

October, 2000

Rs. 20/-

Volume IV, No.1

Workers of the world, unite!

UNITY & STRUGGLE

Organ of the International Conference of Marxist-Leninist Parties and Organisations

UNITE ET LUTTE

Organe de la Conference Internationale de Partis et Organisations Marxistes-Leninistes

UNIDAD Y LUCHA

Organo de la Conferencia Internacional de Partidos y Organizaciones Marxista-Leninistas

CONTENTS

- For peace in Colombia and the well being of the people,
dialogue with broad popular participation
Communist Party of Colombia (M-L).....1
- Popular uprising in January in Ecuador
Marxist-Leninist Communist Party of Ecuador.....12
- New revelations about the activities and
destruction of the GDR section of the
Communist Party of Germany/ML (KPD/ML) (II)
Communist Party of Germany (KPD).....23
- "Precise understanding of a given situation
and how not to run and hide behind theory"
Labour Party of Iran.....38
- Globalisation, frontiers, uneven development
Communist Organisation October of Spain.....43
- Combining legal and illegal work:
One of the fundamental questions of our party
Revolutionary Communist Party of Turkey(TDKP).....49

COLOMBIA

FOR PEACE IN COLOMBIA AND THE WELL BEING OF THE PEOPLE, DIALOGUE WITH BROAD POPULAR PARTICIPATION.

The question of peace nowadays in any part of the world is a complicated one. The case of Colombia is not an exception, both because it is a long-standing problem of generalised violence perpetrated by the authorities and paramilitary organisations, and the popular response to it, under the influence of various factors, as well as the depth of this process that has developed for about two centuries, especially during the last 50 years.

The long and occasionally heated debate over the causes of violence in Colombia has contributed to the political and social national historiography with a large amount of materials in the form of essays, stories, novels, poetry, tales etc. The two main tendencies in world thinking are expressed in them; in essence both ways of thinking manifest themselves in the way of analysing and studying the reality of our country:

- One tendency remains on the surface of the facts and phenomena, studies facts isolated, therefore the sources of violence during one particular historical period are necessarily different from those of other periods. The linkage between various historical facts is considered purely formally or mechanically. This way it is impossible to understand that these expressions of violence have experienced a restless process of accumulation that affects that whole society and has determined the character of its historical development.

- The other tendency leads the course of scientific analysis right to the roots of the economic, political, social, ideological, cultural, military phenomena, studies them in the concrete national and international historical context, points to their interrelation shown in the national historical process and to the relevance of these factors and the economic, political, ideological, social, military, etc. interests of the various social classes, in particular the economic interests.

It is evident; by dismembering History one breaks up the unity of the Colombian national legacy which, with its richness, has built up its personality and specific features as a nation which have influenced its social classes. Without such a point of view, which is dynamic and dialectical, of the class forces that emerged with the structure of society;

without a dialectical-materialist conception, it is very easy to get lost in the immense sea of historical events, thus failing to disentangle the profound causes and course of the social development.

It is therefore an interplay of identities and the class struggle, the content and form that this struggle adopts, that constitutes the engine of social development. The History of societies based on class antagonism is the History of the class struggle. The History of Colombia is not an exception to this law of social development, on the contrary it has become a tragic expression of it.

Class struggle, the engine of development

But the class struggle is waged in all fields of social life: in economics, politics, culture, ideology, military, etc. Each aspect of this class struggle adopts a particular form.

The economic struggle has confronted the classes due to gross disproportions in the appropriation, distribution and the enjoyment of material goods produced by society or given by nature, until nowadays it reaches a point where millions of dispossessed starve, what is now shamefully called absolute poverty, a point where the person actually earns much less than is necessary to survive.

There is no voluntarism in this. The unavoidable process of the economic structure of society inherits the contradictions of the society that preceded it. Today's Colombia, a capitalist society, backward and dependent on U.S. imperialism, develops and confirms the new features that give identity to the bourgeoisie, the only beneficiary of the new privileges yielded by the new type of exploitation of man by man, wage slavery.

