of the Fourth International

By DAVID HEFFELFINGER

Nothing is more important today than the training, the education of the young working class, in the program, the traditions, and, yes, even the art of socialist revolution. It is a task that is compounded in difficulty by the muddled and twisted versions of socialism and communism that young workers and students are presented with in their daily lives. But it is nevertheless an urgent and pressing task.

There are unquestionable signs of a new awakening of the young generation and of their reappearance in the front lines of the struggle against the old order.

In Europe, the appearance of the youth once again in the streets is filling the proletariat with new energy and vitality. Surely the May Day demonstrations in Poland of hundreds of thousands and the clashes of the French youth with the miserable government of Mitterrand are giving terrible headaches to the Stalinist bureaucrats and their bourgeois counterparts in France. The wedding of the political revolution against the usurpers of the Russian Revolution with the social revolution in Western Europe will be due in no small part to the courage, boldness, and audacity of young proletarians. Both the bureaucrats and their bankers will be tossed on the scrap heap like worn out shoes.

The American youth, a cross section of their brothers and sisters all over the world, will not be far behind. The bubble of promised prosperity has burst, and American youth are finding their unity with the revolution against imperialism and the mobilization of the organized proletariat against the policies of the septuagenarian, Reagan.

There is another factor of tremendous importance. Now with the upsurge of the class struggle in Europe and America, the youth will be fighting in the living struggle of the proletariat. The Fourth International, which has based itself from the time of its foundation on the simple precept that the working class is the locomotive of the revolution, has a tremendous responsibility to train and educate the new generation in the school of socialist revolution.

If the road to hell is paved with good intentions, then it is no less true that the best intentions alone cannot guarantee the victory of the socialist revolution. It requires a party and cadre steered in the program and methods of class warfare and armed to the teeth against the debilitating ideological attack on the consciousness of the youth and the proletariat by the practitioners of class collaboration.

The theories of "peaceful coexistence," of "human rights," coming from the Kremlin and the centrists who live in the shadow of Stalinism, are the enemy of all the proletariat, and most especially of the youth on whose mobilization these false leaderships prey.

It is these leaderships who are responsible today for the criminal lack of independent struggle against the intervention of Reagan's counterrevolutionary armies in Central America, who have turned their support to the Democratic Party at the moment when, as in the Chicago elections, the most oppressed are trying to break with it.

To realize the construction of a center of the training of young revolutionists, a massive Revolutionary Youth International under the leadership of the youth itself, the Fourth International calls on young proletarians and fighters everywhere to prepare with it a Conference of Youth of the Fourth International, in Stockholm, Sweden at the end of the Summer of 1983. Be there! Be with the revolutionaries of the Fourth International.

# A Black Candidate in 1984?

argument w/ those wanting inde. black candidate

By MARGARET GUTTSALL

Black political leaders continue to debate whether or not to put forward a black candidate for US president in the 1984 Democratic Party primary elections.

Jesse Jackson, of Operation PUSH in Chicago, continues to consider this perspective imperative, as the only way to get black people involved in the electoral process and develop their power within the Democratic Party. Andrew Young on the other hand, mayor of Atlanta, and other key leaders of the NAACP and the Urban League, are afraid that the Democratic Party's response to such a candidacy (which they correctly predict will be racist to the core) will alienate blacks even more from the Democratic Party.

This debate is a sign of the unprecedented opposition of black working people to the Democratic Party and of their determination to do something about the unemployment, inflation, and racist attacks that are undermining everything that blacks have fought for.

But this movement cannot be carried forward with a black candidate for US president, be it inside or outside the Democratic Party. An independent labor candidate for US president is the only solution for black youth and workers.

### Within the Democratic Party

As we said in the last issue of *Truth*, all the various proposals for a black candidate are being advanced as means to pressure the Democratic Party, register more blacks, and at best elect more black Congressmen. And the efficacy of this strategy has already been shown in the Chicago mayoral elections.

The day black Democratic Party candidate Harold Washington, who barely won the election, was inaugurated, he announced that the financial situation in Chicago was far worse than he thought it had been, that he would freeze wages, freeze hiring, layoff all recently hired workers, and raise personal income taxes. Today, only one month later, he is in the process of trying to negotiate a compromise with Ed Vrdolyak, racist Democratic Party machine head, concerning the

maintenance of the very machine that he promised to destroy.

Does this mean that Washington has "sold out"? Yes and no. Yes in the sense that he has not done what his followers wanted. No, in the sense that Washington is *simply being faithful* to the Democratic Party he is pledged to serve which, because it is a *pro-capitalist, anti-working class party*, must, in a financial crisis, try to making the working class pay. And which for the same reason, must, in a political crisis, such as the one taking place in Chicago today, try to hold the pro-capitalist, anti-working class Democratic Party regime together. This is the significance of Washington's attempt to reach a compromise with Vrdolyak.

### Outside the Democratic Party

Then why not run an independent black candidate outside the Democratic Party and against it? Such a candidacy could mobilize blacks and others concerned with black rights against Reagan and the Democrats.

