

Information, Education & Discussion

Bulletin

In Defense of Marxism

Published by expelled members of the Socialist Workers Party, Fourth Internationalist Tendency (F.I.T.)

C O N T E N T S

PAGE

Introduction	1
THE MOST PECULIAR DISCUSSION THE SWP HAS EVER HAD by Frank Lovell	2
RITA SHAW SPEAKS AT SWP RALLY	6
— AN OPEN LETTER TO MEL MASON by Larry Stewart	8
A DANGEROUS ESCALATION OF THE SLANDER AGAINST THE F.I.T. by Steve Bloom	10
PRECONVENTION AND PRE-WORLD CONGRESS DISCUSSION	
The Transitional Program and the Fight to Save the Family Farmer by Christine Frank Onasch	15
— The Radicalization and the Socialist Workers Party by Evelyn Sell	20
The Revolutionary Marxist Movement and the Iran-Iraq War by David Williams	24
FROM THE ARSENAL OF MARXISM	
James P. Cannon on the Control Commission and SWP Constitution Introduction by Jean Y. Tussey	30
LETTERS	34

No. 8

June 1984

\$3.00

Editor, FRANK LOVELL

Send requests, materials, financial contributions to

Bulletin I. D. O. M.
P. O. B o x 1 3 1 7
New York, N.Y. 10009

"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 (quoted in Trotsky's The Challenge of the Left Opposition, 1926-27; for another translation see Lenin, Collected Works, vol. 32 pp. 43-44).

* * * * *

The Bulletin In Defense of Marxism is published by the Fourth Internationalist Tendency, a group founded by members expelled from the Socialist Workers Party because we opposed abandoning the Trotskyist principles and methods on which that party was founded and built for more than a half century.

Denied the right, specified in the SWP constitution and by Leninist norms, of full and free discussion of all programmatic changes, we were subjected first to gag rules and slander, and finally to wholesale expulsions by the leadership in order to facilitate their imposition of a new, revisionist line, without approval by the membership.

We are now forced to carry on this discussion from outside the SWP. our intent is to foster discussion within the party by those sincerely seeking to defend a revolutionary Marxist program, as well as to bring about our own readmission.

We firmly believe that the present leadership of the SWP cannot avoid that discussion in the long term through organizational measures and expulsions. The relevant issues will increasingly be on the agenda as their new line comes into conflict with the reality of the class struggle in the U.S. and around the world.

-
- BULLETIN IDOM
EDITORIAL BOARD**
-
- Naomi Allen
 - Steve Bloom
 - George Breitman
 - Frank Lovell
 - Sarah Lovell
 - Bill Onasch
 - Christine Frank Onasch
 - George Saunders
 - Evelyn Sell
 - Rita Shaw
 - Adam Shils
 - Larry Stewart
 - Jean Tussey
-
- George Lavan Weissman

INTRODUCTION

Preconvention discussion in the Socialist Workers Party has finally started, officially -- although in a halting and guarded way, as our opening article in Bulletin No. 8 demonstrates. Every SWP member and supporter has a vital stake in the kind of discussion it will be because it offers a way out of the party's present crisis or a way to deepen the crisis. That is why we will continue to report on the development of the discussion as closely as we can.

To enhance the chances of a "safe" and "controlled" preconvention discussion, the SWP leadership seeks to immunize the membership against the political views of recently expelled oppositionists by smearing us as "disrupters" and barring us from all SWP events. But sometimes this stupid and self-defeating policy collides with political reality. One such instance occurred in Seattle recently when the SWP had to agree to let Rita Shaw speak at a public SWP rally, even though she is a leader of the Fourth Internationalist Tendency and has repeatedly been stigmatized as a notorious disrupter. We hope news of the Seattle meeting will help to hasten the burial of this exclusionary policy.

From Newark we have an open letter to Mel Mason by Larry Stewart who was barred from an SWP rally shortly after Rita Shaw endorsed the SWP ticket in Seattle. We don't think anyone can read Stewart's moving letter without realizing how damaging the exclusion policy is -- for the SWP itself, and especially its election campaign. This is another case of the leadership's vindictive factionalism damaging first of all the best interests of the SWP.

We have previously reported on the expulsion of Gerardo Nebbia from the SWP in New York. Now, because we had the temerity to reject his expulsion without a shred of evidence or trial, the SWP leadership has escalated its slanders and accuses the F.I.T. as well as Nebbia of being Healyite agents and accessories. Steve Bloom analyzes this escalation and tells why the SWP leadership prefers to open the preconvention discussion with such lies. In the Nebbia case the SWP accusers have been forced to reveal their "evidence." This is presently under investigation by a responsible committee of the F.I.T.

We are publishing three articles in this issue of the Bulletin that would have been submitted to the SWP Discussion Bulletin if their authors had not been expelled or otherwise excluded from the party's political development. The contribution by Christine Frank Onasch benefits from her experience as a leader and elected organizer of the SWP Twin Cities branch, and as an industrial worker for most of her adult life who comes from a farm family. She polemicizes against the schematic program for farmers drafted by inexperienced SWP "experts" in the field. Evelyn Sell also corrects some current misconceptions spawned by the SWP leadership, especially about working class radicalization. Her contribution adds to our understanding of the methodology of the present crop of SWP leaders. David Williams sketches some Iranian history which has been lacking in articles of the SWP press. His contribution ought to interest SWP members for this reason, even if they do not agree with his conclusions. We will continue to publish material regularly for the preconvention and pre-World Congress discussion that is not accepted or is suppressed by the SWP leadership.

With this issue of the Bulletin we are initiating another department, "From the Arsenal of Marxism," which used to be a valued part of the SWP's theoretical magazine. Here we reproduce a 1966 letter by James P. Cannon. In this letter the founder of American Trotskyism warns against moves to monkey with the SWP constitution in order to "tighten" centralization at the expense of democracy. The party is too "tight" already, he wrote, "and if we go much further along this line we can run the risk of strangling the party to death." Eighteen years later, his warning has even greater relevance and resonance.

THE MOST PECULIAR DISCUSSION THE SWP HAS EVER HAD

by Frank Lovell

The SWP National Committee at its April meeting finally issued the call for the thirty-second national convention of the party, August 4-10, 1984, at Oberlin, Ohio, and announced the formal opening of the pre-convention discussion on May 5. The place and date of the convention were reported by those attending the NC plenum when they returned to their branches. However, the formal call--"To Districts, Branches, and Members"--dated April 26, was first published in Information Bulletin No. 2, May 1984, and delivered to most branches at the end of May, following the Memorial Day weekend. This obviously prevented the opening of the pre-convention discussion until much later than May 5.

Simultaneously delivered to the branches with the above-cited Information Bulletin, which published the convention call and other material from party officials, was a Discussion Bulletin, No. 1, May 1984. It is instructive to compare the size and contents of the two bulletins. The Discussion Bulletin consists of eight pages in all, including the cover, and contains two articles by rank-and-file members. The Information Bulletin is 38 pages long, consisting of letters or reports by five central party officials, including a condescending letter from the SWP National Secretary to one of the rank-and-file participants in the discussion, designed to intimidate others who may wish to enter the discussion if time permits, all else being equal. From this it appears as if the Discussion Bulletin is where SWP members may be permitted to say what they think and the Information Bulletin is reserved for party functionaries to explain what SWP members ought to think.

Thus began the officially recognized 1984 pre-convention discussion in the SWP, a most peculiar beginning.

This year's convention was supposed to be held last year, in accordance with the SWP constitution. But the leadership was too busy, or too tired, or too uncertain of its new political course to have the convention in 1983. So they cancelled it, not once, but twice. They were not eager for a convention where they would be confronted with an opposition committed to defending the policies and traditions that the leadership has been trying to jettison since before the 1981 convention, using devious means to avoid an open discussion among the party ranks of the specific issues in question. No SWP convention has ever before been postponed for such hidden reasons.

What are the hidden reasons and specific issues?

The truth is the reasons are not well hidden and the issues are rather generally known to the SWP membership, if not yet fully understood. In one of the published discussion articles (the one that alarmed the SWP National Secretary and prompted his threatening response nearly twice the length of the offending article) its author, Eileen G., Philadelphia branch, summarizes the perceived political position and unfounded hopes of the majority faction in control of the party. "The majority view seems to be that it is necessary to curb criticism in order to achieve a rapprochement with the revolutionary governments and people of these countries [Cuba, Grenada, and Nicaragua]" she says. "We can then be recognized by the Cubans as a potential ally, helping to build defense and protest actions when these are called for. Ultimately, this is seen as leading to joining the Cubans, the NJM, the FSLN in a revolutionary socialist international organization." The present SWP officials are not prepared to deny that they

harbor such illusions, nor are they prepared to openly defend them. And this is seen by them as reason enough to try desperately to postpone, distort, and prevent serious and rational discussion. Such dubious reasons are best kept hidden as long as possible, while hopes are cultivated that events beyond our control will make the fantasy a reality.

Between the postponement of the convention last year and the calling of the convention this year, the SWP leadership expelled all known or suspected oppositionists and forced many others to resign on various pretexts and false charges. After getting rid of anyone who the leadership suspected might raise oppositional or troublesome questions, they then cautiously and belatedly opened preconvention discussion as of May 5, expecting no one to jump to the opportunity. This was the first time in SWP history that critics of the leadership have been expelled before a discussion to clarify the political differences.

The expelled members appealed to the NC to be readmitted to the party when preconvention discussion was opened so that the members would be able to hear more than one point of view, the entrenched leadership's. The NC rejected the appeal. This will be the first SWP convention where an organized opposition is proscribed in word and deed, specifically forbidden in the lengthy letter from the SWP National Secretary to Eileen G., who called "for the formation of a tendency" based on her contribution to the discussion.

Preconvention discussion periods usually begin with publication of draft resolutions that the NC wants the members to discuss and the convention to adopt. But under the rules of the present party leaders the period for submitting written articles for the SWP Discussion Bulletin runs from May 5 to July 19, a total of 76 days. As of June 5, only two months before the convention, the NC has not printed a single draft resolution for convention delegates to vote on, even though point #3 on the 8-point convention agenda is "Political Resolution."

If the official opening of this preconvention discussion was peculiar, the actual beginning was more peculiar. The first bulletin submitted by the SWP leadership after the official date for opening preconvention discussion (and before printing the formal convention call) was devoted entirely to an official report called "The Gerardo Nebbia Disruption Campaign," having nothing whatever to do with any of the profound political issues under discussion in the party (see Internal Information Bulletin No. 1 in 1984, dated April). Instead of a political resolution, the Leadership started the "discussion" with a stink bomb, designed to distract attention from the political differences and to harden prejudices against critics of the leadership. The aim was to whip up party patriotism and close the minds of those who might have been willing to listen objectively to the political arguments of the opposition. Never in the entire history of the SWP or its predecessors did the leadership ever before open any preconvention period this way--by befouling it.

Oral discussion in the branches this year was supposed to last from May 5 until the end of July, when delegates are to be elected. But as of the beginning of June, when one-third of this period had elapsed, not a single branch of the party, to our knowledge, had started its oral preconvention discussion. That must set some kind of record, but in any case it demonstrates that the leadership is not eager for a discussion even after expelling and reviling all real or potential critics. This odd turn of events was not left to happenstance. It was organized through the party apparatus.

In an official report "to NC members, organizers and executive committees," titled "Organizing for the Party Convention" by Larry Seigle (one of the official direc-

tives published in IB No. 2) a schedule of preconvention activities is outlined as follows: "...the party will combine a period of preconvention discussion with carrying through our key party campaigns." What are these key party campaigns? "This will include stepped-up efforts to recruit party contacts in the YSA, among organized Active Supporters, co-workers on the job, fighters in the National Black Independent Political Party, and others who are moving toward membership in the SWP," says Seigle. The one party campaign that receives no mention in any of the official reports is the 1984 presidential election campaign and the Mason-Gonzalez ticket.

Seigle's report makes a special point of the decision to exclude nonparty YSA members from the party's preconvention discussion. This retrogressive action is explained away as a newly discovered trick to recruit YSA members to the party. Seigle recommends that nonparty YSA members be told straight out: "If you want to be a part of what we're doing, now is a good time to sign up as a provisional member. You'll come to the meetings and have a voice in deciding the line of the party."

Ever since the YSA was organized 24 years ago, YSA members who do not belong to the SWP have always been invited to attend preconvention oral discussion and debate in the party branches and to read the SWP preconvention discussion bulletins. This established practice was seen, correctly, as an excellent way to contribute to the education of young Trotskyists and Fourth Internationalists. But this sensible and progressive policy has been rudely rescinded this year by the SWP leadership, which says, "The presence of nonmembers in the room during the preconvention discussion... undermines the democracy of the party by inhibiting the open exchange of views and the freedom to raise questions that are essential to the discussion."