The class struggle also develops in the political sphere. The struggle for citizens' rights, for a decent life, for a secure life, in short, for all the Human Rights. The essence of the matter is that in Colombia these rights virtually do not exist.

The International Community is an irreplaceable witness to the brutal fascist aberrations of "Colombian democracy": this is a fact decisive for the political confrontation, the struggle of ideas and programs for change which have been replaced by State political violence, which is impossible to deny. Official violence in all fields of political life has given rise to the popular armed response since the people were left without any other choice in order to defend their rights.

The struggle for civil rights - still waged at the level of the Constitution and laws - is criminalised since it has become a crime for which

many have been jailed or even paid with their lives. Although it might sound surprising to some the era of McCarthyism is still in force in Colombia. The democratic regime has been dismantled, it has been transformed into a kind of militarised civil dictatorship. The State of Laws has been replaced by a Terrorist State. The people have been left without an alternative; thus the guerrilla war emerged, mainly in the countryside. First there appeared armed resistance during the dictatorship of the 1940-50s and subsequently it adopted the form of guerrilla warfare for political power.

The war in the history of Colombia

However, this war is in fact a continuation of the struggle for independence. Here we would like to draw the attention of the reader to the words of the Colombian writer, Professor Arturo Alape in his work "Peace, Violence: exceptional witnesses": "It is necessary to recall that shortly after the cry of Independence in 1810, the criollo notables instigated a long civil war to secure their power. This war waged under the guise of sophisticated arguments, of Federalists against Centralists, of slanders which are always used against an enemy, all ended up on the Spanish gallows of 1816, as a result of the lack of vision of the leaders of the first republic. Shortly after, in 1826, when the Colombian armies returned from Peru and Bolivia (...) the conflict broke out and continued for the whole century. In 1828 Obando and Lopez rebelled in the Cauca, in 1829 Cordoba rebelled in Antioquia, in 1830 after endless revolts the Ecuadorian and Venezuelan oligarchies dissolved Great Colombia by assassinating Sucre and carrying out coups d'etat which became a civil war in Colombia (...)" (The assassination of General Sucre is a controversial topic; we do not agree with the opinion of Professor Alape.)

To the wars among fractions described above, to what may be called a systematic war, one must add other violent actions (of pathetic dimensions), that apparently are not connected with each other; but come from the same causes, like the brutal assassination of the Liberator Simon Bolivar on a September night of 1828, the assassination of Marshal Sucre, the assassination of the liberal leader Rafael Uribe on the stairs of the National Capitol in 1914, the massacre of thousands of banana workers, thus inaugurating a new method to resolve labour and social conflicts through assassinations and massacres, which remains today the weapon of choice in the hands of the capitalists and their State. The popular leader Jorge Elieser Gaitan was assassinated on April 19, 1948, at a time when the IX Pan-American Conference, the predecessor of the OAS, was be-

ing held in Bogota; then comes the assassination of Luis Carlos Galan Sarmiento, liberal presidential candidate, a fighter against the corruption fostered by the bourgeois parties and the State. All these assassinations and many more, too many to enumerate here, were for political reasons. This is the political assassination, selective and massive, made into an instrument, a preferred argument, to resolve political, labour, social and economic conflicts.

From 1810 on the internal armed conflict and the political violence that manifested themselves in different ways developed further during the rest of the XIX century. The War of a Thousand Days crossed the XIX century. This is simply to recognise a historical truth.

Many wars took place in the XIX century: in 1828, 1830, 1832, 1839, 1841, 1851, 1854, 1859, 1867, 1880, 1895, 1899. These are only expressions of how painful and full of sufferings were the last 90 years of the XIX century. The people suffered the destructive moral and material burdens inflicted by a civil war, a war that was not meant to defend their interests but was inspired, organised by the ruling classes who were the only ones who profited from it. These wars were no more than blind and miserable disputes for political power and material wealth, the Colombian soil, seas, rivers and skies. Many historians claim that between 1863 and 1884 there took place more than fifty wars instigated by heroes of the war of independence and their successors, who became kings of small Sovereign States that emerged as a result of the dismembering of the Motherland.

