



**Nahuel Moreno
(and Colaborators)**

**Theses on
the World
Situation**

Nahuel Moreno (and Colaborators) Theses on the World Situation

Draft Resolution of the International Secretariat of the IWL, 20 October 1984
Correo Internacional No 8, 31 October 1984)

English Translation: Daniel Iglesias

Cover and interior design: Daniel Iglesias

Editor notes: Daniel Iglesias

www.nahuelmoreno.org

www.uit-ci.org

www.izquierdasocialista.org.ar

Copyright by CEHuS Centro de Estudios Humanos y Sociales

Buenos Aires, 2024

cehus2014@gmail.com



Contents

Theses on the World Situation

Foreword.....	1
Introduction by <i>Correo Internacional</i>	2
I. The Chronic Crisis of the World Economy.....	3
II. A Permanent Economic Counterrevolution	5
III. The Economic Crisis of Socialism in One Country	7
IV. An Increasingly Serious Revolutionary Situation	10
V. Backward Countries and Imperialism	14
VI. The Front of Imperialism and the Exploiters.....	17
VII. Two Antagonistic Political Fronts	20
VIII. The Mass Organisations, their Leaderships and Vanguardes	24
IX. The Building of a Revolutionary Mass International	29

Foreword

This document was published in the magazine *Correo Internacional* No 8 (31 October 1984) and was the basis for the discussions in the sections during the pre-congress on the international situation and politics. It was prepared by Nahuel Moreno and other members of the international secretariat. In the presentation, it said: “The theses address the major problems of the world situation, from one angle: how to help resolve the crisis of revolutionary leadership and the tasks that those who claim Trotskyism and the Fourth International have at the moment.” It added: “The great difficulties that humanity has in positively resolving the option between “socialism or barbarism” have not been ignored.”

In the same magazine both a transcript of a lecture given on 15 August 1984 by Ernest Mandel in Sao Paulo (Brazil) and an article polemicising Mandel’s remarks were published.

In March 1985, the theses were approved at the first World Congress. The transcript of Moreno’s speeches on that agenda item is available at www.nahuelmoreno.org. They were later published as the “International Manifesto” (also available at www.nahuelmoreno.org) in *Correo Internacional* No 10 (July 1985).

All notes are by the editors

The editors

May 2024

Introduction by *Correo Internacional*

Introduction by *Correo Internacional*

This issue of *Correo Internacional* has a special importance. In it, we publish the Draft World Theses presented by the International Secretariat to the World Conference of the organisation.

The World Theses are the synthesis of the political experience, the theoretical-political elaboration and the revolutionary practice of the International Workers League in its struggle for the Fourth International. The theses address the major problems of the world situation, from one angle: how to help resolve the crisis of revolutionary leadership and the tasks that those who claim Trotskyism and the Fourth International have at the moment. To achieve this, we have not followed the easy and self-satisfied path of adapting reality to the political needs of our international organisation. Rather, reality has been taken as it is: with the tremendous strength of the revolution but also with the powerful enemies that confront it, at a level never seen in previous periods. The great difficulties that humanity has in positively resolving the option between “socialism or barbarism” have not been ignored.

The world’s revolutionary situation is generating the human material to resolve the leadership crisis. In view of this, the International Workers League rejects the self-proclamation to propose the Revolutionary United Front, based on a minimum program that unites all those who are for the revolution, for the defeat of imperialism and the bureaucrats.

The need for a political response to the vanguard that emerges from the struggles of all peoples opens a strong discussion in the ranks of the Trotskyist movement. This is reflected in the controversy with Mandel, the main leader of the other major current of the Fourth International, the Unified Secretariat (USec) which, together with our organisation, makes up the vast majority of the world Trotskyist movement. For Mandel and the USec, those who lead revolutions become “de facto” revolutionaries and Trotskyism must support their politics, even if they criticise their mistakes. For us, leaders such as Castro or the Sandinistas today play a role contrary to the interests of the revolution since they call for trust in the “democratic” wing of imperialism and the national bourgeoisies. They themselves are part of the world front for peace, truce and democracy that has its highest expression in Contadora.

Currently, the barrier between revolution and counterrevolution is not only a historical barrier but an everyday wall. The most minimal political facts have currently divided the revolutionary and non-revolutionary currents, hence the enormous possibilities that have been opened to revolutionary Marxism to acquire mass influence, on condition that it knows how to be part of the processes. of reorganisation of the vanguard of the workers’ and popular movement, and to maintain a consistent revolutionary policy. This is the challenge of Trotskyism.

Theses on the World Situation

I. The Chronic Crisis of the World Economy

1.- The ultimate key to begin to understand all the phenomena that have taken place in the international arena since the late 1960s is the chronic crisis that the world economy has endured since then. This chronic crisis is constantly deepening and has led to increasingly intense short-term economic crises approximately every five years.

2.- The chronic crisis has had three peaks or acute short-term crises. The first, from 1966–1967, led to a fall in the rate of profit and American production. It was a crisis of Yankee imperialism that spread to other countries, caused by the first consequences of German and Japanese competition to an old American industry that was no longer hegemonic in the world market.

The second crisis took place between 1973 and 1975 and affected all the capitalist and imperialist countries.

The third was born in 1979 and is also generalized to the entire world economy. The American economy only recovered in late 1982 and early 1983.

3.- In all cases, the overcoming of the crisis is produced by an increase in the mass of surplus value, which momentarily slows down or reverses the inexorable fall in the rate of profit. Yankee imperialism managed to overcome its crises thanks to the fact that it managed to impressively increase the quota of exploitation of the workers of the whole world. This increase in profit derived from the growing exploitation of the proletariat is what allows it to have a great mass of money to give credit — to companies, the middle class, sectors of the proletariat itself, countries, provinces and municipalities — and thus create a purchasing power that helps for a time to reactivate the economy.

The explanation given by some Marxists, according to which the imperialist economy overcomes its crisis by only creating purchasing power through credit is, totally wrong. If this were the case, capitalism would develop without difficulties or crises, creating purchasing power with loans. In reality, the capital that is lent comes from the super-exploitation of workers and the looting of other countries.

4.- The first crisis, not being generalized to the entire capitalist world, could be weathered by Yankee imperialism with a significant increase in the exploitation of its own working class and with competitive manoeuvres against the other imperialist countries, such as the abandonment of the dollar-gold parity. The next two crises, being generalized, put in evidence the true mechanism that Yankee imperialism used to overcome them.

That of 1973 was not overcome through credit but by the colossal mass of surplus value that was extracted from the workers of all non-oil countries, mainly the backward ones.

The overcoming of the 1979 crisis took longer and was at first much weaker, not because there was a lack of money to lend but because the manoeuvre of taking back a huge mass of surplus value from the non-oil countries did not give the result expected by the increased oil production.

5.- Although slowly, Yankee imperialism has managed to overcome its latest crisis. Since late 1982, its production increased. It achieved this by super-exploiting all the countries and workers of the world, including the Americans, to a degree never seen in recent decades. Marxists who believe that Yankee imperialism overcame its crisis through the colossal indebtedness of the Reagan administration see only the outward appearance of the phenomena. In reality, Reagan got the loans and capital he needed because the exploitation of workers around the world increased dramatically in recent years. Thus it raised the rate of profit — reflected in the interest rate — and this attracted capital.

6.- The chronic crisis has been advancing from the periphery to the centre. This is a law that has been in place since at least 1966 — we believe that throughout this post-war period. The overcoming of the crisis includes fewer and fewer countries; more and more countries are still in crisis after being overtaken by some of the core countries. It is an expression of uneven development.

The degree to which the crisis hits in different countries is also uneven. After the last one, virtually only the US could make a significant recovery in its economy.

7.- All symptoms seem to indicate that the United States and the entire capitalist world are approaching a new crisis, much more violent than the previous ones. The process of internationalisation of the economy and its centralisation by Yankee imperialism and the large international monopolies, the “transnationals”, added to the speed of communications, allows a dizzying rate of obtaining surplus value, distribution of profit and accumulation and over-accumulation of capital. This same rhythm accelerates the crisis of the imperialist economy.

Each enormous increase in the mass of surplus value recovers the rate of profit and makes it possible to overcome the conjunctural crisis. But it prepares a bigger crisis: by increasing capital colossally, there is an over-accumulation of capital, which seeks investments where it can get profits; and as the mass of surplus value remains the same and capital has increased, the rate of profit falls abruptly, causing a new short-term crisis.

8.- The over-accumulation of capital causes that a large mass of the same is not invested in production and is transformed into fictitious, usurious, loan capital. This capital is injected in the form of credits that end up causing widespread indebtedness, both in advanced and backward countries and now in some workers’ states. A spectacular example is the fiscal deficit of the United States.

When these debts fall on a country or social sector that has already been looted to the last drop, they become unpayable, not only capital but even interest. If this becomes generalized, indebtedness, which in itself is only an epiphenomenon of the economic crisis, can become an additional factor of crisis and in its most spectacular expression.

9.- The crisis creates an exacerbation of the competition between the transnationals and of these with the national or independent bourgeoisies. This leads to increasing concentration, the supremacy of the strongest monopolies and the displacement of the weaker or outmoded. All the old industries and dominant monopolies are being displaced. The automotive, steel, coal, aviation, and domestic industries are in a crisis with no way out.

10.- The ultimate reason that shows the overcoming of the crisis is given by the struggle between the exploited and the exploiters at a global level. Only by achieving a permanent, practically limited increase in exploitation will imperialism be able to overcome the next conjunctural crises and the chronic crisis since the increase of capital is incessant and vertiginous. And this depends on the degree of resistance of the workers around the world to the super-exploitation plans of imperialism and the native bourgeoisies. The more they resist, the more this crisis will become increasingly acute and without exit.

II. A Permanent Economic Counterrevolution

1.- The economic crisis forces imperialism and the bourgeoisie to keep a permanent and brutal offensive against the workers of the entire planet. It is not the same situation as in other historical stages in which, because of uneven development, the bourgeoisie of fundamental countries could carry out reformist policies or grant important concessions in the face of workers' struggles. It is not even similar to other circumstances in which the working class or other segments of the workers managed, with hard fighting, to keep a balance in their standard of living. That reformist era or stage is completely behind us.

The current stage of the bourgeois economy, starting in 1966, is one of permanent counterrevolution. Imperialism and the exploiters not only cannot grant or maintain wins in terms of the standard of living of the masses but, on the contrary, they have no other economic alternative than to violently wrest all wins from them and plunge the working people into the most appalling misery. In 1966, imperialism leaps from a reformist stage, from concessions to segments of the workers, to an increasingly terrible total and generalized offensive against them at the international level.