There may be exceptions, Seigle says, and, sure enough, an exception already has been made. Although nonparty YSA members are not allowed to read preconvention bulletins about political questions, they are encouraged to read the "Gerardo Nebbia Disruption Campaign" bulletin.

According to Seigle's instructions on "organizing for the party convention," the Workers and Farmers Government concept must be mastered. This is listed as the second point on the convention agenda--right after "Appeals of Disciplinary Actions." But the party leadership has failed in more than two years to draft any resolution on this all-important question... which it asserts is the central one facing the whole Fourth International. Instead of a resolution, SWP members are directed to focus on the oral report on the Workers and Farmers Government made by Jack Barnes at the February-March 1982 NC plenum. This report was later inflated and published with many appendices in International Internal Discussion Bulletin Vol. XVIII, No. 5, June 1982, as if it constituted a breakthrough in Marxist theory. Seigle goes on to list all known documents that he interprets as supporting the position in the Barnes report. And he omits all mention of the weightier mass of published material opposed to the Barnes position--such as Steve Bloom's 1982 article, "The Workers' and Farmers' Government and the Socialist Revolution" (Bulletin IDOM No. 6), and Ernest Mandel's 1983 article, "On the Workers and Peasants Government" (International Internal Discussion Bulletin, Vol. XX, No. 2, April 1984). Never in the history of the SWP has the leadership opened any previous discussion by issuing an official reading list so discriminatory and one-sided.

The importance attached to the "Workers and Farmers Government" debate by the SWP leadership is further revealed in the Seigle report on how to organize

branch discussions on this question. This is addressed to branch executive committees, dated May 19, and published in IB No. 2; it is separate and different from the earlier report on organizing for the convention published in the same IB. Seigle had said in the earlier report (dated May 15) that an "important aspect of the report on the workers and farmers government before the party for decision by the convention is the proposal to change the SWP's transitional governmental slogan from, 'For a workers government,' to 'For a workers and farmers government.'" He went on to say, "This includes the proposal to amend Article II of the party constitution." (This reads: "The purpose of the party shall be to educate and organize the working class for the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of a workers government to achieve socialism." The proposed change reads: "The purpose of the party shall be to educate and organize the working class for the establishment of a workers and farmers government leading to the abolition of capitalism and the achievement of socialism.")

In his following report Seigle confides to branch executive committees "the double nature of the proposed constitutional amendment. It not only would replace the slogan of a workers government with that of a workers and farmers government," he says, "it would also place the inauguration of a workers and farmers government in its proper place--not following the abolition of capitalism, as the constitution reads now, but as an instrument for the workers to use in the fight to abolish capitalism and achieve socialism."

Here is a restatement, by Seigle, of the discredited Stalinist "stages theory" of the revolutionary process and social transformation. The theory is refurbished by Seigle and others in the leadership of the SWP majority faction in light of the Cuban and Nicaraguan revolutions as they see them. This is the essence of their revision of the Trotskyist theory of permanent revolution.

Coupled with this revisionism in the realm of theory is the revision of the Leninist organizational concept. The revision of Lenin's organizational methods and practices is exemplified in the letter by SWP National Secretary Jack Barnes, in IB No. 2. Barnes invokes the authority of "higher bodies" in the SWP organizational structure to decree that "only the elected leadership bodies of the SWP can authorize a discussion inside the SWP." In practice this has meant that serious discussion in the SWP is confined to "elected leadership bodies" which dictate to the ranks what may and may not be considered, discussed, and decided.

These revisions of Marxist theory by the elected leadership of the SWP without consultation and correction from the ranks of the party give the pre-convention discussion this year a most peculiar character from the outset.

The Discussion Starts Here!

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

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

RITA SHAW SPEAKS AT SWP RALLY

Rita Shaw, a member of the Fourth Internationalist Tendency and of the editorial board of Bulletin in Defense of Marxism, was one of the speakers at a rally on May 13 organized by the SWP branch in Seattle to protest an arson attack on its local headquarters on April 26. Shaw spoke at the SWP rally as an official representative of the Coalition of Labor Union Women (CLUW), although virtually everybody in the audience knew her record as an outstanding SWP activist since the 1940s who had been expelled from the SWP early this year as a "splitter" and "disrupter" and denied admission even to public meetings of the SWP.

Victims of right-wing vandalism and arson in the Seattle area include the Everett Feminist Women's Health Center which was torched for the third time April 19, just one week prior to the nighttime attack on the SWP headquarters. Many in the women's liberation movement and in the Black community, as well as civil libertarians, believe that these cowardly attacks are encouraged by the failure of the police to investigate, and by recent police raids and shootouts in the Black community. So the SWP call for a protest rally got sympathetic response and rather broad support.

Within a few days after the fire bombing, Shaw had sent the local SWP branch a letter encouraging a broad campaign against the right-wing terrorism and for the Mason-Gonzalez presidential ticket, enclosing financial contributions for both causes. The answer of the local SWP leaders was to inform the SWP members that Shaw's attendance at the coming protest rally would be "an act of provocation" and would not be tolerated.

After receiving the SWP call for the protest rally, the local CLUW chapter adopted a resolution condemning the attack on the SWP and decided to send an official CLUW speaker to the rally. Later, Shaw was picked to speak for CLUW. Since she wanted to avoid any unpleasant public confrontation with SWP members, she asked that the SWP be informed that she would be CLUW's representative at the rally. After some hesitation, the SWP organizer replied that Shaw would be allowed to attend as the CLUW speaker "provided she conducts herself in a non-provocative manner and does not raise anything about her expulsion."

The rally was relatively small but there was good representation from other organizations, including the local chapters of NOW and CISPES, who brought messages of solidarity. There was a table showing some of the books burned in the arson attack on the SWP, along with petition sheets to put the SWP on the ballot, but there was no public reference to them by the SWP speaker (gubernatorial candidate Cheryl Hidalgo) or the chairperson.

In her brief talk, Shaw told how CLUW had helped organize protests against the attacks on the Everett Feminist Women's Health Center and opposed all such methods of silencing political opponents. Advocating a repopularization of the old organizing slogan, "An injury to one is an injury to all," she concluded by reading CLUW's resolution on the SWP firebombing, whose final resolve said that CLUW "opposes the violence and lawlessness used against organizations, individuals, and labor unions exercising their right to express their ideas and opinions."

Shaw then declared that she wished to add some personal remarks. This seemed to shock most SWP members present (especially the chairperson) who looked as if they were bracing themselves for a big attack on the SWP. While the chairperson looked helplessly about, Shaw went on. She urged all present to support

the SWP candidates in the fall elections, to contribute money to their campaign, and to vote for them - as she has done and will continue to do. Her few words explaining the direct connection between the working class politics of the SWP candidates and the physical attacks on the party's campaign offices were the only cogent reference to the election at this rally. Her remarks were well received by most of the audience - as if they sensed that something had been missing until then.

The Militant's June 1 article about the Seattle rally quoted the CLUW resolution but avoided mentioning the name of the CLUW representative.

The chief result of the SWP's exclusion policy is to further isolate the party from its present and potential allies. It remains to be seen if the recent Seattle experience will help SWP members to reconsider this self-defeating policy.

Its rationale is that the F.I.T. or any other political tendency that is critical about one or several aspects of the current leadership's positions and pose questions about the SWP's role and relationship to the Fourth International, the labor and radical movements, or the working class, must somehow be playing a provocative role. Therefore, it is the F.I.T. and other oppositionists or critics, who create a situation ripe for FBI and CIA infiltration. It is oppositionists who are responsible, not the U.S. government. Oppositionists thus become the immediate danger and must be cordoned off from all contact with SWP members.

Such circuitous argumentation leading to irrational conclusions can flourish for a while in the confines of a small isolated group. But when the group ventures beyond the narrow limits of its circle and tries to establish any kind of working relationship with others in the labor or radical movements, as was attempted in Seattle under pressure of right-wing attacks, then the absurdity of trying to proscribe and exclude political opponents is quickly exposed. The SWP's present exclusion policy is absolutely incompatible with the party's hopes of becoming the revolutionary party that will lead the struggle for working class emancipation. The sooner this is understood, the healthier the SWP will become.

TIMELY QUOTATION

"And the main thing is that because of the decisions and the economic measures adopted by the party, the result of which was to bring about the disappearance of the differences of opinions and the groupings, the Tenth Congress was able to prohibit formally the constitution of factions, with reason to believe that its decisions would not remain a dead letter. But as experience and good political sense show, it goes without saying that by itself this prohibition contained no absolute or even serious guarantee against the appearance of new ideological and organic groupings. The essential guarantee, in this case, is a correct leadership, paying timely attention to the needs of the moment, which are reflected in the party; and flexibility of the apparatus, which ought not paralyze but rather organize the initiative of the party, and which ought not fear criticism or intimidate the party with the bugbear of factions (intimidation is most often a product of fright)."

Leon Trotsky, "Groups and Factional Formations," December 22, 1923,
The New Course, from The Challenge of the Left Opposition (1923-25)
p. 83

AN OPEN LETTER TO MEL MASON

May 26, 1984

Dear Comrade Mason:

This letter is directed to you as a fighter for Black Liberation and leader in the working class struggle for justice in this country. It comes from a Black worker who for many years was a loyal member of the SWP and who supports your presidential candidacy and the SWP's overall political platform without any reservation.

I have voiced that support to all my friends and everyone I know. By letter to the SWP and vocally I have volunteered to work for your campaign in any way that I can. These offers have received no response - until last Sunday night, May 20, when I was physically barred from attending your campaign rally in Newark.

I was one of many members undemocratically expelled from the SWP early this year under the guise of "disloyalty." The real reason we were expelled was that we hold political perspectives different from the current leadership and possibly a majority of the membership. When we protested and asked to be reinstated, the leadership took a step to prevent any kind of collaboration, fraternization, or discussion between us and the SWP membership: it instructed all branches to ban us from all public activities of the party, including its forums, bookstores, and election rallies. The pretext given is that we are disrupters linked to anti-party enemy groups and possibly government Cointelpro operations.

I shall not dwell at length on the mingled feelings of outrage and resentment I experienced in the May 20 incident. I found it necessary to state and restate the truth that I only wanted to attend the public election rally and had no intention of trying to force my way in. I had to repeat a number of times that I wasn't there to cause any disturbance or provocation. Surely you can understand the intensity of my feelings at being confronted and barred from participating in a party event by comrades, including some I've known for many years - at the same time that members of actual opponent and hostile groups, like Stalinists and Social Democrats as well as Republicans and Democrats, were free to enter the rally from which I was barred.

Later I learned that racists had made a death threat against you that very day. What a bitter irony that the defense guard that day spent time and vigilance in excluding a supporter of your campaign!

But it is necessary to subordinate subjective feelings and to pose the problem politically. That is the main reason I am writing to you now.

An election campaign is an opportunity for the revolutionary party to reach many more people with its message than it normally does. This is doubly true of presidential campaigns, which usually result in the SWP and YSA getting more new contacts, friends, and recruits than at other times.

For this to happen the party of course has to have an open and outgoing policy and attitude toward the non-party forces it encounters during the election campaign. That has traditionally been the course followed by the SWP since its first presidential campaign in 1948, as I can personally testify. We reached out to non-party members, invited them to participate actively in the campaign work, even if they did not fully agree with our platform. We did not bar anyone from petitioning or campaigning with us merely because they did not measure up to our internal standards for party membership. As a result, there were

thousands of workers over the years who regarded Farrell Dobbs as their candidate and the SWP as their party even though they did not join it.

This year the SWP has invited all who support your campaign to participate actively in it - by collecting petitions to get on the ballot, by circulating our literature, by helping to finance the campaign, by joining the SWP or YSA, etc. This is unquestionably a correct non-exclusionary policy in full accord with our best traditions and methods.

But how effectively can it work if simultaneously the non-party elements we are reaching can see other Mason-Gonzalez supporters excluded from election rallies simply because of some internal party difference that really has nothing to do with the campaign? Won't that make the SWP look sectarian and hypocritical? Won't that antagonize and alienate the forces we are trying to attract through the campaign?

This is a point that Frank Lovell made recently at the end of his article about the 1984 election campaign, in the May issue of the Bulletin in Defense of Marxism (No. 7): "Significant new forces cannot be won in an atmosphere which demands total agreement with the SWP leadership on every point as a condition for participating in the Mason-Gonzalez campaign."

I am not trying to embarrass you or put you on the spot. I am not asking you to agree with everything said above. What I want is to urge you, as the party's chief banner-bearer in this year's campaign, as the party member having major responsibility for the effectiveness of the campaign, to try to persuade the party leadership that the best interests of the party will be served by canceling the present exclusion policy. Nobody should be barred from SWP events merely because they are on some blacklist compiled by the SWP leadership. Such blacklisting may serve temporary internal factional purposes but only at the expense of the SWP's public standing and authority.