But to the extent that it remained a strictly *black candidate*, addressing blacks on black issues, it would be incapable of developing a real alternative to the Democratic Party, of building the kind of movement necessary to confront and destroy this racist power structure and completely transform society. It would be incapable of addressing itself to the concerns of the entirety of the working class and its unions, of confronting the current politics and leadership of the working class and its unions, which are the only source of power in this society outside of the capitalists and their parties. Thus such a candidacy could only wind up as a dead end, as an impotent protest.

This was the problem with the Eldridge Cleaver campaign in 1968, led by the Black Panther and Peace and Freedom parties and with the various election campaigns run within the unions by the Dodge Revolutionary Union Movement (DRUM) shortly thereafter. The Cleaver campaign was essentially a petty bourgeois campaign uninterested in addressing the concerns of the masses of workers. While the

DRUM campaigns for union office were working class, their political content was black nationalist, black candidates, on black platforms, addressing themselves essentially to black workers, and were thus unable to win over the masses of workers, black and white, and wrest control of the unions from the Democratic Party and their agents in the unions.

Confusionists will argue that an independent black candidate can reach out to other working people about their common concerns and mobilize them against Reagan and the Democrats, but then you aren't really talking about an independent black candidate any more. You're talking about some sort of popular candidate. And what is necessary isn't some sort of popular or even working class candidate because it is necessary to center the struggle on a fight to mobilize the unions against Reagan and the Democrats — thus an independent labor candidate.

Nationalists may argue that the unions are racist and that such a candidacy (which may or may not be black) will not necessarily be any different from the white capitalists' candidacies. While the unions are indeed racist, racism is not *endemic* to them. They have no stake in racism as do capitalists. They remain racist to the extent that they remain tied to this capitalist state and its parties. A fight for an independent labor candidate is a fight to break the unions from the state and its parties and rid them of their racism.

Such radical nationalist arguments against such a struggle only wind up like the rest, as an excuse for avoiding the struggle to transform the working class and its unions, confront its current politics and leadership, as an excuse for remaining marginal to the struggle for power in the society.

The 1984 elections represent a tremendous opportunity for blacks to forge the independence and unity of their class, the working class, build its new leadership, and in so doing begin to build the political power they desire. But to do so requires clarity, not confusion in tactics.

An Independent Labor Candidate in '84!

## May Day in Poland

As we anticipated, the May Day demonstrations in Poland were large and combative. As many as 40,000 in Gdansk, 15,000 in Warsaw, and tens of thousands in other cities throughout the country took part. This represents another breach, not just in Stalinist rule in Poland, but in the wall of silence around the Polish Revolution.

We insist on this point: all the powers of and apologists for imperialism (and that includes its Kremlin agency) have repeatedly tried to portray the Polish Revolution as over, beaten, ancient history. In this way they hoped to defuse the enormous sympathy for it among Western workers, and thus prevent this sympathy from leading to the road the Polish workers had already taken.

The events of the last few months, culminating in May Day, have torn apart this screen of lies. The Polish Revolution re-emerges just at the moment when the class struggle in the West — for example, France — is reaching a new level. For this reason, not to mention its own fears of what will happen at home, the Kremlin

itself is criticizing the Jaruzelski regime as too soft (in the Soviet foreign affairs weekly, *Novoye Vremya*).

Now, as the Polish Revolution develops not only on its own basis but in rhythm with the upsurge of the international working class, the question of its program and its leadership is posed even more in terms of the *international* character of this program and leadership. There is no isolated, national solution available to the Polish Revolution. The history of its last three years bears this out in general. The situation today emphasizes it concretely.

Readers of *Truth* are aware that the Fourth International, the TO in the United States, has consistently opposed the lie that the revolution was defeated. They know that we have continued to cover its development, above all in terms of the struggle of the Revolutionary Workers League of Poland (RLRP), our section there.

The situation in Poland, the international situation demand the *international* program and leadership that only the Fourth International can provide. The correctness of

our whole past struggle is the proof of this.

The Polish workers need a party! A party does not arise spontaneously, it has to be built. Trips have to be organized, publications distributed and expanded, connections regularized. All this requires *money*, "the sinews of war." Once again, we appeal to our readers: *contribute to the International Workers Fund* — build the party of the Polish Revolution!

Make checks payable to *Truth* and indicate that they are for the IWF. Send your contributions to: *Truth*; PO Box 32546; Detroit, MI 48232.

K.F.

### TRUTH, Bi-Weekly Organ of the Trotskyist Organization/USA

Editorial Board: Kevin FitzPatrick; Margaret Guttshall, Editor; David Heffelfinger.

Subscription Rates. North America. \$1 for six issues (introductory); \$6 for one year. \$15 for one year supporting subscription. Inquire for other rates, including institutional rates.

### Note to Readers

Because we have decided to devote our resources to publishing The Fourth International, journal of the Executive Committee of the Fourth International, this issue of *Truth* is two pages.

The next issue, appearing June 3, will be the usual size of four pages.

### TRUTH: Introductory Subscription, 6 Issues for \$1

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY/STATE/ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

Fill out this form and send it with \$1 to:  
Truth, PO Box 32546, Detroit, MI 48232