2.- This counterrevolution or permanent economic exploitation of the working masses makes use of multiple instruments; all of them aimed at increasing absolute surplus value, that is, the exploitation of workers:

- Unemployment has become widespread, even in the imperialist countries — where there are currently 35 million unemployed people. In the backward countries, the unemployed number 300 million. In this way, an immense industrial reserve army is being formed globally, which presses for the reduction of wages.
- At the same time, exploitation is intensified by extending the working day through overtime. Moreover, by not incorporating more workers, overtime saves the bourgeoisie all social expenses: insurance, health, retirement, etc. Thus, even if the wages of employed workers increase slightly, the wage bill decreases.
- Another avenue for the extraction of absolute surplus value is the intensification of work pressure. That is, atrocious production rates are imposed which, added to the extension of the working day, leads the workers to a terrible dumbing down.
- Massive migrations of foreign workers are caused, creating a new immigrant proletariat subjected to the most brutal jobs, with the most debased wages, alien to the tradition of the native proletariat, union and politically defenceless. In the United States, this policy is combined with internal migrations — now from the traditional industrial centres of the north to the south, and the west — which produce similar effects. A parallel process is massive proletarianisation and child labour. Currently, the policy of bringing immigrant

workers to the imperialist metropolises has stopped in many countries, opening instead the time of unemployment for immigrant workers.

- The social wage — health, pensions, unemployment insurance, housing, etc. — is cut or directly eliminated for the entire proletariat. For immigrant workers, there is nothing direct. This is reflected in rising poverty rates in capitalist countries, including the US and Japan.
- The transnationals proletarianise the most miserable, poor and defenceless labour force to compete against the privileged workers of the imperialist metropolises. They move their industrial plants or set up new ones in the populated countries of the third world: Korea, Mexico, Haiti, Taiwan, Brazil, etc., where wages are several times lower than those of the metropolises and the exploitation is terrible. From them, low-priced goods are exported to the advanced countries, forcing the wages of their proletariat to be lowered.
- Capitalism penetrates in full in the countryside, proletarianising a sector of the peasantry and subjecting it to ferocious exploitation and causing the exodus to the cities of great hungry masses, who cannot find work and become massively integrated into the industrial reserve army.
- Imperialism plunders the backward countries, subjecting them to increasingly unequal exchange, directly extracting large masses of surplus value from the investments of the monopolies that are remitted to the parent companies and through the foreign debt mechanism. In 1983 alone, backward countries paid over us\$ 100 billion on account of their foreign debts. Added to this, is the massive flight of capital to the imperialist metropolises by national capitals themselves.

Imperialism advances on the workers' states to plunder them too. It is a semi-colonising offensive, which is already extracting surplus value from the proletariat of those countries to a greater or lesser degree. It does so through international trade, but semi-colonisation targets the deepest parts of the economy. Some of these countries are already in debt with the imperialist banks and have even signed agreements with the IMF. To this, we must add the direct investments of capital and, as the most advanced element of the semi-colonisation process, the conquest of real economic enclaves in China and Yugoslavia.

III. The Economic Crisis of Socialism in One Country

1.- All the workers' states have been suffering a marked decline in their economic development for 10 years or longer. At the end of the last decade and the beginning of the present, there were several cases of a decrease in the gross product, in Poland, or stagnation, in the USSR. Even if there are circumstantial improvements, this crisis has no signs of being overcome. The bureaucratic regime and its Stalinist policy of building socialism in a single country, enclosed within its borders, has become an absolute obstacle to the permanent development of the economy of the workers' states.

2.- China, which achieved an 8 per cent increase in its production last year, seems to deny this law. But China has lived in a permanent and acute crisis in its economy. And the current growth comes as a consequence of huge concessions to the peasantry and imperialism. They are the first successes of a policy of capitulation to capitalist pressures, not of the "construction of socialism". In its development, this policy leads to the transformation of China into a semi-colony of imperialism. In the long run, China will plunge into the misery and crisis of all colonial countries, or it will return to a deeper crisis of an economy run by the bureaucracy.

3.- Because they are economies not dominated by capitalism, their crisis is expressed in totally different ways from that of capitalist countries. It is of underproduction, not of overproduction. There are queues of buyers with plenty of money, but there are no goods to buy. This is because the bureaucracy is unable to organise production to meet the needs of the population.

4.- However, it would be a mistake to confuse how the crisis takes place with the causes of it. The first and fundamental cause is that they are relatively backward national economies, or of intermediate development like the USSR, objectively inserted, whether their governments want it or not, in an economy, a technological development and a world market dominated by imperialism, especially Yankee imperialism.

The bureaucracy holds that the workers of any country face only one scourge: the national exploiters. But the scourges are two; the second is national borders and backwardness, which allow imperialism to exploit or oppress that country isolated on its borders, even if the national exploiters have already been removed.

5.- The second cause of the crisis is the bureaucracy itself. The lack of democratic control of the economy by workers leaves it in the hands of an inefficient bureaucratic administration. The lack of democratic freedoms causes a backwardness in science and technology that makes workers' states depend on capitalist models, turning technology into a weapon of imperialist economic penetration. The privileges of the bureaucracy and the lack of democratic participation in the economy cause disinterest, apathy and listlessness among workers, which, added to the technical backwardness, results in low productivity.

6.- The objective law that every national economy is part of the world economy dominated by imperialism has to be taken into account by every revolutionary leadership, to counteract it.

The bureaucracy denies this law and opposes it to that of socialism in a single country: a socialist economy can be built without first defeating imperialism, each following its path.

This economic theory and politics respond to the need of the ruling bureaucracies to guarantee their respective private preserves where they can oppress the masses and parasitise the economy to maintain their privileged lives. The best expression of this policy is the refusal of all ruling bureaucracies to federate with the other workers' states. Its most disastrous manifestation is the war between workers' states. No bureaucracy wants to give up its privileges to another bureaucracy.

7.- As a result of this policy, instead of "socialism in one country", it is capitalism that advances in the workers' states:

- All of them — including Vietnam and Cuba — established regulations to favour imperialist investments.
- Some are making giant strides in their encouragement of capitalism. China accepts that Hong Kong remains capitalist and has developed several Hong Kong-like cities on its territory. It seems like a return to imperial China, with its enclaves and concessions to imperialism. Poland has accepted that the Catholic Church administers the colossal fortune sent by imperialism to benefit peasants and encourage agrarian production.
- Several countries — Poland, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Korea — are beholden to the IMF and/or in debt to the core with international financial capital.
- The technological dependence of the workers' states with imperialism has been growing. Technologically all of them —including the USSR— are of an intermediate or backward level.
- Although in recent years there has been some setback or stagnation, there has been a great increase in trade with capitalist countries for two decades now.
- Increasingly, the laws of the world market are imposed on commercial transactions within COMECON¹ and the workers' states. The USSR tries to obtain advantages of all kinds. Now it has just raised the price of oil to that of the world market.
- The most developed workers' states, alone or in partnership with imperialist companies, carry out colonial investments and exploitations in backward countries.

8.- Exceptional circumstances allowed the construction of socialism in a single country to seem possible for several decades. Before the Second World War, the inter-imperialist struggle, the colossal economic crisis and the defeat of the revolution allowed the bureaucracy to impose its policy of genocidal terror and autarkic "construction of socialism". In the postwar period, the great revolutionary triumphs controlled by Stalinism, which provided the bureaucracy with a great deal of room for manoeuvre, and the economic boom, created the same optical illusion.

Today the world economic crisis and the systematic economic offensive of imperialism lay bare the harsh reality. Socialism in a single country, instead of leading us to socialism, amid tremendous contradictions and struggles, leads us back to capitalism. The phenomenon of workers' states being semi-colonised by imperialism and, at the same time, the most powerful ones becoming junior partners, sub-metropolises of imperialism in the exploitation of backward countries, highlights the failure of "socialism in a single country".

This economic failure is also the failure of a supposed anti-imperialist policy: that of defeating imperialism through economic development. With patience and many years, the bureaucracy said, the economy of the USSR will be much more powerful than that of imperialism and then socialism will automatically triumph throughout the world. Almost 60 years of "socialism in one country" are proving otherwise.

1 COMECON (Council for Mutual Economic Assistance) was an economic exchange organisation that existed between 1949 and 1991, created and controlled by the bureaucracy that dominated the Soviet Union, which included the Eastern European countries occupied by the Red Army and where the bourgeoisie had been expropriated, Cuba and some other bureaucratic workers' states, and also some capitalist countries.

9.- There is no progressive economic solution to the current crisis of the imperialist and capitalist economy and society. The only way out to overcome the economic crisis comes from the political side: through the global mobilisation of workers and exploited peoples against imperialism until their political defeat. In today's world, there are only two alternatives for all countries: either the imperialist counterrevolution or the socialist revolution. The socialist economy will be global or it will not be.

Capitalism conquered a fabulous historical achievement: the world economy. Socialism can only start from this economic conquest and not from further back: from backward national or regional economies.

The revolution started from much further back: from countries that were the weakest and most backward links of that world economy. But the triumphant revolution is not, nor can it be the counterrevolution of socialism in one country, and a backward one at that. Revolution and building of socialism are closely related terms but not identical. They cannot be because the first is political-social and the second is essentially economic-social. Therefore, the two realities are the counterrevolution of imperialist and all the exploiters, or the mobilisation of the workers of the world to politically defeat imperialism, mainly the Yankee, master and lord of the world economy.

IV. An Increasingly Serious Revolutionary Situation

1.- The crisis and misery of the exploited masses continue to provide, in a growing manner, the basic economic and social conditions of a revolutionary situation. This economic-social crisis has been accompanied, since its beginning in 1968, by an exacerbation of the struggle of the workers and the oppressed around the world against their exploiters. The two factors united have given birth, since that date, to a revolutionary situation on a global scale.

The revolutionary mobilisation is led by the proletariat and the poor masses around the world. The petty bourgeoisie and the middle classes, also attacked by the crisis, generally support democratic stabilisation and order. Where the situation becomes more critical (Bolivia, Chile, the Philippines) they tend to split to the left and right.

2.- In the course of this revolutionary situation, which has prolonged and deepened to the point of paroxysm since the last economic crisis, the struggles of the mass movement have achieved great waves and revolutionary triumphs. Like every revolutionary triumph, they are essentially political.