The party leadership will listen to you if you raise this question with them because they know that you will do it only out of concern for the best interests of the campaign. The party membership will breathe a sigh of relief to be rid of this exclusionary millstone around their necks. And non-party workers reached in this campaign will have an additional reason to come closer to the campaign and the SWP.

Comradely,

Larry Stewart
Newark, N.J.

A DANGEROUS ESCALATION OF THE SLANDER AGAINST THE F.I.T.

by Steve Bloom

On April 25, 1984, the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party adopted a statement which escalates their slander campaign against the Fourth Internationalist Tendency: "FIT, which declares its allegiance to the Fourth International, and is engaged in collaboration with the Bureau of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, [has joined] in the public campaign against the party organized by the WL/WRP." (WL/WRP refers to the Workers League in the U.S. and the Workers Revolutionary Party in England, also known as the Healyites after their leader, Gerry Healy. These organizations have for some years been engaged in a slanderous campaign against the SWP--accusing its central leaders of being FBI agents.) This is another step in the Barnes leadership's effort to isolate the membership of the party from those who have been expelled, as well as from the majority of the Fourth International which has refused to recognize the political purge in the SWP.

There is no legitimacy whatsoever to these charges. Every member of the F.I.T. has condemned and fought the Healyite attack on the SWP when we were in the party. Our position on this has not changed as a result of our expulsion. We pledge to work with the SWP in every possible way to combat the disease of Healyism.

The supposed basis for this totally false accusation is the "Report on the Expulsion of Gerardo Nebbia" which was adopted by the National Organizing Committee of the F.I.T. on March 2, 1984, and published in the March issue (No. 4) of the Bulletin In Defense of Marxism. Nebbia was expelled from the SWP on February 11--on the grounds that he was "an agent of the Workers League/Workers Revolutionary Party disruption operation and for being a member of Socialist Action."

The NC statement is included in a new SWP "information" bulletin. This document, in addition to attempting to smear the F.I.T. with the brush of Healyism, continues the party leadership's broader campaign to accuse those who have been expelled of all sorts of crimes and provocations.

The real purpose of the new bulletin--introduced at precisely the time when the party was supposed to be opening its pre-convention discussion--is to further distract attention from the fact that the present majority leadership of the SWP has done everything possible to avoid a political debate with the opposition. For our part, we have requested for more than two years that the Barnes faction begin such a debate. Instead of doing so, they have answered us at every turn with trumped-up organizational charges.

The SWP membership had been told that the Nebbia expulsion was based on "direct, incontrovertible documentary evidence" which absolutely proved his guilt. (The quoted words are taken directly from the "Report of the Control Commission to the Political Bureau," Feb. 11, 1984. They also appear in the NC statement.) It was declared

however, that this evidence could not be revealed for reasons of "security."

When he was expelled, Nebbia said he was innocent, applied for membership in the F.I.T., and asked our assistance in investigating the charges made against him by the party leadership. We appointed a commission which prepared our initial report. This report did not concern itself with the charge that Nebbia was a member of Socialist Action, but concentrated on the more serious question of his alleged link to the Healyites. Our conclusion on this was quite straightforward--it would be totally irresponsible for anyone to accept the charge that a party member is an agent of the Healyites (or any other kind of agent for that matter) without substantial proof; it was irresponsible for the SWP leadership to make this charge in this way; and in the absence of tangible proof the only possible course was to assume that Nebbia was not guilty.

The final paragraph of the report stated: "We challenge the SWP leadership to prove its charges against Comrade Nebbia, or to withdraw them. It is impossible to prove the negative in such a case: that Comrade Nebbia is not an agent of the Healyites. But this is not necessary. No self-respecting revolutionary can accept an action as serious as expelling a comrade on the basis of someone else's word. Until we have been presented with real and substantial evidence, the only responsible course is to reject the charges and consider Comrade Nebbia not guilty."

Because we insisted on tangible evidence before accepting allegations of guilt, the SWP leadership now says that the F.I.T. has joined the Healyite disruption campaign. But it was no sign of softness toward the Healyites that we reacted in this way. It is precisely because of the seriousness with which we take the charge against Nebbia that we cannot accept it simply on the word of the SWP leadership.

Revolutionary Marxists have always taken this approach toward charges that members of the party are agents. If we are organized in a disciplined and centralized way we can minimize the damage which will be done by an agent in our ranks. It would be far more harmful to begin a witch-hunt every time someone made an accusation. Charges that a member is an agent require clear and definitive proof. Any other attitude opens the party up to victimization and will create prime conditions for the FBI and others who want to engage in disruption. (This is what happened to groups like the Black Panther Party in the late 1960s.)

It was this conclusion, nothing more, that was explained in the report by the FIT commission, and it is for this that we are denounced by the SWP NC for "openly leveling slanders that are at the heart of the WL/WRP's campaign against the SWP and the Fourth International," and for "accusing the party of carrying out a standard 'snitch-jacket' job against a loyal comrade." But we did neither of these things. We pointed out that the irresponsible methods of the SWP leadership in making these allegations against Nebbia without supplying any proof could open the party up to this kind of victimi-

zation. We said that we would have to assume that a frame-up was involved until and unless we could verify the evidence.

The statement of the NC, in fact, implicitly accepts this premise when it explains: "If the Political Bureau had decided to make public the charges against Gerardo Nebbia, then we would have had no alternative but also to make public the facts on which the charges were based." This is quite true. Why? Because no one can be expected to accept such charges without evidence. It should come as no surprise, then, that the F.I.T. refused to accept them, and hardly a sign of our having become part of the Healyite disruption campaign. (It speaks volumes about the contemptuous attitude of the SWP leaders toward the party membership that they did expect the ranks to accept this expulsion without evidence.)

And the party leadership has now tacitly acknowledged the correctness of the F.I.T. commission's demand that they present their proof, since in their new bulletin they published documents which they claim prove Nebbia's guilt. These documents, they say, were removed from Nebbia's home in his absence and without his knowledge, by a visitor, his sister, who is also a member of the SWP. After consultation with SWP chairperson Barry Sheppard, she copied the documents for Sheppard and, it is further stated, returned them surreptitiously to Nebbia's home. Most of the material relates to Nebbia's connection to Socialist Action, but one item does concern the Healyites: a receipt for a money order made out to the Workers League Monthly Fund, signed with the name Guillermo Brown, in a handwriting that Nebbia's sister asserts is Nebbia's.

The reason given in the NC statement for publishing this material now is the danger that the Workers League might "produce doctored versions of the documents found in [Nebbia's] possession, or forge new materials altogether," and try to claim that the party had "falsified the documents to make them incriminating." By publishing them, it is stated, "there can be no legitimate dispute over them." And this, it is explained, overrides the security requirements which initially precluded the publication of the documents.

This is hardly credible. How does the party's publication of this material guard against a claim of falsification? Anyone making such a claim could just as well say that the SWP had falsified the documents and then published them.

The fact is, as we stated in our initial report, that the seriousness of the action taken by the party leadership in charging and expelling Nebbia demanded that the evidence be revealed when the accusations against him were first made. There is no indication that any danger either to the SWP or to any of its members has resulted from the revelations in the new bulletin.

The NC statement complains about the fact that we printed our findings on the Nebbia case publicly in the Bulletin In Defense of Marxism, while the Political Bureau had "decided that the matter should be treated as an internal party affair." This is completely cynical and dishonest. The F.I.T. has repeatedly asked to participate in the "internal" affairs of the party, including the discussion

leading up to the August convention, which will hear the appeals of the expellees. These requests have been consistently ignored by the present leadership. We have been forced to speak out publicly because all "internal" discussion has been closed off to us--and the Nebbia case is not the only one we have had to take up in our bulletin. The Bulletin IDOM is the only vehicle we have to defend ourselves and our political views before the SWP membership.

Connected to this is the assertion in the NC statement that "FIT never asked the SWP for its evidence against Gerardo Nebbia." This, too, is completely hypocritical coming from a leadership that has refused even to acknowledge our letters. And it is particularly so in this case, since the Feb. 12 New York/New Jersey membership meeting, where Nebbia's expulsion was reported, was informed by Barry Shepard--in response to a question from a member--that the Political Bureau had considered notifying Socialist Action that there was a Healyite in its ranks, but had rejected doing so because they would then be obliged to reveal their evidence, which they would not do.

It is obviously irresponsible for the party leadership to believe that a charge of Healyism can be made against a member and kept so completely "internal" that other Fourth Internationalists in the United States would not be involved or informed. The only alternatives to the approach of the F.I.T. commission, given the circumstances, would have been for our tendency to completely ignore the charge against Nebbia, or to bar him from membership solely on the authority of the SWP leadership. Neither of these was acceptable.

The attempt of the SWP NC to link the F.I.T. to Healyism is based not only on our initial conclusions in the case--that Nebbia was not guilty--but also on one of the recommendations included at the end of our commission's report: "3. The F.I.T. should support Nebbia's efforts to bring into existence an impartial commission of inquiry which would invite the SWP leadership to submit its alleged proof that he is an agent of the Healyites."

The NC statement says the following about this recommendation: "FIT demands a public 'commission of inquiry' to investigate the SWP's alleged use of FBI methods. The demand for such a 'commission of inquiry' to investigate the SWP has been a slogan of the WL/WRP disruption campaign for a decade."

This assertion, purporting to be a restatement of the F.I.T. recommendation, is in fact an outright falsification. We are denounced for demanding a "public" commission to "investigate the SWP." Nothing of the kind was suggested. The word "public" is simply inserted by the party leadership, and no investigation of "The SWP's alleged use of FBI methods" is mentioned in the F.I.T. report. The purpose of the investigation we proposed was to find out the substance of the charges against Nebbia--to force the accusers to submit their evidence. This has been accomplished, which means there is no longer any need for a special commission.

Since the SWP has now published documents in the case, a more thorough investigation is possible and a new report will be made. The New York Local Organizing Committee of the F.I.T. has therefore

selected a three-person committee (chaired by Larry Stewart, a former member of the SWP's Control Commission) to investigate everything concerning Nebbia's alleged association with the Healyites. Our sole aim is to uncover the truth.

The SWP Control Commission conducted a one-day inquiry into the Nebbia case before recommending his expulsion. (There is irony in the NC's accusation that the F.I.T. "rushed into print" in response.) They conclude that the documents said to have been found in his home prove that Nebbia is an agent. By themselves, however, these documents prove nothing. They must be examined, authenticated, and explained. Nebbia denies any knowledge of the money order receipt, which is the key item in the Healyism charge; he says the handwriting on the receipt is not his and he does not know who Guillermo Brown is. We invite anyone who may have additional relevant information, including the leadership of the SWP, to bring it forward. The address of the New York F.I.T. is P.O. Box 1947, New York, N.Y. 10009.

The link to Healyism is central for us in this case. We do not regard Nebbia's relationship to Socialist Action as an important issue. Discussions with members of S.A. or the F.I.T., concern about the problems faced by the expelled (the subject of most of the documents used to convict Nebbia) have been made major offenses in the SWP by the Barnes leadership. But association by party members with those who have been expelled is no crime as far as we are concerned. The published documents do not prove anything about Nebbia's alleged membership in S.A.

The NC statement tries to make something sinister out of the organization of "interior work" by Socialist Action and the Fourth Internationalist Tendency. Yet this is nothing more than the efforts of loyal comrades, unjustly expelled, trying to reach back into the party with a Trotskyist political perspective. Of course, in the new rule-book of the Barnes leadership, any attempt to discuss political questions with members of the party is labeled a "disruption campaign."

The NC statement accuses the F.I.T. of "factional blindness" in our handling of the Nebbia case. It is not we who are moved by factionalism, but the leadership of the SWP. It is in the factional interests of that leadership to raise so many organizational charges and slanders that the political issues in dispute become obscured. The absurd charge of "Healyism" against the Fourth Internationalist Tendency reveals most of all the lengths to which they will go to avoid the political debate--which they have good reason to fear.

--May 30, 1984

THE TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM AND THE FIGHT TO SAVE THE FAMILY FARMER

by Christine Frank Onasch

INTRODUCTION

DISCUSSION ARTICLE

It is important that the revolutionary party formulate a clear, precise agrarian program using transitional demands aimed at winning farmers over to the proletarian revolution and socialism. This is an urgent task which should not be taken lightly given the serious crisis capitalist agriculture is in and the disastrous impact it is having on family farmers. To aid in this effort we need a discussion inside the party which clarifies the programmatic points currently in dispute within the Trotskyist movement in this country. There is no apparent disagreement over the analysis of the capitalist crisis in agriculture, that it is one of overproduction, or the resulting problems with which farmers are currently being confronted. Rather, the main dispute is over the question of whether or not the party should lead a fight to save the family farmer and upon what programmatic basis can it best do that? The purpose of this brief discussion article is to help provide some answers to these questions based upon the historical experience of the Marxist movement.