3.- The first wave was in 1968, with the French May that achieved, belatedly, the defeat of De Gaulle, caused the crisis of the Fifth Republic, and buried his Bonapartist plan. Equally or more important were the great workers' mobilisations in Italy, which imposed factory workers' commissions and the sliding scale of wages.

In the workers' states, there was the great Czechoslovak political revolution, crushed by the Red Army and, subsequently, the beginning of the revolutionary rise of the Polish proletariat in 1971. In a distorted form, this rise manifested itself in the Chinese cultural revolution.

In Latin America, it produced, among others, the semi-popular student insurrection in Mexico in 1968, the Argentine "Cordobazo"² in 1969, and the revolutionary situation in Chile after Allende's electoral victory.

The global rise of 1968 hit all continents.

4.- The second wave, in the mid-1970s, achieved spectacular triumphs. The most important was Vietnam, where the American masses played a decisive role, and which was the first military defeat of Yankee imperialism. Along with it came the Portuguese anti-fascist revolution, the liberation of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea Bissau by the black guerrillas and, shortly after, the transformation of Zimbabwe into a black republic. Although without revolutionary triumphs, the rise forced the Spanish and Greek bourgeoisie to replace Francoism and the dictatorship of the colonels respectively, with parliamentary Bonapartist regimes with broad democratic freedoms.

2 **Cordobazo**: it refers to a worker and student semi-insurrection that took place in Argentina on 29 and 30 May 1969 in the city of Cordoba, one of the most important industrial cities in the country, and that began a revolutionary situation. Its most immediate consequence was the fall of the military dictatorship of Juan Carlos Onganía in 1970, and then the opening of democratic freedoms and the calling of national elections in 1971–72. See *After the Cordobazo* at www.nahuelmoreno.org.

5.- The third wave, at the end of the 1970s, obtained the great triumphs of Iran and Nicaragua, with the revolutionary fall of the Shah and Somoza. This wave continues today, although facing imperialism that has achieved great economic triumphs — among others with its proletariat — and initiated a political-military offensive.

6.- The current revolutionary situation is characterised by the imperialist political-military counteroffensive (its economic offensive never stopped advancing, with significant successes). This political-military counteroffensive has suffered a series of failures, or ephemeral successes that turn against it or exacerbate the class struggle worldwide. The most outstanding characteristic of the current revolutionary situation is this exacerbation of the class struggle at the international level, on a scale never seen in previous stages, except in the immediate post-war period.

7.- Since the revolutionary triumphs in Iran and Nicaragua, the following revolutionary processes have taken place:

- A colossal development of the Central American revolution and, within it, the Salvadoran one, despite the military intervention of Yankee imperialism in Nicaragua, El Salvador, and the entire area. In El Salvador, the revolution was twice on the brink of triumph over the genocidal government.
- The initiation of a guerrilla movement of the Arab masses in Lebanon, after the imperialist-Zionist intervention. This guerrilla is hitting hard Israel's fascist army.
- The fall of dictatorships in Peru, Bolivia, Argentina, and now Brazil. These are great revolutionary triumphs, no matter how much conditioning they have suffered from imperialism and the leadership of the mass movement; they open a very important stage of the revolutionary rise in the Southern Cone, marked by workers' and urban mobilisations.

8.- In addition to these, there are other great centres of the class struggle. The first, despite its relative defeat, is the Polish revolution. Solidarity has been the greatest revolutionary mass organisation that the European proletariat has produced in this entire post-war period; because of its massive and democratic character, it connects with the tradition of the soviets of the first post-war period and the committees or commissions of the Portuguese revolution.

9.- The second is the revolutionary crisis that the Philippines has been going through since the assassination of Aquino, with gigantic mobilisations of the urban masses and a communist guerrilla that controls a large part of the island where 40% of the country's population lives and which it has now spread to the vicinity of Manila. This revolutionary rise is combined with a deep economic and political crisis of the bourgeoisie and its institutions. Apparently, the fall of the fascist Marcos government is close, which would be a terrible blow to imperialism and would open the possibility of a very weak "democratic" bourgeois government, which would help the development of the revolution.

10.- India is going through a more than mature revolutionary crisis. The chronic economic-social crisis is combined with an increasingly acute exacerbation of three struggles: the agrarian, that of nationalities and that of the workers' movement. The first and to a certain extent the second are or tend to be true civil wars.

11.- Imperialism and the racist South African regime believed they had achieved a certain stability in the area by having signed or being about to sign their counterrevolutionary pacts with the Stalinist-bourgeois regimes of Mozambique and Angola. But the revolutionary process broke out within South Africa's borders. The economic crisis combined with the struggle of the Black people and proletariat, created for the first time a revolutionary situation in what was the most stable bastion of capitalism in all of Black Africa. It is the first Black revolution that will have the proletariat as its undisputed leader from its first stages since it takes place in a country where there is a widely developed working class.

In North Africa, there is a similar situation: large urban popular uprisings in Morocco and Tunisia and 20,000 men in arms of the Polisario Front controlling a large part of the so-called "Spanish Sahara".

12.- The world proletariat increases its resistance to imperialism's super-exploitation plans, although unevenly.

The vanguard are the workers of the Latin American Southern Cone. Peruvian, Argentine and Bolivian workers —mainly the latter— have been at the centre of political life in recent years. Something similar is happening with the Brazilian, Chilean, and Uruguayan working class.

Behind it comes the European proletariat that, honouring its tradition of being the most class-conscious in the world, offers an ever tougher and more heroic resistance to imperialist misery and unemployment. The Spanish workers of Sagunto and other struggles, the great mobilisations of Italian workers and, to a lesser extent, French workers and, fundamentally, the German metalworkers' strike and the incredible coal strike in England, are shaking the foundations of British and continental imperialism. The Polish working class continues to resist the offensive of the military dictatorship through Solidarity.

The working classes of the USA, Japan, and the USSR are behind, but they still reflect the rise and the process of defensive struggles. In the USA, after almost a decade of passivity, the workers' mobilisation is slowly being reborn with the coal strike and, more recently, the automotive conflict, mainly General Motors. In Japan, after the virtual disappearance of the workers' struggle after the great mobilisations of the 1960s, two or three years ago the workers' movement was resurgent, resisting the closure of medium-sized shipbuilding and metallurgical enterprises. Although it is not qualitative, it is symptomatic of the beginning of the crisis of the Japanese social "model".

In the USSR, although little or nothing is known about the organised actions of the working class, there is an inorganic and individual but massive resistance: absenteeism, job desertion, work at a snail's pace, etc.

13.- The other exploited classes, potential and necessary allies of the working class for the socialist revolution to triumph, also confront the national and imperialist exploiters with everything.

Of these allies of the proletariat, the first and traditional is the peasantry and the rural semi-proletariat, who are fighting throughout the world. There are two types of struggles: the more or less spontaneous ones without greater centralisation or organisation, and those organised in guerrillas.

Of those of the first type stand out for their importance, since they eventually rise to almost a social war with serious armed confrontations, the struggles in India and Brazil.

14.- The second type, peasant guerrillas, are reemerging throughout the world, mainly in Southeast Asia and Latin America.

The Filipino guerrilla advances spectacularly. Its communist leadership is a danger since it is very possible that, in the long run, it will follow the general orientation of Stalinism and make a pact with any bourgeois democratic government or a similar variant.

The triumph of the Nicaraguan guerrilla caused a revival (Colombia) or an emergence (Peru) of the rural-urban guerrilla. The different Colombian guerrilla organisations and the Sendero Luminoso [Shining Path] of Peru express a social phenomenon and political tactic completely different from what the Guevarist guerrilla was. This was a student-oriented, well-to-do, conspiratorial and far from the mass movement. The Peruvian, Colombian, Salvadoran and Guatemalan guerrillas have deep roots in the peasantry or the agricultural semi-proletariat, as well as in the wretchedly poor masses of the cities.

Their political tactics take into account the social sector they represent and lead.

This does not mean that they are correct since they are limited by the social sector they lead — a very backward peasantry in the case of Sendero Luminoso — and by the conceptions and programs of the political leadership they have.

But to the extent that they reflect, as until now, the peasant or urban masses in struggle, they are a highly progressive phenomenon: a civil war of the exploited against exploiters. In this civil war, regardless of the criticism of its leadership, the IWL is located in the trenches of the exploited; it

takes sides, with all audacity, for the revolutionary military expression of that civil war. This is its general policy, from El Salvador to the Philippines.

15.- The penetration of capitalism into the countryside has caused, besides the growing misery of the peasantry and the agricultural proletariat, massive emigration to the cities, giving rise to the phenomenon of large cities throughout the backward world. The slow and in some cases non-existent progress of industrial development causes the marginalisation of those large masses who suffer subhuman living conditions in overcrowded suburbs. Thus, another fundamental ally of the proletariat is born: the marginal urban masses.

They mobilise autonomously and inorganically – the looting in Brazilian cities – or together with the working class – the Colombian “civic strikes”, the descent towards the centre of the “young towns” (shanty towns) of Lima during the general strikes.

It is necessary to formulate a policy to make these marginal masses firm allies of the working class, fighting so that they do not fall under the counterrevolutionary leadership of the church or other similar variants, as is happening in Brazil, where priests have organised six million people in their “grassroots communities”.

16.- Finally, oppressed nationalities and races, women, the elderly, youth, and the pacifist and environmental movements are also allies of the proletariat.

The struggles of oppressed nationalities and races have a certain symmetry with the peasant movement, since it is expressed in urban or rural guerrillas — Lebanon, Ireland, the Basque Country — or in spontaneous uprisings — India, Palestinian towns subjected to Israel, black ghettos in the US and South Africa. These struggles are colossal revolutionary factors, whose highest expression at the moment is the racial uprisings in India and Pakistan and the guerrillas in Lebanon.

The pacifist movement in Europe against the installation of missiles and imperialist armamentism is also very progressive. It is also so in Eastern Europe, although it is controlled by the Protestant church since it expresses repudiation of the Stalinist bureaucracy. For now, it is a phenomenon similar to that of Solidarity.

V. Backward Countries and Imperialism

1.- The process of workers' states ruled by bureaucracy towards semi-colonisation by imperialism and back towards capitalism is alarming, but not irreversible. Its future depends on the great struggles of the mass movement on a global scale. The bureaucracy is weaker every day in the face of imperialism, but the masses are stronger every day.

2.- The tremendous strength of the mass movement in revolutionary upsurge is best demonstrated in the fact that in recent years it has managed, with its struggles, to make many countries independent from imperialist domination. That no new workers' states have been conquered since Vietnam does not mean that great victories have not been won.

While the bureaucracy hands over the countries it rules, the revolutionary masses change the character of numerous nations, wresting them from imperialism. Iran, Nicaragua, Angola, Mozambique, Libya, Ethiopia, South Yemen, etc., are countries independent of imperialism without having ceased to be bourgeois countries nor having become workers' states. They are intermediate phenomena, not yet defined, since their future has two alternatives: retreat towards a semi-colony or advance towards a new workers' state.

3.- If we schematically classify all the countries in the world in terms of their relationship with imperialism, we find imperialist, colonial, semi-colonial and independent countries. Independent countries are both the workers' states and the bourgeois countries that became independent from imperialism by the revolutionary mobilisation of the masses.

4.- As with countries, the revolutionary rise of the masses has given rise to different political regimes and types of government.

The rise has forced imperialism and many bourgeois governments to make important political concessions to the mass movement. They have gone so far as to cause a controlled regime change, as in Spain or Brazil. In Spain, we went from a totalitarian regime to a parliamentary monarchy due to the premeditated action of the fascist monarchy and the big bourgeoisie. In Brazil, from Geisel³ until the end of Figueiredo,⁴ a similar process took place: from a military dictatorship to a bourgeois democratic regime controlled by the armed forces. This plan failed due to the large demonstrations of repudiation, which effectively defeated the military. We call these types of government senile

3 **Ernesto Geisel** (1907–1996) was a Brazilian military leader and politician, who was President of Brazil from 1974 to 1979, during the Brazilian military dictatorship.

4 **Joao Baptista Figueiredo** (1918–1999) was a Brazilian military leader and politician. He was head of the Secret Service (SNI) during the term of his predecessor Ernesto Geisel, who handed over the presidency to him in 1979. Figueiredo was the last military man to head the dictatorship that began in 1964 and governed until 1985. After the fall of the military regime in 1984, elections were held again.

Bismarckism⁵ because they carry out very important progressive changes to avoid the socialist revolution in a stage of total decadence of the bourgeoisie.

5.- The great revolutionary triumphs, which destroyed the previous regime by uprooting it, have given rise to two types of government. A weak, unstable one, which we have called Kerenskyist. Another strong, solid one, which we have called Bonapartist and many times directly bourgeois-Stalinist.

The first type is the product of great revolutionary triumphs carried out through a great mobilisation of masses not framed by a guerrilla party-army. Immediately after the triumph, very weak, unstable governments emerged, in permanent crisis. Such is the case of Portugal, Peru, the beginning of Khomeini⁶ in Iran, Bolivia, Argentina, the end of the Figueiredo government and possibly the beginning of the next civil government in Brazil.

6.- Both the senile Bismarckist regimes and those described in the previous point – except for Iran, since the country's independence from imperialism was achieved there – are imperial democracies. That is regimes with broad freedoms, but direct agents of the economic and international policy of imperialism.

7.- The second type of government, the Bonapartist and strong ones emerged from the triumphant revolutions that destroyed the armed apparatus of imperialism or the bourgeoisie through a guerrilla army. Nicaragua, Angola, and Mozambique have strong governments because they control the new armed forces, that is, the guerrilla army that destroyed the previous armed forces, national or colonial. Ethiopia is a similar case, although the mass movement was not led by a guerrilla army but a professional one and it was still a party army, like the guerrillas.

Except in the case of Nicaragua and to a certain extent Zimbabwe, Bonapartism ended up imposing totalitarian Stalinist one-party regimes in South Yemen, Ethiopia, Angola, Mozambique, etc. The same trend occurred in Nicaragua and Zimbabwe but the compromises or pressures of imperialism and social democracy on the one hand and the pressure of the mass movement and tribes on the other counteracted this tendency towards a totalitarian Bonapartist regime clearly of the Stalinist type.

8.- This character or tendency towards strong Bonapartism is common to all backward bourgeois countries that won their independence concerning imperialism. This is because governments must control a highly critical and contradictory situation. On the one hand, they want to avoid the socialist workers' revolution, defend the allied national bourgeoisie or create and develop it where it does not exist. On the other hand, they try to defend themselves from the imperialist pressure that wants to colonise the country again.

In the final analysis, they are Bonapartist governments sandwiched between the mass movement and imperialism, which rely on and control the former to resist the latter. They are similar to the governments of Peron, Nasser or Nehru but at a much higher stage of the world revolutionary process.

9.- Years ago Posadas⁷ and today the USec or some of its currents tend to define these political regimes as workers' and peasants' governments. Our definition –and Trotsky's– is that workers' and peasants' governments are those that have broken with the bourgeoisie. All these bourgeois Stalinist

5 It refers to the politics of **Otto von Bismarck**, Prince of Bismarck and Duke of Lauenburg (1815–1898), a German statesman and politician, architect of German unification and one of the key figures in international relations during the second half of the 19th century. During the last years of his life, he was nicknamed the “Iron Chancellor” for the determination with which he pursued his political goals, fundamentally the creation and maintenance of a system of international alliances that would ensure the supremacy and security of the German Empire.

6 **Ruhollah Khomeini** (1902–1989), also known in the Western world as Ayatollah Khomeini, was an Iranian politician and cleric. He was the founder of the Islamic Republic of Iran and the leader of the 1979 Iranian Revolution, which saw the overthrow of the last Shah of Iran, Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, and the end of the 2,500-year-old Persian monarchy. Following the revolution, Khomeini became the country's Supreme Leader.

7 **J. Posadas** was the pseudonym of Homero Romulo Cristali Frasnelli (1912-1981) an Argentine Trotskyist leader. When in 1953 the Fourth International was divided between the International Secretariat and the International Committee, Posadas sided with the secretary, Michel Pablo.

or directly Bonapartist governments, on the contrary, tend to protect the national bourgeoisie and make pacts with imperialism. The Nicaraguan government, for example, is a champion of paying the debt to imperialist banks.

VI. The Front of Imperialism and the Exploiters

1.- Several current currents of Marxism, and also those who claim to be part of the Trotskyist movement, hold that the economic crisis and the revolutionary upsurge have caused a deep division in the ranks of imperialism and the bourgeoisie. According to these interpretations, the crisis exacerbates the contradictions between German and Japanese imperialism and the big Yankee boss. Moreover, they point out that American imperialism has begun its decline and is losing ground, especially against Japan. They also assert that cracks are opening up between the national bourgeoisies and Yankee imperialism and that the crisis sharpens the contradictions, even opening the way to ruptures with imperialism.

2.- The situation, however, is the opposite. For us, never in the history of capitalism in this century have the different imperialisms and national exploiters been so united, so dominated and so controlled by an imperialist power, as is the case today with the United States.

Three reasons reaffirm the total dominance of American imperialism over the national bourgeoisies and the rest of the imperialisms:

First: The political unity of all the exploiters of the world to confront the rise of the mass movement. The terror of all imperialists and bourgeoisies of the revolutionary triumph is infinitely greater than the possible frictions or discrepancies that may arise. Before the triumph of the masses, the unity of the exploiters.

Second: The profound need that all of them have, without exception, to redouble the exploitation of workers, to face their economic crisis. This need is above any small divergence in economic policy. They are all firm supporters of the economic counterrevolution.

Third: Economic power, if we include technological control and military power, is overwhelmingly favourable to the United States.

If we were to into account the data on the development of traditional industries and commercial exchange, we would draw the conclusion that Japan and Germany are beginning to dominate the United States. But if we take into account the arms industry, rocketry, energy, and the nuclear arsenal, the Yankee power is overwhelming and greater every day.

3.- These inter-imperialist relations lead us to assert that there is no real possibility that the differences between the imperialist powers will be resolved in a war between them. Precisely the dominant characteristic of inter-bourgeois and inter-imperialist relations since the end of the Second World War is the impossibility of a Third inter-imperialist World War.

The possibility has been hypothetically considered that Europe and the backward countries may join the USSR and the national bourgeoisies to confront Yankee domination. This possibility must be ruled out for the next few years. Inter-imperialist ties prevent this. And within them, the power of the armed forces will continue to be defining. When English imperialism began its decline,

its powerful army and navy also accompanied the fall. Today the situation in the United States is the opposite: its armed forces are stronger than those of rival empires, and besides they control them through NATO.

4.- Yankee domination over the whole of imperialism does not make disappear the differences and contradictions within the camp of the exploiters. On the contrary, the economic crisis and the intensification of the class struggle sharpen these differences and contradictions. But this sharpening, unlike on other historical occasions, cannot destroy in the coming years the profound unity orchestrated around Yankee imperialism.

5.- As we have already pointed out, the economic crisis has intensified the confrontations between the multinationals themselves and with the national exploiters. Now we are interested in pointing out the overall policy and the differences that exist within the dominant classes.

From the beginning of the revolutionary stage that opened with the French May until now, we have seen three different stages of the imperialist front:

The first was the military confrontation with the vanguard of the world revolution, the Vietnamese guerrilla. The internal face of this policy was Nixon's attempt to reach a Bonapartist government that would become independent of the legislative branch. It was the policy of the stick and open confrontation. But the Vietnamese guerrillas and workers, and the internal opposition of the American people, frustrated both of Nixon's attempts. The Yankee army is defeated in Vietnam and Nixon has to resign, implicated in the Watergate scandal.

The second stage of imperialist policy is characterised by conciliation, negotiations, and democratic openings at home and abroad. It is the time of Carter and his wife's travels preaching "human rights" around the world, promoting conferences against South African racism, campaigning against Latin American dictatorships, opening dialogue with the Angolan MPLA [People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola] and strengthening ties with European social democratic parties. It is a defensive policy of an imperialism that was left groggy by the defeat in Vietnam and is retreating in a stampede in the face of the world mass movement and its people. It is what we call "democratic counterrevolution", of promoting openings and regimes of formal democracy, as a relief channel from the revolutionary pressure of the masses. Logically, an imperial democracy that, in the backward countries, had to ensure imperialist domination by means other than genocidal dictatorships.