WHY THE SWP SHOULD HELP LEAD A FIGHT TO SAVE THE FAMILY FARMER

Any program of demands relating to the needs and interests of farmers must begin as its starting point with the need to save small family farmers who are being driven out in greater numbers. The aim of the ruling class is to get fewer independent producers to bear a greater part of the risk and indebtedness of agricultural production thereby increasing profits for U.S. agribusiness. Despite the alarming decline in the number of family farms, they still produce more than half of the nation's agricultural commodities, and family farmers make up the majority of agricultural producers. Agribusiness and the government are pursuing policies that are leading to a decrease in the number of producers on the land so that less farm income will be used to sustain the producers and their families. This will allow for a greater margin of profit for the food monopolies, grain merchants and speculators. The ruthless means for achieving this end are forced bankruptcy and farm foreclosures.

What has enabled U.S. agribusiness to derive greater productivity from fewer farmers has been the use of intensive cultivation and scientific stockbreeding through mechanization and specialization. Technological advances in chemicals, feeds, machinery, veterinary medicine and plant and animal genetics have made U.S. farmers the most productive in the world. Today one farm worker or farmer has the capacity to feed 65 people. Since World War II, agricultural output rose twice as fast as that in manufacturing.

In the past, Marxists always believed that small agricultural producers were doomed to extinction and would join the ranks of the proletariat. This has by-and-large been true. But because large-scale capitalist agriculture has not developed adequately to replace family farming and small-scale operations, small independent producers are still required. This is due primarily to the inherent risks in agriculture--the possibility of bad weather, pestilence and disease as well as the anarchy of the capitalist marketplace. U.S. capitalism still needs family farmers, albeit in smaller numbers. Their complete demise, however, is not inevitable, and it is wrong for socialists to simply throw up their hands and say, "Nothing can be done to stop farmers from being driven off the land."

Until a socialist reorganization of agriculture takes place which will ensure an adequate number of producers on the land to provide the maximum amount of high-quality, nutritious food stuffs to be made available to all, it is the responsibility of revolutionary Marxists to formulate a program which is focused on saving the family farmer. This includes Black farmers as well who are disappearing at an even faster rate. Family farmers must be saved from complete destruction and the human suffering that goes with that process as rural life declines.

This perspective was first adopted by Marxists in Engels' article, "The Peasant Question in France and Germany," written in 1894. The social democrats of Engels' day had to grapple with the problem, as Engels stated it, of "How was the peasant to be helped,

not the peasant as a future proletarian but as a present propertied peasant, without violating the basic principles of the general socialist programme?" The conclusion they came to was that although the downfall of the small peasant was inevitable, their task was not to aid or encourage it, but to assure the peasants that their land would not be forcibly expropriated and to convince them that their only salvation lies in cooperative production. Engels explained what the party's attitude should be.

We of course are decidedly on the side of the small peasant; we shall do everything at all permissible to make his lot more bearable, to facilitate his transition to the co-operative should he decide to do so, and even to make it possible for him to remain on his small holding for a protracted length of time to think the matter over, should he still be unable to bring himself to his decision. We do this not only because we consider the small peasant living by his own labour as virtually belonging to us, but also in the direct interest of the party. The greater the number of peasants whom we can save from being actually hurled down into the proletariat, whom we can win to our side while they are still peasants, the more quickly and easily the social transformation will be accomplished.

This perspective should be maintained. Saving the family farmer from extinction will be of immediate benefit to the urban working class. As farmers have warned: "If you kill our farms, your cities will die." As rural life continues to deteriorate, it will affect life everywhere.

At the same time, it should be made clear that the effort of revolutionary Marxists to help save the family farmer is not based on any petty bourgeois concepts about the moral superiority of family farming or that private ownership in agriculture is more efficient and productive. Rather, in the same article, Engels makes clear that "the main point is and will be to make the peasants understand that we can save, preserve their houses and fields for them only by transforming them into co-operative property operated co-operatively. It is precisely the individual farming conditioned by individual ownership that drives the peasants to their doom." It would be wrong for us to make the promise that we would preserve individual ownership. This is a promise we cannot keep.

The aim of the Socialist Workers Party should be to formulate a program that ends the exploitation of the family farmer by capitalism, shows the benefits of cooperative farming and adopts measures that lead to collectivized production.

A PROGRAM TO SAVE THE FAMILY FARMER

Three of the major points in dispute in the SWP's agrarian program include parity and the related issues of prices and markets, nationalization of the land and a moratorium on foreclosures. It is important to clarify where the Barnes leadership is wrong on these questions and offer a correct program.

100% of Parity--The Cost of Production Plus a Decent Income

Farmers should be guaranteed by the government the cost of production plus a decent income for themselves and their families. If market prices do not meet operating costs, then the government should pay the balance to farmers plus what it takes for them to live including providing medical benefits and pensions. This is far superior to paying farmers not to produce in order to drive up prices. Also, it can be pointed out that such a program can easily be achieved if the war budget is eliminated. The slogan "For Peace and Parity" is therefore, quite logical.

It is true that most demands for parity are linked up with various schemes and legislation which are inadequate, but the basic concept of parity is not only highly popular among farmers but a serious and necessary demand around which to rally farmers and their supporters. The important thing for revolutionary Marxists to remember is not to get caught up in any specific scheme which is presented as a panacea but to raise the demand for 100 percent of parity as a just agitational slogan which is essential to the survival of family farmers. It is also a slogan that is advantageous to raise in terms of educating farmers about the true nature of the profit system. In the

course of their struggle for parity, they will learn some important lessons and draw some vital conclusions when their fight goes unheeded by the ruling class as it has been. Any government program set up to guarantee cost of production to farmers should be democratically administered by an elected committee of farmers.

The SWP leadership maintains that the demand for parity will accomplish nothing and rejects it. This is based on what they see as the fallacy in parity--that markets can be controlled and that it is possible to regulate supply and demand under capitalism. They are critical of the demand for parity because of its "general mystique" which supposedly assumes that wealth comes from the land and the raw materials on it rather than from labor. They are critical of those farm leaders who raise parity as a cure-all and attach the demand for cost of production plus a living income to complicated formulae.

Regardless of the shortcomings of many farmers' understanding of the capitalist market system, the popular demand for 100% of parity should still be actively supported by the Socialist Workers Party in order to help build a movement of farmers to demand cost of production plus a decent living while educating farmers about why capitalism does not function to their benefit. It can be an opportunity for Socialist Workers to combat the misconceptions farmers have and explain that the anarchy of capitalist production prevents any sort of rationalization or regulation. Only a planned socialist economy can achieve that. By participating in the struggle for parity, revolutionary Marxists will gain authority among farmers and be able to better defeat erroneous petty bourgeois theories about the source of wealth by presenting the labor theory of value and educating those farmers who are open to other ideas. On the other hand, to reject the demand for parity because it is based on false views of how the capitalist economy works will turn farmers off to hearing a Marxist analysis.

Price Committees

The demand to establish democratically elected price committees to ensure that consumers are not gouged and farmers receive a fair price for their commodities is one that will help to bring workers and farmers closer together in struggle to defend their interests as both consumers and producers.

Another reason why the SWP leadership rejects the demand for parity is because farm leaders have illusions that under capitalism prices can be regulated. Of course, the regulation of markets, prices and the relationship between supply and demand cannot be controlled under capitalism especially not by the capitalist government or the corporate heads of industry. However, measures must be taken to ensure a market and an adequate price for the farmers' commodities. Losses should be absorbed by the government, and surpluses should be either consumed or stored for future use in accordance with present need. Nothing, of course, should be wasted. Through democratically elected price committees some regulation of prices favorable to both farmers and consumers can be achieved. From a propaganda point of view, raising the demand for price committees is a logical means through which to educate farmers about the machinations of the capitalist market system which cannot operate in their favor. The proposal for price committees can strengthen the demand for parity and is a practical measure that can be taken.

Nationalize the Food Monopolies--Establish a Government Granary

It is the capitalist marketing system which is the cause of farmers' problems and is set up in order to rob farmers of the products of their labor. Farmers must not only be guaranteed a fair price but a market for their goods as well. However, as long as they are forced to sell their commodities to the giant grain dealers and food processors, they will continue to be ripped off along with the consumer. Therefore, the government must guarantee the farmer a market for his produce as well as an end to the monopolization of food production. The nationalization of the food trusts and the establishment of a government granary--that is a government monopoly of food processing and distribution--is the only solution especially in a country where agriculture is the largest industry. The government should also take immediate measures to distribute food to the malnourished and provide food subsidies to families on substandard diets. This government monopoly of food processing and distribution should be extended to foreign trade in food stuffs as well to end profiteering from famine.

Nationalize the Big Corporate Farms and Agricultural Lands

As was outlined in the Transitional Program:

The program for the nationalization of the land and collectivization of agriculture should be so drawn that from its very basis it should exclude the possibility of expropriation of small farmers and their compulsory collectivization. The farmer will remain owner of his plot of land as long as he himself believes it possible or necessary.

The advantages of voluntary collectivization must be taught to farmers once workers and farmers hold governmental power and begin to democratically transform agricultural production for the purpose of satisfying human need.

Industrial workers should consider themselves duty-bound to show farmers every cooperation in traveling this road: through the trade unions, factory committees, and, most importantly, through a workers' and farmers' government.

The transitional demands we raise should attack the system of food production for private profit. The two slogans for nationalizing the corporate farms and the food monopolies complement each other because they hit squarely on the profit system. Farmers must first of all be educated on the fact that as long as food is produced for the profit of the few, the family farmer will be exploited.

Since many farmers are semi-proletarians, even future proletarians or are teetering on the abyss between debt slavery and wage slavery, the assumption then is that farmers like workers should be ready and eager to embrace socialist ideas, but as Engels described it, their "deep rooted sense of property" prevents them from doing so. Engels said of the small peasant that "the more difficult it is for him to defend his endangered patch of land the more desperately he clings to it." The small farmer is also likely to view socialists with the same resentment and suspicion he views the banks and other interests which are driving him off the land because socialists "speak of transferring landed property to the whole of society." Thus, the small farmer who in many cases owns his own land is inclined to see socialists advocating collective property relations as just as dangerous as his enemies who are robbing him of his land for private profit.

This country was once a nation of farmers, and the age-old assumptions that go with the traditions of the land are still very strongly felt among American farm families. That is why such a fierce struggle is being conducted to stop farm foreclosures. One of the focuses of the anti-foreclosure fight is to educate farmers about what their rights are as property owners and debtors. They are concluding that what the banks and government are doing to them is in violation of their constitutional rights to hold property. This is a right inherited from the bourgeois democratic revolution to which farmers will cling tenaciously. There is no denying that this sense of private property--however illusory--is an obstacle to achieving nationalization of the land.

The SWP leadership currently calls for nationalization of the land as a means to end the mortgage and rent system in order to make all land public property. They reason that since most farmers are heavily mortgaged and many rent, few actually own their own land. Therefore, to nationalize all land would mean they would have nothing to lose and everything to gain. On the contrary, the correct way to call for the end to the mortgage and rent system is to relieve indebtedness by nationalizing the banks to provide cheap credit and by expropriating the big landholders from whom small farmers rent.

The party must win the trust and confidence of farmers, educate them about who their allies are and direct them toward the leadership of the working class rather than driving them into the clutches of the bourgeoisie. Demands must be formulated that will counter the anti-communist prejudices of farmers and overcome the negative effects of the Stalinist forced collectivization in the Soviet Union.

The only correct measure is to nationalize the big corporate farms, grazing and timber lands and water rights and put them under the democratic and collective control of the workers who work those lands. All sales of public lands should be stopped.

An Indefinite Moratorium on Foreclosures

Because farmers are victimized by the greed of the banks charging usurious interest rates and price-gouging agribusiness monopolies and are in debt as a result of no fault

of their own, they must be defended from foreclosure and require immediate relief. The demand for an indefinite moratorium on farm foreclosures is just another way of saying, "No Foreclosures At All," "The Victim Should Not Be Made Into the Criminal". All those farmers who have recently been foreclosed on and robbed of their land and machinery should have their property restored to them. Our slogans should be "Return the Custodianship of the Land to Family Farmers" and "Land to Those Who Till It".