The end of the Carter administration heralds the third phase of imperialist policy. Imperialism begins its counteroffensive and its preparations to use the club again. The revolutionary triumphs of Nicaragua and Iran accelerate the transition from one policy to the other. Carter already deployed two military initiatives preparatory for the Reagan period: 1) the installation of missiles in Europe to target the USSR, and 2) the organisation of a rapid deployment army, which could reach any place in the world where it might be necessary to suffocate a revolutionary rise. The failure of the recovery of the Tehran hostages is the first frustrated attempt at this policy. The methods of democratic counterrevolution of Carter's first stage are not abandoned but concessions to the mass movement (controlled democratic openings, defence of human rights) are combined with armed methods.

The Reagan government began to execute the imperialist counteroffensive prepared by Carter. The missiles are installed in Europe and the organisation of the rapid deployment army is finished. They intervene in Grenada and Lebanon. Libyan planes are attacked.

What characterises the Reagan government is having taken to its ultimate consequences and on a global scale the tactic that had been used in Angola of manufacturing and supporting counterrevolutionary guerrillas such as UNITA,⁸ against the progressive guerrillas of the MPLA or the governments that emerged from Portuguese decolonisation in Mozambique and Angola. This counterrevolutionary tactic was applied in all its intensity in Nicaragua with the organisation of the

8 UNITA (National Union for the Total Independence of Angola) was the second political party in Angola. Founded in 1966, UNITA fought alongside the MPLA in the War of Independence (1961–1975) against colonial rule by Portugal. After liberation, UNITA became an agent of imperialism, receiving military aid from the United States and South Africa to combat the MPLA, supported by the Soviet Union and its allies. See *Angola the Black Revolution Underway*, at www.nahuelmoreno.org.

“contras”⁹. The Afghan guerrilla has ended up in the hands of the CIA and Yankee imperialism. In Namibia and Lebanon, Reagan directly used the armies of his South African and Israeli gendarmes.

Reagan’s use of the club in the counteroffensive has not made him abandon, for the moment, the old policy of democratic counterrevolution. The Vietnam syndrome continues to weigh so heavily that Yankee imperialism dares not, for the time being, intervene directly in national wars. It is no coincidence that the marines were withdrawn from Lebanon as soon as they suffered losses and the situation began to change. This is why it continues to use indirect methods: military aid, experts, counterrevolutionary guerrillas.

There is a direct relationship between military means and the democratic counterrevolution. The first seeks the second. Military pressure seeks pacification and democratic counterrevolution. Whether in Angola, Mozambique or Lebanon, Reagan has tended towards agreements. The same today in the Honduras-Nicaragua confrontation. Reagan used force to convince the opportunist leadership that they have to agree to stop, freeze, and defeat the revolution. The revolutionary rise is too powerful for Reagan to dare to play all his cards in violent methods after he has fared so badly with them.

We do not believe the widespread idea, which is being propagated around the world, that Reagan plans to invade first where there is a critical revolutionary situation. This will be the last thing he will do when his attempts to make a counter-revolutionary pact with the leadership of the mass movement fail.

7.- Reagan’s policy does not eliminate the differences that exist within imperialism, including the Yankee imperialist bourgeoisie itself. Every revolution underway divides the bourgeoisie into two wings: the wing that wants to divert and freeze the revolution through agreements and negotiations, and the wing that wants to confront it in a violent, armed way. Reagan today synthesises these two positions in an eclectic and empirical way, a reflection of the intensification of the class struggle and the defeats suffered. Although in general terms the entire world bourgeoisie uses both the stick and the carrot, sectors of the European bourgeoisie, of the backward countries or of the American Democratic Party itself, have great differences with Reagan in how to approach the Palestinian problem, relations with the USSR, the Central American revolution or the problem of the foreign debt of backward countries. But even these bourgeois sectors use (or prepare to do so) violent methods when peaceful mechanisms fail. Thus, France sends troops to Chad and Lebanon and reinforces its entire nuclear force. England materialised the Malvinas (Falklands) War. War and peace are two methods in search of a single objective: the counterrevolution that saves capitalism from its crisis.

⁹ The **contras** were the various counterrevolutionary armed groups, financed and supported by Reagan and the CIA, that were active in Nicaragua from the beginning of the 1980s fighting the Sandinista government, until they were decimated and defeated.

VII. Two Antagonistic Political Fronts

1.- The most important political fact of recent years, the one that divides waters at the level of the mass movement and its vanguard, is the emergence of a political front at the world level, intending to liquidate the revolution, of defending the privileged sectors, but at the same time formally distancing itself from Reagan's arms belligerence.

2.- It is a front very similar to the one agreed upon at Yalta and Potsdam to stop the colossal revolutionary upsurge of the postwar period, in which, while imperialism massacred the Greek revolution, Stalin intervened with everything to prevent the triumph of the Chinese and Yugoslav revolutions, so that the Eastern European countries occupied by the Red Army would not be transformed into workers' states and that the communist parties in Western Europe would not take power.

With the outbreak of the Cold War, this counterrevolutionary front, although it does not disappear, sees its unity deteriorate. There is no systematic joint intervention to extinguish the sources of the world revolution — which, on the other hand, are sporadic and not generalized as in the immediate postwar period — and there is strong friction between imperialism and bureaucracy. "Peaceful coexistence" has a similar sign: there is much less friction but each one fundamentally acts as a cop of their area of influence.

Currently, the fear of the world revolutionary upsurge once again closely unites all the exploiters of the world and the bureaucracy in a common policy: that of bourgeois democratic counterrevolution worldwide. The counterrevolutionary front intervenes in all countries and sectors of the planet to defeat the revolution.

The new fact, which reflects the crisis of Stalinism, is that, within the front, the bureaucracy is much weaker than in other times, and is getting weaker every day. Now, rather than agreeing first and acting later, imperialism acts and forces the bureaucracy to follow.

3.- This front is made up of most of the imperialist sectors, the US Democratic Party, the European Economic Community, the exploiters and the national bourgeoisies, the Catholic Church, Christian Democracy, Social Democracy, Chinese and Russian Stalinism, Castro-Stalinism, Sandinismo, the leadership of the Salvadoran guerrilla, the governments of Libya, Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia, South Yemen and almost all semi-colonial countries, the ultra-reactionary governments or political leaders of Latin America, conservatives such as Betancur¹⁰ or Herrera Campins.¹¹ This solid political front is the most formidable we have witnessed so far this century. It is a new Sacred Union of an

10 **Belisario Betancur** (1923–2018) was a politician and President of Colombia from 1982 to 1986 for the Colombian Conservative Party.

11 **Luis Herrera Campins** (1925–2007), was a Venezuelan lawyer, journalist and politician. He was a member of COPEI, the traditional Christian Democratic party. Was president between 1979 and 1984. During his government, the devaluation of the bolivar known as Black Friday occurred in February 1983, which began a deep crisis of the Venezuelan semicolonial capitalist economic model.

international and national character, like the one denounced by Lenin and the internationalists in the First World War.

4.- The program, the policy of this front, and its great banners are very precise and deceptive: social peace, stopping wars, negotiated solutions, concertation, human rights, bourgeois democracy in all regions and countries. Its best-known expression, the mirror in which all conflict zones in the world look, is Contadora,¹² the peace and truce plan in Colombia and its extension to El Salvador.

Their expressions and achievements are applauded by all representatives of the world counterrevolution: the pact between Mozambique and South Africa; the ephemeral agreements on Lebanon; the peace agreement between Betancur and sectors of the guerrillas in Colombia; the agreements between Gaddafi¹³ and the Algerian government with the Moroccan and Tunisian reaction to confront and isolate the Polisario Front.¹⁴ It is indirectly reflected in Israel in the pact between Peres' Labour and Shamir's conservatives. In the joint declaration of all Uruguayan parties to ensure investments and imperialist capital. It is expressed in the government of Siles Suazo¹⁵ in Bolivia, with the participation of the Communist Party to impose the IMF plans on the working class. It had one of the first expressions in the "Spanish model" of transition from Francoism to the monarchy, with its Moncloa Pacts.¹⁶ It materialises in Poland in the agreement between the Church, imperialism and the Jaruzelski¹⁷ government to develop peasant production and avoid major problems for the military dictatorship. In different areas, in different parts of the world, and different political situations, the Front acts.

This Front holds that it has two enemies to face: the right and the ultra-left. Both are equally dangerous for peace and democracy in the world. The Reaganite right and the imperialist and bourgeois sectors want to impose ultra-reactionary or counter-revolutionary governments, they are the "warlords". For its part, the extreme left wants the revolutionary process to continue until expropriation. The Front defends the policy of the fair middle ground, maintaining the status quo where there is bourgeois democracy. Leave everything as it is, without questioning the exploitation; that the workers accept the most absolute misery in exchange for having formal democratic freedoms. Not having to eat, but being able to vote.

5.- From the class point of view, this front is made up of most of the parties and organisations of imperialism and national exploiters (from the Yankee Democratic Party to the Christian Democrats, through the Church and the Colombian conservatives) But they are not only the direct representatives of the bourgeoisie and imperialism. A prominent place, decisive for its effectiveness, is occupied by the leaderships of the world mass movement. It is a front with the workers' and petty-bourgeois parties and organisations that claim to be anti-imperialist and even socialist (the Second International, the Stalinist and union bureaucracy, the liberation movements, Castroism, Sandinismo).

12 **Contadora Group**: formed by the governments of Mexico, Colombia, Panama, and Venezuela, and supported by Fidel Castro, to stifle the development of the Central American revolution, especially in Nicaragua, El Salvador and Guatemala. It took the name from Contadora Island, in Panama, where the first meeting was held on 7 January 1983.

13 **Muammar Gaddafi** (1942–2011), commonly known as Colonel Gaddafi, was a Libyan military, politician, and dictator who ruled his country for 42 years, from 1969 until the day of his death in 2011. For many years he was part of the bourgeois anti-imperialist movement of several Arab countries, but then he turned to increasingly anti-worker, anti-popular, pro-imperialist and dictatorial positions. He was overthrown in 2011 as part of the "Arab Spring" process and was executed when he was captured trying to flee the country.

14 The **Polisario Front** is a Sahrawi liberation movement that calls for the independence of Western Sahara from Morocco.

15 **Hernan Siles Zuazo** (1914–1996) was a Bolivian politician. He served as president of Bolivia in two terms (1956-1960; 1982-1985).

16 The **Moncloa Pacts** were economic and political agreements to address inflation and unemployment, and to channel labour and popular discontent during the Spanish 'transition' towards the elections to the Cortes and were signed on 15 October 1977 at the Moncloa Palace by representatives of the main trade unions: the General Union of Workers (UGT) and the National Confederation of Workers (CNT) and the government, with the endorsement of King Juan Carlos de Borbon.

17 **Wojciech Witold Jaruzelski** (1923-2014), born into Polish nobility, was a Polish general, politician and dictator of the Polish People's Republic from 1981 to 1989. In December 1981 he imposed martial law and a series of repressive measures to crush the rise of the workers and the powerful Solidarity trade union.

The bulk of the middle classes, essentially those of the metropolises but also in the semi-colonies that have not exacerbated their crises to the extreme, are great supporters of the world front for peace and democracy. They oppose both the extreme right and the revolution, they seek stability in the face of chaos. They are staunch defenders of Contadora, of national unity in all countries, of the pacification of Colombia. They consider bourgeois parliamentarism as their natural environment, they are in favour of conciliation and for the situation to remain as it is.

6.- The inexorable reality of the economic crisis and the imperialist and capitalist offensive to overexploit the workers, regardless of the political regime, has created a front, antagonistic to the previous one, completely different: that of the masses in the struggle for their survival. A struggle that undermines and shatters the front for peace and democracy.

Unconsciously, this front of the masses in struggle has a program radically opposite to the previous front: the triumph of the struggles, the end of misery and therefore the triumph of the revolution that will expropriate the capitalists and imperialism. This front systematically destroys what the other front builds and assembles, it questions the agreements and truces that disarm the people and the democracies that overexploit workers.

From the class point of view, this front is made up of workers from all over the world, regardless of the social system or political regime under which they live, and by their allies from other social layers or sectors equally attacked by imperialism in crisis. It is not a front with one sector of the exploiters to go against another and allow exploitation to continue under “democratic” forms but a front of the exploited to eliminate exploitation.

This front does not yet express itself organically like that of the imperialists and bureaucrats. It exists in the struggles, in the guerrillas, in the mobilisations, in passive resistance. Precisely its expression at the political level is a vanguard still limited, heterogeneous and partial, clearly lagging behind its daily manifestation through the struggles.

7.- What we say is not declamatory but a reality. In Colombia or El Salvador, truces are agreed upon or proposed but significant sectors refuse to abide by them. In Bolivia, pacts and agreements are signed that the proletariat and the peasantry tear to shreds within a few days. In Nicaragua, a strong workers’ party, the Popular Action Movement (MAP), says that “Contadora seeks to liquidate the revolution through diplomatic means”. Sendero Luminoso [Shining Path] breaks out of the bourgeois-democratic framework in which the large opportunist parties want to confine it.

In South Africa, the racist government of Botha¹⁸ made a peace agreement with Mozambique in the region, and soon the black proletariat began a grandiose struggle against him, accompanied by the other racial minorities. The peasantry and agricultural proletariat of India and Brazil break the peace plans of the government and its opportunist parties.

In Lebanon, Druze and Shiite guerrillas destroy all of Israel’s pacification plans and force it to flee. In England, the mining proletariat threatens to break with its struggle all the historical pacts between the conservatives and the union bureaucracy against the British workers.

Dozens of examples demonstrate the daily clash that takes place between the two fronts, between revolution and counterrevolution with a human face.

8.- The key to all international politics is to pronounce on which front we are on, avoiding the centrist trap that we are with the exploited, but, in the face of the danger of war and Reagan’s barbarism, we are for the lesser evil. There is no middle ground. It is an all-out confrontation. The development of one front inexorably means the defeat of the other. The advance of the peace front is the liquidation of the revolution. The advance of the struggle of the masses supposes the breaking of pacts, peace, and agreements.

18 **Pieter Willem Botha** (1916–2006) was a South African politician, commonly known as “P.W.” or “die groot krokodil” (the great crocodile). He served as the last prime minister of South Africa from 1978 to 1984 and the first executive state president of South Africa from 1984 to 1989.

As continuators of revolutionary Marxism, as consistent Trotskyists, we are with the front of the exploited for the triumph of the socialist revolution, and we consider it a primary task to confront the front of the capitalist exploitation, even if it is under human and democratic clothing.

VIII. The Mass Organisations, their Leaderships and Vanguards

1.- The trade unions are the great organisers of the workers' struggles and take centre stage in place of the traditional labour, social democratic, and Stalinist parties. Although the old union apparatuses have accompanied the old workers' parties in their decline, they continue to be the point of reference for the struggles of the workers and their organisation, despite the distrust and rejection that their leadership causes.

Where great struggles of the proletariat have taken place, new mass union organisations have emerged or existing ones have been strengthened. The best examples have been the Bolivian COB [Bolivian Workers Centre] and Solidarity in Poland; in these cases, the massive nature of these centres transformed them into organs of power. Other examples, more modest but significant, are the black unions in South Africa and the revival of the CCOO [Workers' Commissions] in Spain. Something similar happens with the commissions, factory committees, and delegates coordinating committees, which are born and developed parallel to the strike process.

2.- A whole new series of phenomena has taken place in the mass movement, of transcendental importance for the development of the revolution.

In many peasant countries, such as India and Brazil, processes of peasant unionisation have been developed that quickly become a prelude to armed struggle in the countryside, since the landowning bourgeoisie does not accept unionisation, neither the peasants nor the agricultural proletarians.

In the large cities of many semi-colonial countries, neighbourhood organisations have emerged in marginal areas, controlled by the Catholic Church and Stalinism. One of the newest and most controversial phenomena is the significance of large organisations and mobilisations controlled by religion or by different Churches. The first big example was the Iranian revolution and the role of the Shiites. But they were not an exception; the experience of the Sikhs in India and the strength of Muslim currents throughout the East proved it.

There are Marxist sectors that consider that this resurgence of ideologically medieval organisations expresses the decadence of the workers' and mass movement and all its political currents. We believe, on the contrary, that the revolutionary upsurge is so powerful that the mass movement uses the organisations and leaders it has at hand. The leadership void can thus be replaced by sects, opportunistic organisations or religious currents. It is something similar to the role of the priest Gapon in Russia at the beginning of the 1905 revolution.

3.- The old traditional parties of the workers' movement are completely in crisis, although they survive due to tradition and the weight of inertia.

Social democracy has become more than ever an electoral apparatus, based on the bourgeois state apparatus and the media. The great objective of all social democratic leaderships is to enter bourgeois governments as ministers or officials. The leaders of these parties have been transformed into bourgeois statesmen who go out of their way to make plans so that their bourgeoisie wins

more than ever. Their reference to the working class is essentially electoral. Although they maintain organisations, these are to consolidate their place in the bourgeois state. The programmatic differences between a social democratic government and a conservative bourgeois government practically do not exist. Felipe¹⁹ applies a much tougher plan than the UCD²⁰ was ever able to apply. Mitterrand takes on Thatcher's entire program. Craxi²¹ attacks the sliding scale of salaries in a way that the Christian Democrats did not.

The role of the Socialist International is that of an imperialist international. The interests it defends and the policies it applies have nothing to do with reformism. They are Contadora's godfathers.

In Latin America and Africa, their relations and parties are not social-democratic, but liberal bourgeois such as the Venezuelan Democratic Action (AD),²² Argentine Radicalism, the Chilean Radical party, or the traditional Uruguayan parties.

4.- The crisis of Stalinism is much more acute than the crisis of social democracy since its relationship with imperialism is not as direct, and its place in the bourgeois state is not accepted in the same way. The crisis of Stalinism is a consequence of the world revolutionary upsurge and the crisis of Moscow Stalinism. It is the masses who turn their backs on a bureaucracy that squandered the immense capital of the October Revolution. The parties dependent on the Kremlin support the front with the Church, the US Democratic Party, and the national bourgeoisies. In its Eurocommunist version — already in crisis as a project different from that of social democracy — the communist parties are equally subsidiary to the policy of alliance with imperialism and its national bourgeoisies. The objective of one and the other, Eurocommunists and Muscovites, is the same: to be accepted by the bourgeoisie as statesmen. Thus, they entered the government in France, Panama and Bolivia, to implement the IMF's plans of misery and exploitation.

The Maoist apparatus has been destroyed as an international current. Their policy of supporting Yankee imperialism, even the most repugnant expressions at the national level, such as Pinochet and UNITA in Angola, have broken any possible attraction for the vanguards, such as the one it had in the 1960s. If they develop as national groups with influence, their autonomy from Beijing is almost total. Thanks to this, they can bring together progressive sectors of the mass movement, even if their erratic line is not reversed. However, these are exceptions, such as sectors of independent unionism in Colombia and the Nicaraguan MAP. Most of Maoism has fallen into the most abject opportunism.

5.- Vanguard sectors and the mass movement that repudiates social democracy and Stalinism, however, trust in Castroism, Sandinismo and the Salvadoran leadership as true revolutionary leaderships. They sustain this trust based on several certain facts: they led triumphant revolutions or guerrillas and were continually attacked by Yankee imperialism. We are opposed as a method to defining a political current by the struggle it leads or by who attacks it. We define it by its politics and where it leads.

Castroism and its junior partners of Sandinismo and the FMLN are part of the world front for social peace, the truce, formal democracy, the payment of the foreign debt and the fulfilment

19 **Felipe Gonzalez** (b. 1942) is a lawyer and one of Spain's most important political leaders. He was general secretary of the Spanish Socialist Workers Party (PSOE) from 1974 to 1997 and the third president of the Government of Spain since the transition, between 1982 and 1996.

20 **Union of the Democratic Centre (UCD)** was a political coalition and later a right-wing Spanish political party, led by Adolfo Suarez, who played a leading role in the "transition" following the death of the dictator Franco for the legalisation of political parties, in particular the PSOE and the PC, and elections to the Cortes. He led the Spanish government between 1977 and 1982.

21 **Benedetto "Bettino" Craxi** (1934-2000) was an Italian politician and one of the leading exponents of the Italian Socialist Party (PSI). He was Prime Minister of Italy from 1983 to 1987. Implicated in the bribery and political corruption scandals known as Tangentopoli, which first involved the leadership and officials of the Christian Democratic and Socialist parties, he fled to Tunisia in 1994, where he died in January 2000.

22 **Democratic Action (AD)** is a Venezuelan social democratic political party founded in 1941, it led the military rebellion of 1945, and together with COPEI —initially with the Democratic Republican Union (URD)— it was one of the three signatory parties of the Pact of Puntofijo in 1958, a democratic governance agreement between political parties a few months after the overthrow of the dictator Marcos Pérez Jiménez.

of all austerity plans. They practically apply this global policy in their area of influence: Central America and the Caribbean. They support Contadora, the truce and the government alongside the genocidaires in El Salvador, and the freezing of the Nicaraguan revolution.