The major error that the SWP leadership makes is that they support the movement for a moratorium on foreclosures but not the demand itself. They support the demand for a moratorium on foreclosures only insofar as it raises the cry for emergency relief. Their reasoning is that the demand for a moratorium on foreclosures is not enough, that it does not solve the problem that caused foreclosures to begin with. Therefore, they raise the demand for land nationalization as the ultimate and only means to end foreclosures because what is really needed is the elimination of the rent and mortgage system which allows the banks and government to victimize farmers. It is possible that by not wholeheartedly supporting the demand for a moratorium on foreclosures, the SWP will eventually end up abstaining from the movement to stop them. This would be unfortunate.

The general tendency of the SWP leadership is to shrink away from the obligation to help mobilize popular sentiment which can lead to anti-capitalist conclusions. Instead, they lean toward raising maximum demands which by themselves do not help to educate but merely confuse and alienate the very social elements they are striving to win over. To say to farmers, "The nationalization of the land is your only solution," is asking them, given their current level of political consciousness and strong sense of property rights, to embrace something they cannot easily accept or understand. So far, the SWP's campaign to take this urgent message to the countryside has not been well received by very many farmers. It is predictable that the Barnes leadership's infatuation with farmers will be shortlived unless adjustments are made in the party's program. When farmers do not immediately and eagerly follow the party's lead on this question, they will be considered too conservative and be left behind in a cloud of dust as the SWP leadership rides off into the sunset in search of some other movement to try to influence for its own purposes, i.e., mainly to impress the Castroist current.

In contrast to this sectarian approach, the best results will be achieved through presenting transitional demands which elevate the consciousness of farmers step by step, increasing their understanding as they proceed through each successive struggle. We can explain that the fight for the demands outlined in the socialist program for agriculture will lead eventually to the abolition of private property in land tenure. The fact is that an immediate solution to foreclosures does exist in the demands for a moratorium on foreclosures and easy credit. What is not productive and teaches farmers and their allies nothing about the kind of struggle necessary is to jump from A to Z, from the problem to the solution expressed to its nth degree. The current experience of most farmers and most workers for that matter does not facilitate them making great leaps in their thinking by concluding that the only solution to foreclosures is land nationalization--period. They must still learn to crawl before they can run.

Our collective historical memory in generalizing from concrete experience is what Trotskyists have to offer the mass movements that is unique. By the same token, this does not mean that the Transitional Program is a method that should be applied in a mechanical or formalistic way. All slogans and all demands are not good for all times and all situations. Each country has its peculiar problems, conditions and historical development. What was right for the Russians and Cubans may not be applicable in the United States where social conditions and agricultural production are dramatically different. That is why an agrarian program for this country must be well designed and thought out to show that the party's orientation to farmers is serious.

Other vital points in the party's agrarian program should be:

- 1.) Nationalize the Banks and Provide Cheap Credit
- 2.) Open the Books of the Food Monopolies and Agribusiness Concerns
- 3.) Nationalize the Railroads to Provide Adequate Farm-to-Market Transport
- 4.) End All Embargoes and Feed the Hungry Everywhere
- 5.) No Import Quotas--Adopt Free-Trade Policies
- 6.) Establish Farmer-Run Soil and Water Conservation Programs
- 7.) Defend and Organize the Agricultural Laborer

THE RADICALIZATION AND THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY

DISCUSSION ARTICLE

by Evelyn Sell

The Socialist Workers Party was able to grow and to expand its influence during the late 1950s and throughout the 1960s based on its understanding of and response to the radicalization taking place. The party and the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA) entered the decade of the 70s confident of continued expansion in size and increased importance in the movements fighting for social changes. The radicalization continued and exists today--but the SWP did not achieve what it expected (and since it gave political leadership to the YSA, the youth organization was similarly affected).

What happened? Why? To begin to answer those questions, it's helpful to compare what was projected with what actually took place in U.S. society and around the world.

In his political report to the SWP National Committee in February 1970, Jack Barnes pointed out:

"The central purpose of this report is to look at one single proposition that's come out of the discussions in the Political Committee: we believe that today we have our first opportunity to become the very center of the radical movement in this country. The evolution of the radicalization since the convention (in 1969--E.S.) has convinced us of this more firmly than ever. ... The basic perspective for the 1970s is one of broadening mass struggles and growing class polarizations in American society as the radicalization deepens." (page 179, Towards an American Socialist Revolution)

The leadership of a revolutionary socialist party has an elementary responsibility to look ahead in this way in order to organize its political work. Marxists understand that all such projections must undergo the test of events. Errors of judgment can be quickly remedied by utilizing the self-correcting mechanisms built into a Leninist party: full discussion and input from the entire membership followed by democratic decision-making based on honest review of the facts, sober evaluation of how perspectives matched up with reality, and consideration of all opinions.

The developments in the months following the February plenum confirmed the optimistic assessment approved by the National Committee. In his talk to the 1970 Socialist Activists and Educational Conference, Barry Sheppard described the international roots of the radicalization and detailed the rise and development of this process in the U.S. (Towards an American Socialist Revolution)

In her talk on the student movement and the rebellion of women, Mary-Alice Waters stated:

"When we say that we have entered a period of radicalization, we're saying that we believe a process has been set into motion that cannot be halted arbitrarily, nor without a major social convulsion. (Emphasis in original--E.S.) It is now clear that before this radicalization ends the question of power, the question of which class will rule society, will be posed in this country." (pages 68-69, *ibid.*)

Jack Barnes explained:

"...there will be no reversal of this radicalization before the working masses of this country have had a chance to take power away from the

American capitalist rulers. There will be ebbs and flows in the struggle; there will be class polarizations; there will be partial defeats and partial victories. There will be all sorts of stages, some rapid, others drawn out, as the ruling class uses different methods, up to and including the attempt to use fascism to try to prevent the workers from winning power. But the important thing for us to see is that this radicalization will not be reversed until we have had our chance." (Emphasis in original--E.S. page 108, *ibid.*)

Barnes pointed out "that the space of time in which a radicalization can become a revolutionization can be very short." (page 108, *ibid.*)

Although cautionary phrases like "ebbs and flows" were sprinkled through reports and educational talks during the next few years, the benefit of hindsight allows us to see that these central leaders thought the radicalization would get bigger and better, wider and deeper, grander and greater, and move into a pre-revolutionary situation in the U.S. with the SWP in the forefront of the masses. These key leaders served both as the voices for and the trainers of the radicalized youth joining the YSA and the SWP.

The radicalization did continue but it took unexpected forms and stretched out over a longer period than anticipated. It became more diffused, variegated and fragmented. The situation changed dramatically with the end of the war in Vietnam and the withdrawal of U.S. troops. The anti-war movement had been the main focus of SWP and YSA activities for almost ten years. The movement had set the rhythm and routine of political life, had determined methods of functioning. Expectations about the other movements were not fulfilled by the course of events. The Black ghetto rebellions did not erupt in city after city as forecast. The radicalized youth were no longer on the campuses waging free speech fights and exploding in protest actions. Women, Chicanos and Puerto Ricans did not advance along the paths laid out in reports and resolutions. The strength of U.S. imperialism and the role of the Democratic and Republican parties did not decrease drastically as foreseen. The influence of the Communist Party and the social democrats did not dwindle away to almost nothing as predicted. The SWP did not become "the very center of the radical movement in this country."

"What happens to a dream deferred?" asked poet Langston Hughes. "Does it dry up like a raisin in the sun? ... Or does it explode?" What happens to a political dream deferred? In the case of the central leaders of the SWP, the dream took wing like a moth and flew from one bright light to another, getting burned but refusing to treat the injury, and continuing to flutter from flame to flame.

In 1975 a shift was proposed away from the movements which had proved so disappointing and toward the working class. This was the "turn"--not to be confused with the "turn within the turn" in 1978. Prospects for Socialism in America contains a new evaluation of the situation in the U.S. and the call to proletarianize the party; the following quotations come from that source.

Jack Barnes' report to the May 1975 plenum of the SWP National Committee noted: "We are at the beginning of the radicalization of the American working class." (page 82) In his summary remarks, Barnes defined the proletarianization of the party: "We're not talking about a narrow 'union orientation.' We say we are at the beginning of the radicalization of the working class (Emphasis in original--E.S.) ... We are convinced we can recruit over the coming period more workers, more Black fighters, more Puerto Ricans, more Chicanos, more women, more young people." (page 115)

Barry Sheppard's plenum report was entitled "To the Working Class!" He described "the beginning of a new stage in the development of political consciousness in the working class." (page 222) "Our general perspective as we move into this period is that we're going to have smaller branches--we'll be dividing larger branches more, and we'll be building new branches in more cities around the country." (page 239) He predicted increased recruitment of workers directly to the party in contrast to the fact that over "the last fifteen years the majority of the recruitment to the party has been from members of the YSA." (page 241)

Mary-Alice Waters' report on the political resolution, given to the national convention in August, was entitled "Toward a Mass Socialist Movement." She proclaimed that "we have entered upon a new historical experience that is going to be for our generation the equivalent of the great social crisis of the 1930s.

"The forms of the convulsions are not going to duplicate those of the Great Depression. But the duration and the scope of the coming social crisis and the revolutionary perspectives inherent in them are going to be comparable." (page 121) In her concluding remarks, she stated, "Our direction is outward into the mass movement, for more members, for growing numbers of branches, and for smaller branches to carry out this orientation." (page 136)

The convention enthusiastically approved the new orientation and plans. The membership was reinspired by the new direction and proposals. The branches divided and re-divided; new branches were established; some quick results were achieved.

Once again, however, things didn't turn out as expected. This was finally openly admitted two and a half years later. At the same time, it was announced that corrections had been made and another new orientation was proposed: the turn within the turn--what current party members call simply "the turn."

Barnes told the February 1978 plenum it was necessary to "subordinate everything else to immediately organizing to get a large majority of the membership of the Socialist Workers Party into industry and the industrial trade unions ..." (page 52, "Leading the Party into Industry," The Changing Face of U.S. Politics)

Barnes assured the plenum:

"The party is going to be transformed. We will have a different milieu for our campaigns and we will recruit. This will strengthen every part of the party's work. ... We know historically, we know as sure as we are sitting here, that the kind of crisis that we are now in--the economic crisis and the offensive of the ruling class--has always produced in this country an explosive radicalizing motion in the American working class. It is going to happen again." (pages 85-86, *ibid.*)

After the discussion on his report, Barnes admitted in his summary:

"Remember the 'looking in your own backyard' theme? We were slightly off base the way we implemented that. We took things that were real--a child-care struggle in this or that place, the community struggle on the Lower East Side of Manhattan, the Boston struggle--and we drew real lessons from them. But we drew some wrong conclusions, too. For instance, we anticipated a wave of Bostons. We didn't have any more of that kind of struggle. It hasn't happened. We haven't had any more struggles just like the one in District One. This was responsible for some of the one-sided views on building 'community branches.' And we've had to make some corrections.

"We overprojected our rate of growth. And primarily because of that we overdivided ourselves, some of our branches became too small. We've had to change that with some reconsolidation. We made some misjudgments and false starts. And we made the corrections and adjustments and moved forward. We gained valuable experience in the process and better prepared ourselves for the tasks we now face." (page 88, *ibid.*)

Mary-Alice Waters' report to the plenum echoed the same themes: it didn't happen as we expected; things are going to be better than ever with our new orientation. She pointed out:

"Comrades probably noticed from the recruitment figures we distributed that the rate of recruitment has slowed down over the last six months. It is about half what it was in 1976. There has also been a slight increase of the number of comrades dropping out. ... We are almost exactly the same size at this plenum as we were at the convention--one or two short of 1,700, of which 132 are provisional members. (1977 membership was the peak; SWP membership went down from then through the present.--E.S.)

"There is no reason to think that our growth has leveled off for an extended period, though. I think our current figures represent a process of readjustment. ... The decisions we are making at this plenum are going to increase our ability to recruit and integrate new members. ... We can all be more certain of our ability to build the party that is needed to lead the American revolution." (page 40, Party Organizer, Vol. 2, No. 2, April 1978)

Once again, things didn't turn out as figured. Problems in carrying out the new orientation and in relating to the actual radicalization process were not honestly confronted and resolved. Instead, ever more dazzling visions were presented. For example, Barnes' political report to the December 1978 plenum was entitled, "AMERICAN POLITICS TODAY: THE WORKING CLASS MOVES TO CENTER STAGE." In 1979 the YSA abandoned its campus orientation and also made the turn to industry.

The promised results still did not materialize. Frustrated at home, unable to find any strategy to reverse their losses, and increasingly isolated from the ongoing radicalization, the central leaders of the SWP made another turn in 1980-81: to the inspiring revolutions in the Caribbean and Central America.

This didn't work out either. More turns within turns within turns within turns. The SWP is now drastically reduced in size. It has lost influence in the movements fighting for political, economic and social changes. The party and YSA are not relating to the radicalization in the U.S. and the world today.