Castro's policy is consistent in all countries of the world. It is not the extension of the world revolution, the basic principle of the conduct of a consistent internationalist. On the contrary, Fidel supports imperialist and reactionary bourgeois governments around the world, except for some of the Yankee governments, like Reagan's. He defends all acts of the Kremlin bureaucracy and considers himself inextricably linked to it. He has supported the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia and Afghanistan. He vindicates Jaruzelski's military coup. He came to support Videla²³ by mandate of the USSR and in agreement with the Argentine CP.

Castro is a great defender of King Juan Carlos, whom he considers his "friend". He supported the conservative Betancur against the guerrillas when they kidnapped the Colombian president's brother. He is an enthusiastic supporter of social democracy and supported governments such as Schmidt²⁴ in Germany and today Mitterrand in France. In Latin America, he defends the new democratic bourgeois rulers such as Alfonsín²⁵ or Siles Suazo. And today Fidel extols the memory of John Kennedy and praises the "progress of the capitalist and imperialist system".

Sandinismo and the leadership of the Salvadoran guerrilla are outstanding disciples of the Cuban leadership. Ortega²⁶ and Ungo²⁷ in unison highlight the role of the reactionary governments of Panama, Mexico, Colombia and Venezuela that make up Contadora. The Revolutionary Democratic Front (FDR)²⁸ proposes that Belisario Betancur be the mediator in the negotiation with Duarte.²⁹ The Sandinistas do not call to continue the revolution in El Salvador but to sign the imperialist peace. None has a policy of raising the masses of Guatemala, Honduras and Costa Rica to burst the rearguard of the counterrevolution.

The maximum expression of the traitorous role of Castroism, Sandinismo and the leadership of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN)³⁰ in their revolution is the total support for Contadora, that is, for the counterrevolutionary policy of the world front for peace of the imperialist bourgeoisies and the bureaucracy.

23 **Jorge Rafael Videla** (1925–2013) was the general who led the genocidal coup of March 1976 together with Admiral Massera and Brigadier Agosti. Between 1976 and 1978 he served as the de facto presidency of Argentina, of that first Military Junta. He was tried and convicted of genocide in the notorious "trial of the Juntas" in 1985.

24 **Helmut Schmidt** (1918–2015) was a German politician and member of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD), who served as the chancellor of West Germany from 1974 to 1982.

25 **Raul Alfonsín** (1927–2009) was one of the main leaders of the bourgeois Radical Civic Union (UCR). He was the president of Argentina between December 1983 and July 1989, following the military dictatorship.

26 **Jose Daniel Ortega** (b. 1945) is a former guerrilla and one of the main leaders of the Sandinista National Liberation Front (FSLN), which overthrew the dictator Somoza. He led Nicaragua from 1979 to 1990, first as coordinator (1979–1985) of the National Reconstruction Junta and then as president of Nicaragua (1985–1990). He returned to the presidency in 2007 and became an increasingly repressive dictator.

27 **Guillermo Manuel Ungo** (1931–1991) was a Salvadoran social democratic politician. He was a member of the ruling government junta from 1979 to 1980. Ungo was for a time the unofficial leader of the opposition in his capacity as president of the Revolutionary Democratic Front (FDR) alliance.

28 The Revolutionary Democratic Front (FDR) was a coalition of leftist organisations in El Salvador. It was aligned with the FMLN guerrilla movement. FDR was formed in 1980, through the merger of the Revolutionary Coordination of the Masses (CRM) and the Salvadoran Democratic Front (FDS).

29 **José Napoleón Duarte** (1925–1990) was a Salvadoran politician and President of the Republic from June 1984 to June 1989. With the support of the Reagan Administration and the CIA, his time in office took place during the worst years of the Salvadoran Civil War, which saw numerous abuses and massacres of the civilian population by the Salvadoran security forces and the death squad linked to them.

30 The **Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN)** is a political party in El Salvador. The FMLN was formed as an umbrella group in October 1980, from five leftist guerrilla organisations: the Farabundo Marti Liberation People's Forces (FPL), the People's Revolutionary Army (ERP), National Resistance (RN), the Communist Party of El Salvador (PCS), and the Revolutionary Party of the Central American Workers (PRTC). The FMLN was one of the main participants in the Salvadoran Civil War.

6.- Shameful Castroists say that what is important about Castro, Sandinismo and the leadership of the FMLN is not what they say, but what they do. And that all of them made or are making revolutions, and this defines them as revolutionaries. This difference between doing and saying in politics is a trap to hide betrayals. Speaking is the most important form of political activity. If a workers' leader who is leading a strike speaks to say that the strike must be broken and that the boss is sympathetic, he is committing a betrayal of the workers' struggle, even if he were the one who organised the strike, since he calls for trust in the enemy class. Castro, Sandinismo and the FMLN are doing the same.

7.- We are not against pacts and agreements. If for a progressive struggle to succeed, you have to make a pact with the devil, the duty of the revolutionary is to make the pact. We supported the Sandinista pacts with the Nicaraguan bourgeoisie for the struggle against Somoza. If bourgeois sectors or sectors of the Salvadoran Church supported the triumph of the guerrilla, we would not hesitate to support the agreements. Every leadership of the workers' and mass movement has the right to sign the agreements it deems necessary. When, in addition, one is at the head of a State, these agreements emerge as inevitable. Lenin signed Brest Litovsk, making great concessions to imperialism. We defend the right of the Sandinista leadership to sign Contadora; of Colombian Stalinism to sign with Betancur; and of the FMLN leadership to begin negotiations with Duarte. Castro, as the leader of the Cuban workers' state, has every right not to send a weapon or a man to fight Granada, if he cannot do so.

The crime of the Sandinistas, the FMLN leadership, and Castroism is that they call on the masses to trust the signatories of the agreements and present them as a great triumph. Betancur is praised, commended, and almost deified by the FSLN, Castro and the FMLN, as Carlos Andres Perez³¹ was before. The same about the rest of Contadora's governments: the rotten PRI [Institutional Revolutionary Party] regime in Mexico, the pro-Yankee government of Panama, and the reactionary Herrera Campins.

When it fails, as in Angola and Mozambique, to endorse pacts with the racist South African regime, without calling on the black majority to rise against Botha.

It is not a question of whether or not to sign this or that pact but rather whether to place trust in the imperialist and bourgeois governments. Sandinismo can sign Contadora, but it would have to say: We are forced to sign because Yankee imperialism threatens us with invasion, and we are weak; but we call once again for the triumph of El Salvador, of Honduras, of Guatemala; not to trust even for a moment in the governments that have forced us to sign this pact. However, they do the opposite, they paint the Contadora agreement as a triumph and call for trust in the governments that designed it. The same goes for the FMLN. They have the right to sign a truce. But it is treason to call to form a government of national unity, defend the puppet army and ultimately negotiate the victory they have achieved by force of arms.

8.- There is a global process of emergence of new leaderships and a new political vanguard.

The revolutionary upsurge is so strong that it also causes and will continue to cause ruptures and rearrangements of old organisations, even of the union bureaucracies themselves, no matter how enfeoffed they are to the state and the bourgeoisie. Let us point out as an example the English miners' union and the CCOO in Spain.

However, the most significant fact of recent years is the emergence of new political-union organisations and leaderships, such as Lula's Workers' Party (PT) and Solidarity in Poland.

A serious mistake would be made if, as the supporters of Castroism do, we confused a struggle or an organisation with the leadership. Progressive and revolutionary phenomena can be led by definitely reactionary men and institutions. The ultimate expression of this is the Church. In

31 **Carlos Andres Perez** (1922–2010), also known as CAP for its initials, was a Venezuelan politician and the president of Venezuela from March 1974 to 12 March 1979 and again from February 1989 to May 1993. He was one of the founders of Democratic Action (AD), the dominant political party in Venezuela during the second half of the twentieth century. As soon as he took office in February 1989, his measures of drastically increasing fuel and transport fares led to the insurrection known as the "Caracazo".

both Solidarity and the PT, the Catholic Church has a leading role; it has infiltrated the workers' movement to better carry out its counterrevolutionary work, for which the old Catholic unions are not suitable. Centuries of counterrevolutionary experience serve the Church to try to prevent the emergence of mass revolutionary parties, which the crisis of Stalinism makes possible. Failure to systematically denounce this leadership is as serious or more serious than not participating in these highly progressive movements and organisations.

These leaderships, as well as other fronts that are emerging (Uruguayan Broad Front, Bolivian UDP [Democratic and Popular Union], Peruvian United Left, Chilean MDP [People's Democratic Movement]), are undoubtedly on the counterrevolutionary front for social peace and the truce. This does not mean that they do not give rise to unitary mobilisations and new organisations that surpass the old ones.

9.- In recent times we have seen the emergence, at a vanguard level and in very few countries, of new and old organisations that refuse to abandon the fight for the triumph of the revolution. Sectors of the Salvadoran, Peruvian, and Colombian guerrillas, with all their possible mistakes, are in that line. The same happens with the spontaneous emergence of thousands and thousands of union activists, as in Italy. The call of all traditional leaderships to pay the debt, to the implementation of plans of misery, quickly exposes their role. Because of this, it is easier every day for the best fighters to draw conclusions. The future of the world revolution depends on unity with these sectors and their organisations.

IX. The Building of a Revolutionary Mass International

1.- We face the task of building a revolutionary mass international in objective revolutionary economic and social conditions at a global level, that is, more than ripe. Added to them is a highly contradictory subjective condition. Playing in favour of building the International is the crisis of the counterrevolutionary political and union apparatuses of the mass movement, with its two highly progressive manifestations: the emergence of new mass organisations or the progressive course of some old organisations; and the emergence of autonomous vanguard currents in favour of an uncompromising struggle and enemies of class conciliation. Against this is the fact that, because of the weight of inertia, the old counterrevolutionary apparatuses continue to control the mass movement.

2.- The situation of the Trotskyist movement, which in no country has mass weight, is also contradictory. Our current, which is the strongest in Latin America and possibly the most dynamic in the United States — although in only one region — and as a whole is the most dynamic and on the rise, is very weak in Europe and non-existent in the rest of the world. The other currents, all of them in crisis, have capitulated either to some counterrevolutionary apparatus (the SWP to Castroism, Lambertism to social democracy), or, without being agents of any bureaucracy, maintain a revisionist course of political capitulation to Castroism, Sandinismo and the official leadership of the FMLN (Mandel's USec).