It is still possible for the SWP to change its present course and become a vital part of the process taking place. In order to do that, it's necessary to review and evaluate and learn from the series of mistakes made in recent years. By doing that honestly and thoroughly, the party can achieve the political clarification needed to answer the question, "What is to be done?"

THE REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST MOVEMENT AND THE IRAN-IRAQ WAR

DISCUSSION ARTICLE

In Reply to Cindy Jaquith

By David Williams

The article "The U.S. Left and the Iran-Iraq War," by Comrade Cindy Jaquith, published in the May 14, 1984, issue of Intercontinental Press, represents the breaking of a long silence of the leadership of the U.S. Socialist Workers Party (SWP) on the subject of Iran. This is a welcome development indeed. The Iranian revolution which overthrew the Shah in 1979 was a body blow to imperialism in the Middle East; its development since then, however, has not lived up to the hopes of the international workers' movement. Further, it has caused confusion and disorientation of many militants both inside and outside Iran. What the Left needs today is clarity of program, accuracy of information and the moral and intellectual courage to face complex issues and make hard decisions. While Comrade Jaquith offers little in the way of clarity or hard facts, her facing up to the question opens the way for a thorough debate, from which accurate information and a clear program can emerge. Further, as the threat of direct imperialist intervention looms, she offers an action program around which people of different political tendencies can unite in action to demand that the imperialists keep their dirty hands off.

A revolutionary program must be based above all on a correct assessment of the facts. A correct understanding of the history and development of any struggle is essential. In order to understand what the current regime in Iran is and how to advance the Iranian revolution we need to understand certain specific facets of Iran's history.

Iran is a semicolonial country. Early in the nineteenth century a particularly corrupt and bloodthirsty dynasty, the Qajar, took power and shortly thereafter opened Iran to imperialist plunder. The British at that time were consolidating their rule in India, which is, of course, on Iran's eastern border (Pakistan at that time being part of India). It was the British, primarily, who were responsible for what amounted to the rape of Iran.

However, Iran, like India, while economically less advanced, was in many respects culturally superior to the Western invaders. Iranian empires dominated Central Asia in the three centuries before Alexander the Great and again during the later years of the Roman Empire. Iran's art, architecture, literature and science were more advanced than Europe's until the rise of the European bourgeoisie.

The Iranian people regarded the Westerners as barbarians, and somewhat understandably so. They brought few benefits to Iran and caused a great deal of suffering. To this day anything Western is regarded with suspicion by the people of Iran.

Islam in Iran has played a unique role, a role different from that it has played in other Islamic countries.

At the time of Muhammad (the seventh century A.D.) the Iranian empire stretched from what is today Iraq across the Iranian plateau to include all of what is today Afghanistan and the Central Asian Soviet Socialist Republics. It was a declining empire, ruled over by the Zoroastrian Sassani dynasty, whose brutality and corruption would defy belief. Whereas among the Arab tribes to the West, Islam brought social order and a higher degree of civilization,

in the already highly advanced society of Iran the conversion to Islam (which occurred during the Prophet's lifetime) took the character of a people's revolution against the brutal Sassani monarchy and the Zoroastrian priests.

After Muhammad's death a dispute occurred over the succession to Muhammad between, on the one hand, the "three companions"--Omar, Othman and Abu Bekr-- and, on the other, Muhammad's son-in-law Ali. The faction (in Arabic "shi'eh") which supported Ali gained many adherents in Iran and Iraq. Shi'ism tended to reflect nationalist aspirations by non-Arab nationalities in Iran and Iraq. The branch of Islam which supported the Three Companions is known as "Sunni."

Between the conversion to Islam and the sixteenth century Iran did not exist as a distinct nation-state. Though its cultural influence was great it was dominated by a succession of Arab, Mongolian and Turkish rulers. However, in the sixteenth century a new dynasty reunified Iran and established as their capital Esfahan, a city in the center of ancient Persia. This new dynasty--the Safavi--was Shi'ite, and its coming to power effectively isolated Iran by creating a state of war with Sunni powers on both its western and eastern borders--Ottoman Turkey on the west and Mughal India on the east. Shi'ism became identified with the Iranian nation-state. Iran reached its highest level of power and prosperity during the reign of the Safavid Shah Abbas the Great in the early 1600s. The achievements made during the reign of Shah Abbas can still be seen in modern Esfahan.

We can see, then, two unique characteristics of Islam in Iran: first, its revolutionary tradition, going back to the time of Muhammad, and second, the identification of Shi'ism with Iran as a nation.

Iran has not only had to contend with hostile powers on its east and west, but on the north as well. At roughly the same time as the rise of the Safavi shahs in Iran, the Muscovite tsars began to extend their power into central Asia. The Orthodox Christian Russian Tsar considered crusading against Islam a sacred duty, and during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries they took by conquest significant sections of Iranian territory, areas which were later incorporated into the Soviet Union. They took only part of the northwestern province of Azarbaijan, however, and this has had a great effect on Iran's history.

Turkish-speaking Azarbaijan is a highly-industrialized area, with two important cities--Baku, in what is now Soviet Azarbaijan, and Tabriz in Iranian Azarbaijan. During the Russian revolutions of 1905 and 1917 the workers of Baku were able to get the word of revolution across the border to their brothers and sisters in Tabriz. The 1905 revolution sparked the Constitutional Revolution in Iran, a revolution which began in Tabriz.

Throughout most of the twentieth century the workers' movement in Iran has been dominated by the Moscow-oriented Tudeh (Masses) Party. Nowhere else in the Middle East, with the possible exception of Afghanistan in recent years, has the Stalinist party had such strength. However, as we know, the real program of Stalinism is the betrayal of the working class. The Tudeh Party carried out major betrayals of the working class in 1946 and 1953, enabling the last Shah, Mohammad Reza Pahlevi, to consolidate his power. The effect of Tudeh's betrayal was to discredit Marxism as an "alien" and untrustworthy ideology.

The last historical factor to consider is the national question. "Iran" is geographically a plateau bounded by mountain ranges. The Tigris-Euphrates river valley and the Indus river valley are its western and eastern boundaries.

For most of the last 2,500 years it has been dominated by the Persian nationality, which originated in south central Iran, in what is today Fars and Esfahan provinces. In the northwest the Azarbaijani Turks and Kurds have carried on a long struggle for national liberation. Tabriz is Iran's second-largest city, and until World War II it was Iran's most economically advanced city. In Tabriz the nationalist aspirations of the Azarbaijani people and the socialist aspirations of the Tabrizi proletariat have converged in powerful revolutionary upsurges several times in this century. Besides the Azarbaijanis and Kurds, the Arab, Baluchi and Turkmeni peoples have also struggled around nationalist demands.

In 1907, partially inspired by events in Russia in 1905, a revolution began in Tabriz and spread throughout Iran; its primary demand was for a constitution to limit and define the power of the Qajar shah. In the Constitutional Revolution all of the previously mentioned social and historical factors played their respective roles--resistance to British and tsarist imperialism, nationalist aspirations and proletarian demands, and clerical opposition to the corrupt and proimperialist crown. These events were the first political experiences of a seven-year-old boy named Ruhollah Khomeini.

The Constitutional Revolution neither established a stable bourgeois regime, nor did it move forward to the establishment of workers' power. The years following the Constitutional Revolution were a period of instability. Two things made this instability intolerable to the British Empire. One was the beginning of the exploitation of Iran's oil resources as petroleum began to displace coal as the primary energy source in industry. The second was the Russian Revolution of 1917 and the well-founded fear that it would spread into Iran as the 1905 revolution had done. Consequently, in 1921 the British sponsored a coup d'etat by the Shah's prime minister, Col. Reza Palani. Palani changed his name to Pahlevi and crowned himself Reza Shah.

Reza Shah began a series of "modernizations" in Iran, which, while not benefiting the masses of people in a significant way, took power away from the landlords, tribal chiefs and clergy--he "modernized" the exploitation of the oppressed masses. He also suppressed the national struggles of the Kurds, Azarbaijanis and other oppressed nationalities and ruled in the best interests of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company (today known as British Petroleum). In short, he made enemies both of workers, peasants and oppressed nationalities on the one hand and of tribal chiefs, aristocrats and mullahs, the reactionary remnants of the precapitalist past, on the other. In this latter category must be included Ruhollah Khomeini, who was a young adult when Reza Shah took power.

The British deposed Reza Shah during World War II because of his support of Germany. His son, Mohammad Reza, continued his father's policies, being careful, however, not to offend Britain or the United States.

The events of the early years of the last Shah's reign are painfully familiar to revolutionary socialists. In 1946 revolutionary upsurges led to the creation of autonomous republics in Azarbaijan and Kurdistan. The Soviet Army gave them military support for a brief time and then, after discussions among Stalin, Churchill and Truman, allowed the Shah's army to reoccupy the provinces and put down the nationalist revolutions.

In 1953, under pressure from the working masses, the Shah's bourgeois liberal prime minister, Mohammad Mossadegh, carried out a series of nationalizations, including the nationalization of the oil industry. The Tudeh Party led the

working class to support Mossadegh as an "anti-imperialist" rather than rely on its own strength and take power for itself. In the period of delay and confusion the Shah, with the aid of the CIA, staged his infamous coup d'etat and began his twenty-six-year reign as an absolute monarch.

Ten years later the Shah announced his own "modernizations," called the "White Revolution." These included a land reform which limited the local landlords to owning no more than one village apiece (!), an attempt at forcibly settling the nomadic tribes, diversification of Iran's industry, and a generalized imitation of the West. The Shah angered the bazaar merchants by encouraging Western-style department stores and street-front shops in competition with the traditional central marketplace (as an attempt to prevent large numbers of people from gathering in one place). As in Reza Shah's time the White Revolution was resisted by both the oppressed on one hand and by the precapitalist remnants on the other. The leader of the opposition to the White Revolution was Ruhollah Khomeini, now a religious teacher in Qom, a city to the south of Tehran. He had by this time attained the clerical rank of ayatollah, roughly equivalent to a Roman Catholic archbishop. When the Shah and his secret police, the SAVAK, defeated the opposition Khomeini went into exile in Iraq. The Iraqi regime, never friendly towards the Shah, allowed Khomeini to make radio broadcasts into Iran; however, in the late 1970s Iraq and the Shah made a deal in which the Shah withdrew his support from Mustafa Barzani's Kurdish rebels in Iraq in return for which Baghdad stopped Khomeini's radio broadcasts and then exiled him, this time to France. Khomeini's closest companions at this time are familiar to us now--Abolhassan Bani-Sadr, Sadeq Ghotbzadeh, Ibrahim Yazdi. Khomeini's supporters began to smuggle audio cassettes of Khomeini's speeches into Iran in lieu of the radio broadcasts.

We can conclude from these historical highlights several things: first, while Iran is a semicolonial country, politically dominated (until 1979) by first Britain and later by the United States it has been extensively industrialized. Oil is, of course, at the center of its economy, but plastics, petrochemicals, electronics and even auto assembly are significant industries, employing thousands of workers.

Second, before the era of capitalism Iran was one of the world's most advanced societies. The once-powerful precapitalist ruling classes of landlords and tribal chiefs have never accepted the entry of Iran into the western-dominated capitalist world economy. Its reasons for opposing the Pahlevi monarchy never have had anything in common with the interests of the workers, peasants and oppressed nationalities; nevertheless, its vigorous hostility towards the Shah was based on real class interests of its own.

Third, Islam in Iran has a revolutionary and nationalistic tradition. This is not to say that the Islamic hierarchy is in any way progressive today, but in the consciousness of the oppressed people of Iran that tradition has been quite strong. Some radical intellectuals, such as Ali Shariatti, sought to "fuse" Islam and socialism (one is reminded of the "theology of liberation" of some Roman Catholic priests in Latin America). Radical students who were influenced by Maoism and were trying to organize peasant guerrilla war found that they could get a hearing from the peasants if they drew on Islamic traditions in their explanations.

Fourth, throughout most of the twentieth century the Left in Iran has been dominated by the Stalinist Tudeh Party. It has channeled the struggles of the working class into collaboration with the liberal bourgeoisie for over a generation, and it continues to do so. Though a minority of the population, the Iranian working class is socially quite powerful and without question objectively strong enough to take power. What it lacks is leadership.

It is important to look at the 1979 revolution and its subsequent development in this context. There was a convergence of interests between the reactionary clergy and bazaari on one side and the workers, peasants and oppressed nationalities on the other in getting rid of the Shah. The decisive element in this coalition--the element that brought about the Shah's defeat--was the working class. The strike of the bank workers began the participation of the working class in the struggle to overthrow the Shah; the strike of the oil workers sealed the Shah's fate. By encouraging the mobilization of the workers against the Shah, by not making the compromises desired by the bourgeois liberals, Khomeini played an objectively progressive role.

Khomeini's program for Iran, however, was never progressive and never will be. His dream to establish a precapitalist theocracy in modern Iran can never be anything more than a dream. The reality is proving to be an unstable capitalist state which brutally represses the masses who put it in power and yet cannot win political support from the bourgeoisie itself, in whose interests it rules.

It is at this point that we must take issue with Jaquith. It is the regime of Khomeini in Tehran in addition to that of Saddam Hussein in Baghdad that is the enemy of the oppressed people of Iran today. While in his rhetoric Khomeini refers to the United States as "the great sheitan," in his actions he has done more to aid the American and other imperialists. He has demobilized and intimidated the working class. Though the working class has not yet suffered a decisive defeat it has lost most of the gains won by the 1979 revolution.

The political repression of the left in Iran is extraordinarily severe. Membership in left-wing organizations is punishable by death, and all have had to go underground, including those which at one time supported Khomeini. This repression is being carried out by lumpenproletarian elements blindly loyal to the clergy. Included in their numbers are some former agents of SAVAK. These repressive forces call themselves Hezbollah, the Party of God.

In the countryside, as Jaquith acknowledges, former landlords are returning to take over the land taken over by the peasants. Khomeini's regime has continued to hold Kurdistan as a captive nation, endangering the revolution by giving royalist former generals an opportunity to exploit Kurdish nationalism for their own ends. When the government decrees that a woman caught without chador (the black, full-length Iranian veil) must sign a confession that she is a prostitute one cannot argue that women's interests have been advanced in the five years of the Islamic Republic.

The Iran-Iraq war was begun by Saddam Hussein, acting as front-man for the United States, during the hostage crisis. His American backers thought that a quick victory would be his, but the Iranian workers and peasants fought back courageously to defend gains that at that time had not been taken away. Today the war is being fought primarily on the Iraqi side of the border and as a naval battle in the Persian Gulf. Khomeini's stated goal in the war is the overthrow of Saddam Hussein, but it is not in the interests of the Iranian masses to see Hussein overthrown by the bourgeois government of Iran. The aim of Khomeini--as Jaquith acknowledges--isto drive "communism" out of the Middle East.

A correct position on the war must start not from the question of the aims of imperialism, but from the point of view of what will best advance the interests and goals of the Iranian workers and peasants. In assessing this, revolutionaries must understand that the Khomeini government is an obstacle to the fight for those interests. The line of the SWP over the past few years,

while at times formally acknowledging this truth, has failed to draw any conclusions from it.

The imperialists' aims have also changed since the beginning of the war. When Saddam Hussein was unable to win a quick victory against Iran, the imperialists switched to an attrition strategy--they want a victory by neither side, but instead a prolonged conflict with maximum casualties to wear down the people of both countries, but especially Iran. The war against Iraq is no longer a war in defense of the gains of the 1979 revolution. Iraq has been pushed out of Iranian territory, and most of the gains of the 1979 revolution have been lost. The war is being used by Khomeini to divert the energy of the workers and peasants away from fighting their own government and the class for which it rules.

The imperialists are making tremendous profits from this war. Iran is selling oil at low prices to buy weapons at high prices. One of Iran's chief suppliers is Israel (!), which sees the twofold benefit of diverting the Arab states' resources to support Iraq and simply killing thousands of Iraqis and Iranians. It is, of course, true that the primary criminals in this situation are in Washington, Paris, London and Tel Aviv. It is also true that the current regime in Iran is an obstacle in the struggle against these criminals.

Jaquith's article summarizes her political perspective when it says of the 1979 revolution, "The working class was not strong enough to offer an alternative political leadership." On that assessment she justifies her refusal to join the fight against the regime of Khomeini. It is ironic indeed that she should display so little confidence in the Iranian working class--for it was the decisive force which brought down the Shah. It was the organizations of the left, who seek to lead the working class, which were not strong enough. It was, however, not so much numerical strength that they lacked, but political strength, the strength of correct program. They, and the Tudeh Party foremost among them, were the guiltiest of fostering illusions about Khomeini. What they led the working class into was worse than a popular front--it was a subordination of working-class interests not only to bourgeois liberals but to precapitalist dinosaurs as well.

The escalation of the naval conflict in the Persian Gulf has seriously increased the risk of direct imperialist intervention in the region. On this point there is no disagreement--the job of American revolutionists is to alert the working class to the war danger and to organize around the demand of "U.S. Hands Off." United-front action is on the agenda now. All revolutionists in this country should be ready to participate.

JAMES P. CANNON ON THE CONTROL COMMISSION AND SWP CONSTITUTION

Introduction

by Jean Y. Tussey

In November 1966, on the eve of a plenum of the National Committee of the Socialist Workers Party, I received an air mail letter from James P. Cannon which has relevance for today since it deals with the on-going task of building a disciplined democratic revolutionary workers party in the United States.

Cannon's letter was in response to a note from Reba Hansen which included a copy of a letter I had written to her and Harry Ring and Ed Shaw. Ed was then national organization secretary and Reba, Harry and I were on a Constitution Committee considering proposed changes in the party constitution.

As Reba later wrote in James P. Cannon As We Knew Him (Pathfinder, 1976):

"In 1966 when Jim was seventy-six years old, the question of the role of the Control Commission in the Trotskyist movement came up for discussion in the leadership of the SWP....Since Jim was responsible for founding the institution of a control commission in the SWP, his opinion was of prime interest in relation to a proposal to change the constitution with respect to the norms used in selecting members of the Control Commission."

* * *

"Jim utilized the occasion to make some pedagogical points. This way of teaching was quite characteristic of him. He often used seemingly small proposals or incidents to drive home a lesson. In this instance he perhaps felt that his concept of control commissions and how they should function, which he had learned from Trotsky, might not be sufficiently understood by the party. Thus he went to some lengths to once again explain his concept."

My copy of Cannon's reply to Reba is reprinted below.

In 1966 the resolution on the Organizational Character of the SWP adopted at the 1965 convention had raised the question in the minds of some comrades of whether any parts of that resolution should be codified as part of the Constitution. Jim's letter (and Reba's procedure) helped educate some of us in the importance of careful study of any proposals to revise party organizational norms.

In 1984 it is a contribution to the assessment, discussion and debate of the new organizational norms and procedures instituted since the 1961 convention.

(If I had not been prevented by the new norms by which I was expelled from the party, I would have submitted this for publication in the pre-convention SWP Discussion Bulletin.)

Copies to:
Ed Shaw, New York
Jean Simon, Cleveland

November 12, 1966

Reba Hansen
New York, N.Y.

Dear Reba:

This answers your letter of November 2 with which you enclosed a copy of Jean Simon's letter of October 12. I was surprised and concerned by Jean's proposals to change the constitutional provisions providing for an independent Control Commission elected by the Convention, and making it a mere sub-committee of the N.C. which would mean in effect a sub-committee of the P.C. This would be the de facto liquidation of the Control Commission as it was originally conceived.

As far as I can see all the new moves and proposals to monkey with the Constitution which has served the party so well in the past, with the aim of "tightening" centralization, represent a trend in the wrong direction at the present time. The party (and the YSA) is too "tight" already, and if we go much further along this line we can run the risk of strangling the party to death.

* * *

As I recall it, the proposal to establish a Control Commission, separately elected by the Convention, originated at the Plenum & Active Workers' Conference in the fall of 1940, following the assassination of the Old Man. The assassin, as you will recall, gained access to the household in Coyoacan through his relations with a party member. The Political Committee was then, as it always will be if it functions properly, too busy with political and organizational problems to take time for investigations and security checks on individuals.

It was agreed that we need a special body to take care of this work, to investigate rumors and charges and present its findings and recommendations to the National Committee.

If party security was one side of the functions of the Control Commission, the other side--no less important--was to provide the maximum assurance that any individual party member, accused or rumored to be unworthy of party membership, could be assured of the fullest investigation and a fair hearing or trial. It was thought that this double purpose could best be served by a body separately elected by the convention, and composed of members of long standing, especially respected by the party for their fairness as well as their devotion.

I can recall instances where the Control Commission served the party well in both aspects of this dual function. In one case a member of the Seamen's fraction was expelled by the Los Angeles Branch after charges were brought against him by two members of the National Committee of that time. The expelled member appealed to the National Committee and the case was turned over to the Control Commission for investigation. The Control Commission, on which as I recall Dobbs was then the PC representative, investigated the whole case, found that the charges lacked substantial proof and recommended the reinstatement of the expelled member. This was done.

In another case, a rumor circulated by the Shachtmanites and others outside the party against the integrity of a National Office secretarial worker was thoroughly investigated by the Control Commission which, after taking stenographic testimony from all available sources, declared the rumors unfounded and cleared the accused party member to continue her work. There were other cases in which charges were found after investigation to be substantiated and appropriate action recommended.

All these experiences speak convincingly of the need for a separate Control Commission of highly respected comrades to make thorough investigations of every case, without being influenced by personal or partisan prejudice, or pressure from any source, and whose sole function is to examine each case from all sides fairly and justly and report its findings and recommendations. This is the best way, not only to protect the security of the party, but also to respect the rights of the accused in every case.

As far as I know, the only criticism that can properly be made of the Control Commission in recent times is that it has not always functioned in this way with all its members participating, either by presence or correspondence, in all proceedings--and convincing the party that its investigation was thorough and that its findings and recommendations were fair and just.

* * *

It should be pointed out also that the idea of a Control Commission separately constituted by the convention didn't really originate with us. Like almost everything else we know about the party organizational principles and functions, it came from the Russian Bolsheviks. The Russian party had a separate Control Commission. It might also be pointed out that after the Revolution the new government established courts. It provided also for independent trade unions which, as Lenin pointed out in one of the controversies, had the duty even to defend the rights of its members against the government. Of course, all that was changed later when all power was concentrated in the party secretariat, and all the presumably independent institutions were converted into rubber stamps. But we don't want to move in that direction. The forms

and methods of the Lenin-Trotsky time are a better guide for us.

* * *

I am particularly concerned about any possible proposal to weaken the constitutional provision about the absolute right of suspended or expelled members to appeal to the Convention. That is clearly and plainly a provision to protect every party member against possible abuse of authority by the National Committee. It should not be abrogated or diluted just to show that we are so damn revolutionary that we make no concessions to "bourgeois concepts of checks and balances." The well-known Bill of Rights is a check and balance which I hope will be incorporated, in large part at least, in the Constitution of the Workers Republic in this country. Our constitutional provision for the right of appeal is also a "check and balance." It can help to recommend our party to revolutionary workers as a genuinely democratic organization which guarantees rights as well as imposing responsibilities, and thus make it more appealing to them.

I believe that these considerations have more weight now than ever before in the 38-year history of our party. In the present political climate and with the present changing composition of the party, democratic-centralism must be applied flexibly. At least ninety per cent of the emphasis should be placed on the democratic side and not on any crackpot schemes to "streamline" the party to the point where questions are unwelcomed and criticism and discussion stifled. That is a prescription to kill the party before it gets a chance to show how it can handle and assimilate an expanding membership of new young people, who don't know it all to start with, but have to learn and grow in the course of explication and discussion in a free, democratic atmosphere.

Trotsky once remarked in a polemic against Stalinism that even in the period of the Civil War discussion in the party was "boiling like a spring." Those words and others like it written by Trotsky, in his first attack against Stalinism in "The New Course", ought to be explained now once again to the new young recruits in our party. And the best way to explain such decisive things is to practice what we preach.

Yours Fraternaly,

James P. Cannon

JPC:jh

THE CASE OF THE "BOGUS FLYER"

Editor:

The latest SWP "Internal Information Bulletin," slandering the F.I.T. as providing "weapons to the cops" and serving as "a vehicle for the WL/WRP disruption campaign," is a new yard-stick with which to measure the political degeneration of the SWP central leadership. I'm sure the main points of this frame-up will be answered by others. I want to deal here with some of the attacks on Minnesota oppositionists made by Larry Seigle in his March 8 Letter to Party Members, reprinted in the latest "IIB."

Seigle finds sinister forces at work in Minnesota. Referring to the "Expelled Branch" -- the organizational form adopted by seven Twin Cities comrades expelled in the January purge, before the F.I.T. was formed -- he discloses: "They were even able -- somehow -- to obtain the post office box address used by the party in last fall's campaign, which the party had closed. 'Somehow' of course hints that dark forces may have given the 'disrupters' a hand.