3.- Our great weakness prevents us from filling the leadership void and reaffirms our old thesis that the revolutionary mass International will not be built through a linear path of growth of our current. It will emerge from the fusion of our current with tendencies and organisations that break on the left with the counterrevolutionary apparatuses. The sector absolutely privileged for this task is the autonomous vanguard currents that are against class conciliation. Our strategy in the face of these currents is that of the revolutionary united front. (This revolutionary united front is not the one advocated by Mandel, which included fighters in general, even those who followed a counter-revolutionary policy of class collaboration, like that of Otelo Saraiva de Carvalho³² in Portugal).

4.- The revolutionary united front consists of achieving political-organisational agreements based on common programmatic points, which allow us to take part jointly in the processes of the class struggle and the struggle for the leadership of the mass movement. The revolutionary united front that we promote is a transitional step towards a revolutionary mass party.

5.- This strategy for building the revolutionary mass International is not and cannot be propagandistic. We are not nor will we be advisors of these autonomous currents of the vanguard. Our political relationship with them will be established and consolidated in a fraternal common action in the class struggle and the dispute for the leadership of the mass movement against the

³² **Otelo Saraiva de Carvalho**, (1936–2021) was a Portuguese military officer and one of the strategists of the Carnation Revolution. In the 1980s he was the leader of the April 25 Popular Forces, a far-left terrorist organisation that operated in Portugal between 1980 and 1987 and was responsible for dozens of attacks and nineteen homicides.

counterrevolutionary apparatuses. This means that our sections will act in the mass organisations, whether progressive or reactionary.

Without abandoning this fundamental principle, we must orient our activity towards the new mass organisations that emerge or the old ones that adopt a progressive course: the Brazilian CUT [Unified Workers' Central], Polish Solidarity, Spanish CCOO, and so on. This is strategic. Our permanence in the old reactionary mass organisations, on the other hand, is tactical, waiting for them to either adopt a progressive course or be overtaken by a new organisation.

6.- Guerrilla armies are also new progressive mass organisations. But they are not workers' organisations but rather petty-bourgeois ones. This class character, its military structure and, above all, its leadership implant within it a totalitarian regime, opposed to the workers' democracy that, to a greater or lesser extent, is imposed in CCOO, Solidarity, the CUT and the independent unionism of Colombia.

This reality prevents us from participating as a political current within the guerrilla armies. Faced with them, our attitude is one of support for the mass struggle that they lead while we raise a policy so that they become allies of the revolutionary proletariat and of political support for the autonomous vanguard currents that are generated within them.

This does not mean we discard the hypothesis, hitherto theoretical, that the crisis of the apparatus and the pressure of the mass movement will impose internal democracy on these movements. In this case, we would have to redefine our relationship with them.

7.- The fact that the autonomous vanguard currents that break with the counterrevolutionary apparatuses are until now national phenomena and that they exist in a few countries indicates that there is as yet no global or international current that can converge with us in the building of the International. Therefore, the building of the mass International currently involves the building of national workers' and revolutionary mass parties. These parties will probably not be Trotskyists, nor will we Trotskyists be a majority within them, except in exceptional circumstances. They will be Trotskyising parties, that is, they tend towards Trotskyism but have not yet reached it.

8.- Faced with this great task, our policy towards the rest of the Trotskyist movement takes a backseat. That does not mean that we deny all importance since there are hundreds if not thousands of cadres educated in Trotskyism who could be a valuable contribution to the building of the International.

The only current of the Trotskyist movement that may have a progressive evolution is Mandelism since it is not linked to any international or national bureaucratic apparatus. But it is a current that, because of the student and intellectual nature of its leadership, suffers from the disease of impressionism. This has led it to systematically capitulate to the counterrevolutionary leaderships that led revolutions or great struggles (Tito, Mao, Castro, Ho Chi Minh, the Sandinistas, the official leadership of the FMLN). This is why it is revisionist since, claiming to be Trotskyist, it yields to pressure from sectors that are mortal enemies of our movement.

We must carefully follow its evolution, to see whether, under the impact of the workers' uprising, especially the European one, it adopts a progressive course.

9.- Our program for the building of the mass International is a minimal revolutionary program to oppose the counterrevolutionary program of the holy alliance of imperialism, the bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy of "peace between the exploiters and the exploited". Its entire axis is the class struggle, the relentless struggle and until the final triumph of the exploited from all over the world over the exploiters and privileged bureaucrats from all over the world, first of all, their master and lord, Yankee imperialism. It is a program for the triumph of the revolution, on a national, international and global scale. It is minimal because it is not the entire Trotskyist program, but rather a few points that summarise the objectives — often unconscious — of the revolutionary masses in the current stage of the world revolution. For this very reason, it is the program to forge the revolutionary united front with the autonomous vanguard currents that are beginning to be conscious of these objectives and propose to lead the masses until they conquer them.

10.- This is our minimal revolutionary program:

1) We fight for proletarian internationalism. Today, this means supporting all workers', peasants' and popular struggles against imperialism, the bourgeoisie, and the bureaucracy, whatever the political regime they face, both in the workers' states and in the capitalist countries and whatever leadership they circumstantially have. We support Solidarity against Jaruzelski; the FMLN against Napoleon Duarte and his army; Sendero Luminoso against Belaunde Terry;³³ the COB against Siles; the guerrillas and the Colombian independent unionism against Betancur; ETA and the Spanish workers against Felipe and the King; the Argentine workers against Alfonsín and the union bureaucrats; the black guerrillas against South Africa and the pacts signed with it by the Stalinist-bourgeois governments of Angola and Mozambique; the IRA and the English miners against Thatcher; the Palestinians and the Lebanese militias against Israel; independent Nicaragua against imperialism and its counterrevolutionary guerrilla and the Nicaraguan workers and peasants against the landowners and the imperialist and "national" industrial bosses; etc.

This support is concentrated in global campaigns for the triumph of the revolution in the fundamental centres of the global class struggle. Specifically, our central campaign around the world is to support the Salvadoran guerrilla and workers' movement to defeat the genocidal dictatorship, annihilating its puppet army.

2.- We fight for class politics, independent of bourgeois parties and governments. We call not to trust the bourgeoisie, nor to support it. We oppose and denounce all kinds of political fronts with it. We accuse of being agents of the bourgeoisie and imperialism those who call on the masses to trust in bourgeois governments, as is the case in Colombia where even so-called Trotskyists call for trust in Betancur and are part of the governmental Peace Commission that agrees and supervises the disarmament of the guerrillas. We clearly tell the masses that the mortal enemy they face are the bourgeois regimes and governments since they are the ones who exercise power and from there defend the world imperialist-capitalist system, of which they are representatives in each country.

3.- We oppose and denounce the secret diplomacy of the imperialist and bourgeois governments. We call on the masses to never trust in this secret diplomacy; not to accept the pacts that they sign or promote; to demand that their traitorous leaderships make public everything that is discussed with the class enemy and that they not sign anything in secret and without prior democratic consultation with the workers and the people.

4.- The armed forces and the police are tools of the capitalists. They are mortal enemies of the workers and the exploited masses. They should never be trusted, praised, or the possibility of their reform raised. The goal of the proletarians and the exploited of the world is to destroy them since they are the backbone of the exploitative capitalist state.

5.- We fight for the independence of unions from the state. Not only of the bourgeois state but, in the best Leninist tradition, also of the workers' state. The working class has the right to organise itself however it wishes to defend its living and working conditions. This principle could only be revised — and this hypothetically — if the working class were to take power in a country of high economic development, which could guarantee a very high standard of living to the population the day after the revolution.

6.- We fight for workers' democracy and democracy in general in all countries. We want to destroy the single-party system and police control over the population that rules in all existing workers' states. The workers and the masses in general organise themselves into as many parties as they want and with the program they want. The broadest democratic rights for workers are an untouchable principle, whatever the circumstances. Democracy for all the people, including the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie, as guaranteed by the regime of Lenin and Trotsky in Russia, can only be limited or annulled in extremely critical conditions, of civil or anti-imperialist war, that is, as long as they take up arms against the workers' government or collaborate in a counterrevolutionary aggression of imperialism.

³³ **Fernando Belaúnde Terry** (1912–2002) was a Peruvian politician who twice served as President of Peru (1963–1968 and 1980–1985). Deposed by a military coup in 1968, he was re-elected in 1980 after twelve years of military rule.

In capitalist countries, the struggle for workers' democracy is expressed in the struggle for union democracy, against the millionaire and gangster-like bureaucracies, for mass meetings and representatives democratically elected by the ranks as the highest leadership of the unions, for free membership to the unions, for the right of workers to organise in as many unions and workers' federations as they wish — although we will propose single unions per industrial branch and the single workers' confederation at the national level — for the proportional representation of all tendencies in the union leaderships, etc.

7.- All the previous points are summarised in the Marxist maxim: "The emancipation of the working class must be the work of the working class itself". The struggle of the IWL is for the workers and the exploited masses to fight, organise, take power and govern as they democratically decide. We are against any policy and organisation that puts the single party, the guerrilla "commanders", the "socialist" state, and so on, above the masses. We blindly trust our class. If it mobilises and organises itself, it will be the great architect of the world socialist revolution; it will put an end to the exploitation of man by man, to wars, to hunger, to bloody repressions, to the lack of culture and brutalization caused by exploitation, religious superstition, to the lack of scientific and artistic freedom... We do not believe in infallible single parties, in commanders, nor in states that, by regimenting the masses and annihilating all struggle and democratic organisation, will lead humanity towards socialism. We do not call on the masses to play a passive role, waiting for orders from parties, commanders and states. We encourage the self-determination of the masses to make the revolution. Either this is done or it will be defeated, although commanders, states and parties lead some struggles and obtain some partial victories.

11.- While the building of the revolutionary mass International today involves the building of national revolutionary mass workers' parties, through the revolutionary united front with the autonomous vanguard currents, this international program must be translated into a specific program in each country. We may create a revolutionary united front in a country with vanguard currents that do not agree on any of these points but as long as we agree on the implementation of this program for the revolution in that country. In Colombia, there can be no revolutionary united front that is not based on the struggle and denunciation of the Betancur government, its "Peace Commission" and all those who make it up. There cannot be one in Central America if there is no agreement to denounce and fight against Contadora, the "government of wide participation" proposed by the official leadership of the FMLN for El Salvador, etc., and against all those who defend these counterrevolutionary policies.