Immediately after our expulsion the "Expelled Branch" attempted to get a PO box at Industrial Station in St. Paul. None were available and there was a long waiting list. One of our comrades had obtained a personal PO box at a less convenient post office in anticipation of moving to a new apartment. We gratefully accepted the offer to use his box. None of us realized, until the appearance of the "IIB" that this box had been used earlier in a local city council campaign by the SWP. As far as we can verify, the SWP use of this number was limited to one public leaflet. As Seigle states, the box was closed out by the SWP at the end of that low-key election campaign.

This box was "somehow" obtained by the comrade at the beginning of December -- a month before our expulsion -- by the process of applying for a box and being assigned that number. His application evidently coincided with the party closing out this box, making it available. I will leave it to the unbiased reader to conclude how all this fits into the Healyite/cop disruption campaign.

A footnote is inserted in Seigle's letter giving us the lowdown on an even more serious caper: "In April there was a serious escalation of this type of provocation by FIT. Its Minnesota members distributed a sham leaflet, ostensibly to publicize a 'Labor Action Forum.' The bogus flyer listed the phone number of the Twin Cities SWP headquarters as the place to call for more information.

You can't fool Comrade Seigle. He knows "sham leaflets" and "bogus flyers" when he sees them. Unfortunately, there were a couple of dozen people who didn't see through them and actually attended the "ostensible" event being advertised -- a panel discussion on the Iowa Pork strike. Among those duped were several Iowa Pork strikers and their spouses; independent trade unionists from the UAW, HERE, ATU, GCIU, and UE; several unorganized workers interested in the strike; and F.I.T. members. Seigle will be relieved to learn that, probably shocked that anyone responded to their "bogus flyers," the disrupters neglected to either impersonate or denounce the SWP. In fact, the SWP wasn't mentioned during the entire meeting.

(F.I.T. members, in collaboration with other union militants, helped initiate the Labor Action Forum series to provide a non-partisan forum for class struggle ideas in the Minnesota labor movement. Seigle, in his paranoia, sees L.A.F. as only a F.I.T. plan to disrupt the SWP, subtly red-baiting the Forum series in the process.)

Did the Party's phone number appear on the Forum leaflet? Yes. As an afterthought, the F.I.T. comrade preparing the leaflet for the typesetter decided to include a phone number for further information. He intended to use the number of Chris and Bill Onasch - 645-2463. Instead, he used the same

seven digits in another order - 644-6523 - the Branch phone which he had, of course, called dozens of times and which had stuck in his mind.

This unfortunate error was not discovered until after a large mailing had been sent out. Upon discovering it, we immediately took two steps:

1) we hand corrected all remaining leaflets and 2) wrote the party informing them of the error, apologizing for any confusion that might result and asking them to refer any callers to the correct phone number. (This letter, like several others on various topics we have sent to the branch, was never acknowledged and is, of course, ignored by Seigle.)

These "provocations" are cited by Seigle to justify a Political Bureau decision -- taken on January 7, just three days after the mass January purge -- to ban expelled oppositionists from all public Party functions. Contrast this to the approach of the central leadership to the most serious split in our history -- the 1940 split with Shachtman.

The Shachtmanites took the name "Workers Party," a name not only similar to SWP but the former name of our organization before entry into the SP. They called their paper "Labor Action," the name of the Trotskyist paper, edited by Cannon, while we were in the SP. And they outright stole the SWP magazine "New International."

Were they banned from all SWP events? Were they denounced for giving a weapon to the cops? No. They were not even immediately expelled. They were first suspended for a few months and given a chance to return to the SWP. That was the method of Trotsky and Cannon -- rigid defense of political principles, great flexibility on organizational questions.

There are, of course, some important differences between the two splits. The Shachtmanites left on their own volition at the conclusion of a convention. That convention had been preceded by several months of discussion to which the Shachtmanites had virtually unlimited access.

F.I.T. members and other victims of the recent purge were expelled prior to any discussion or convention.

Five months after the January purge, in the midst of pre-convention and pre-world congress discussion, the central leadership has still failed to not only answer the political issues raised by the expelled oppositionists -- they have yet to positively present their own views in a resolution that Party members can discuss and vote on.

It is time for SWP members to call a halt to the purge and slander campaigns and to demand a political discussion. Otherwise there is grave danger that our Party will degenerate into a paranoid sect.-- Bill Onasch, St. Paul,
May 31, 1984

THE NEBBIA CASE

Editor, Bulletin IDOM:

I can't sign my name without risking my membership in the SWP, but I want you to know that I really appreciated the principled position you took on the Gerardo Nebbia expulsion. You knew that you too would be labeled as pro-Healyite or Healyite agents when you refused to consider Nebbia as an agent merely because the SWP leadership said he was one, without the slightest attempt to offer any proof.

That took courage on your part, and forced the SWP leaders to publish evidence that previously they said couldn't be for "security" reasons. I feel you were defending not only a principle, and not just the rights of Nebbia, but also the rights of all the other SWP members not to be expelled without evidence or the chance to confront evidence at a trial.

I don't know anything about Nebbia except that now his guilt or innocence can be evaluated better, as I assume you will do. Meanwhile I hope that my party and its leaders will never again tolerate convictions and expulsions without evidence and without trial.--An SWP'er for over 10 years, May 25, 1984

UNANSWERED CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Bulletin IDOM:

I hope you will publish the enclosed copy of a letter which remains unanswered. Comradely, Jean Tussey

April 19, 1984

SWP Campaign Headquarters
15105 St. Clair Ave.
Cleveland, Ohio 44110

Dear Comrades:

My April 20 copy of The Militant, which arrived yesterday, had a front page article announcing "Sales campaign launched."

C "We urge all readers to get involved in this effort," it concluded. "If you would like to participate, contact the socialist campaign headquarters nearest you, or call the Militant circulation office in New York City."

O As a reader of the Militant continuously for more than forty years, as well as a former writer for the paper and supporter of every national and local election campaign of the Socialist Workers Party, I would like to get involved in the current campaign if the article meant what it said.

O The reason I ~~may~~ would like to participate is NOT because I always have, but rather because I consider the SWP ticket the only serious socialist working class alternative to the capitalist parties in this election.

P Moreover, despite my differences over ^{some} theoretical and programmatic and organizational innovations by the leadership bodies (which I had intended to discuss in the pre-convention discussion period), I never gave up "the struggle for a proletarian Party" and never will. With all its weaknesses, the Socialist Workers Party is still the best vehicle for social change in the United States in my opinion, and I intend to continue to contribute what I can to building and strengthening it.

Sincerely,

Jean Y. Tussey

Y copy to Militant, NYC

P.S. Comrades Sophia and George Chosalou concur with these views and would also like to participate in the campaign.

**BULLETIN IN DEFENSE
OF MARXISM**

--SUBSCRIBE NOW
--ORDER BACK COPIES

PARTIAL CONTENTS OF PREVIOUS ISSUES:

No. 1 December 1983:

SOUND THE ALARM by four suspended
National Committee Members--September
1983

THE POLITICAL PURGE IN THE AMERICAN
SWP by the United Secretariat of the
Fourth International--October 1983

RESOLVING THE INTERNATIONAL CRISIS OF
REVOLUTIONARY LEADERSHIP TODAY by four
suspended NC members--August 1983

NEW INTERNATIONAL SLANDERS FI

No. 2 January 1984:

CONCERNING OUR EXPULSION by seven
members of the Twin Cities SWP branch

DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM AND THE BUILDING
OF THE REVOLUTIONARY COMBAT PARTY IN
THE USA resolution by the Fourth
Internationalist Caucus in the NC--
February 1982

NEW NORMS VS OLD: THE EROSION OF
PROLETARIAN DEMOCRACY IN THE SWP by
four suspended NC members--August 1983

No. 3 February, 1984

CALL FOR THE FOURTH INTERNATIONALIST
TENDENCY by Naomi Allen, George
Breitman, and George Saunders

PLATFORM OF THE FOURTH
INTERNATIONALIST CAUCUS IN THE NC--
December 1981

WE ENDORSE THE 1984 SWP ELECTION
CAMPAIGN

ON THE QUESTION OF REGIME IN THE
REVOLUTIONARY PARTY

WHY STEVE CLARK [In his introduction
to Maurice Bishop Speaks] CAN'T REALLY
EXPLAIN WHAT HAPPENED IN GRENADA, by
Steve Bloom

THE REVOLUTION IN CENTRAL AMERICA AND
THE CARIBBEAN AND ITS PLACE IN THE

INTERNATIONAL CLASS STRUGGLE, by the
Fourth Internationalist Caucus--April
1983

A PLATFORM TO OVERCOME THE CRISIS IN
THE PARTY by the Opposition Bloc in
the NC--May 1983

28 THESES ON THE AMERICAN SOCIALIST
REVOLUTION AND THE BUILDING OF THE
REVOLUTIONARY PARTY by the Opposition
Bloc--May 1983

No. 4 March 1984

FOURTH INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY IS
ORGANIZED NATIONALLY

WHY WE ARE BUILDING THE FOURTH
INTERNATIONALIST TENDENCY by Adam
Shils

The Purge in the SWP:

- 1) STATEMENT OF THE SWP POLITICAL
BUREAU--January 1984
- 2) WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SPLIT
IN THE PARTY by Steve Bloom
- 3) WHAT HAPPENED AT THE CALIFORNIA
STATE CONVENTION by Evelyn Sell
- 4) REPORT ON THE EXPULSION OF
GERARDO NEBBIA

Suppressed Documents:

- REMARKS ON PARTY NORMS AND APPEALS
by Frank Lovell--March 1982
- LETTER BY JAMES P. CANNON--February
1966
- LETTER AND STATEMENT TO THE NC by
Steve Bloom and Frank Lovell--
August 1983

No. 5 April 1984

FOR A DEMOCRATIC DISCUSSION IN THE
PARTY, Letter from the F.I.T. to the
SWP National Committee

PLATFORM OF THE F.I.T.

APPEALS TO THE SWP BY EXPELLED
MEMBERS--Adam Shils, Larry Stewart,
and George Lavan Weissman



HOW THE OPPOSITION TRIED TO PREVENT A
SPLIT--March 1983

THE SWP'S NEW POLICY OF EXCLUSION,
letters from the Twin Cities and New
York

A LIFE WE CAN LEARN FROM: CARL SKOGLUND
(1884-1960) by David Riehle

TOWARD AN UNDERSTANDING OF WORKING
CLASS RADICALIZATION by Frank Lovell

DEMOCRACY IN TODAY'S REVOLUTIONS by
Adam Shils

No. 6 April 1984

Contributions to the Preconvention
Discussion of the SWP and the Pre-
World Congress discussion of the FI:
THESES ON THE WORKERS' AND FARMERS'
GOVERNMENT by the Fourth
Internationalist Caucus--November
1982
THE WORKERS' AND FARMERS' GOVERNMENT
AND THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION by
Steve Bloom--November 1982

SOCIALIST STRATEGY FOR A CLASS
STRUGGLE TRANSFORMATION OF THE
UNIONS by Frank Lovell and Steve
Bloom--August 1983

APPEAL OF EXPULSION by George Breitman

No. 7 May 1984

SWP NATIONAL COMMITTEE CALLS
CONVENTION by Steve Bloom

NBIPP PURGES SWP MEMBERS by Larry
Stewart

CONTRIBUTION TO THE NEW YORK/NEW
JERSEY DISTRICT CONVENTION by three
members

ON THE 1984 PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION
CAMPAIGN by Frank Lovell

MEMOIRS OF A VETERAN SWP ELECTION
CAMPAIGNER by Evelyn Sell

PERSPECTIVES FOR THE 1984 ELECTION a
1983 suppressed document by Bloom and
Lovell

BOOK REVIEWS by Adam Shils and George
Lavan Weissman

--SUBSCRIBE NOW
--ORDER BACK COPIES

ORDER FROM:

Bulletin IDOM
P.O. Box 1317
New York, NY 10009

Please send me the following back issues of the Bulletin In
Defense of Marxism (\$3.00 per copy):

ISSUE # QUANTITY \$

____ Please send me a complete set of #s 1-7 (\$21)

NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ STATE _____ ZIP _____

*Literature
from the
Fourth
Internationalist
Tendency*

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 IEC 75¢

**Why We Oppose the SWP's
New Line on Castroism**

by Steve Bloom 75¢

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

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!

International VIEWPOINT

A twice-a-month review of news and analysis.
Published under the auspices of the United Secretariat of
the Fourth International.

Subscription rates: _____

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

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ Zip _____

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

Checks payable to: International Viewpoint.

From the vantage point of Marxist analysis and participation,
International Viewpoint covers all the most important events in
the world.

Its contributors bring first-hand reports from Mexico to Nicaragua,
from Poland to Portugal, from the Mideast to South Africa.

Remember, *International Viewpoint* is published in Paris and sent
directly to you twice a month via air mail. No other publication
gives so much information that is vital to the working class
movement.

To be informed, subscribe today.