The new century brought new wars, with no perspective of peaceful solution. Our history is full of acts of political barbarism such as the massacre of banana workers, the massacres during the war of resistance between 1946 and 1957. During this period more than half a million were murdered by a criminal and intolerant government.

With the emergence of two political parties of the ruling classes - Liberal and Conservative Parties - new political conflicts arose, the poor masses, in particular the peasantry, became cannon fodder, not knowing the actual reason why they were giving their lives.

It is necessary to draw the attention of the reader to these historical considerations, because many still believe that violence in Colombia dates only from the assassination of Gaitan on April 9, 1948.

It should be noted that violence during the last 50 years has adopted different forms according to the character of the classes and the class struggle in the society of the second half of the XX century. In the previous stages of historical development, the confrontation involved feudal

forces and those who defended the remnants of feudalism, the Conservatives, on the one hand, and the nascent bourgeois forces which pushed forward the process of capitalist development, the Liberals, on the other hand. The most prominent contradictions developed between the landowners and the bourgeoisie, and they were the main beneficiaries and protagonists.

Nowadays the main conflict is between the rich, the ruling sector of society concentrated in one faction, regardless of the two political parties of the oligarchy that may represent them, and the poor, who may or may not be affiliated to these same political parties. Therefore Gaitan insisted that hunger and malaria were neither Liberal nor Conservative, they struck mainly the poor who are unprotected from these plagues for lack both of their own resources and the protection of the State.

Almost two centuries of wars and all forms of political violence influence the idiosyncrasy and the conception of society and life of those who control the functioning of the State and society; the idiosyncrasy and the conception based on state violence as a system of government and a method to resolve social conflicts.

The persistence of wars in the historical development of our nation is fundamental to the establishment of the social-economic formation. Colombian society was constructed through wars that were provoked and supported by the ruling classes. The economic, political and juridical architecture of Colombia is determined by these facts.

The political constitution and war

There is no doubt that the violent character of the class struggle gave rise to two fundamental elements: War and the National Constitution. Therefore the History of Colombia, more than that of other peoples, is plagued by wars to impose a new Constitution, or a Constitution leads to the outbreak of a war, or one that would institutionalise ad-hoc the interests of the victorious class.

Let us cite again Professor Alape: "Such are the antecedents that give birth to the XXth century. Violence had become fundamental for any political process during the first century of the republic. The system of accumulation and reproduction of capital, the system of ownership of land were established through violence. The Colombian legislation was created through violence. In fact the Constitutions of 1821, 1830, 1832, 1843, 1858, 1863 and 1886 were born and created new laws in the light of civil wars". Throughout the republican history of Colombia the so-called Fundamental Law has been used to institutionalise the most di-

verse forms of economic, political, social, ideological and military violence.

State and violence

The present State of Colombia favours the interests of those who hold power which is materialised in its institutions. The executive, judicial and legislative branches act jointly according to this principle of capitalist society. And when the movements and organisations of the workers face the injustices of this social order by making use of the rights granted by the Constitution and the Laws, demanding a solution to the grave problems that have afflicted them for centuries, the government resorts to the law, the military, the police in order to suppress by means of institutionalised violence any manifestation of discontent.

The bourgeoisie, inspired by their mentors, the CIA and the Pentagon, has found ways of concealing their responsibilities for the most barbarous expressions of this Dirty War. In the middle of the 1980s the authorities, jointly with the chiefs of the drug traffic and some representatives of other sections of capital, created fascist bands of paramilitary. They have become in the hands of the bourgeoisie a dreadful and bloody weapon to brutalise the civil population in the cities and in the countryside, combining mass murders with selective assassination of worker, popular, progressive, democratic and revolutionary leaders.

These brutal actions have been accomplished by means of horrifying methods of extermination together with the government's armed forces, police and other bodies of repression of the State. In some cases these crimes have been falsely attributed to the guerrillas even when evidence points flagrantly to the real perpetrators. When this happens the authorities always find a scapegoat, who is accused of the crimes so that "the State institutions (the Government, the Armed Forces and the Police) can be excluded from any responsibility and the reputation of the State remains clean". However lately these institutions openly admit to committing atrocities, threatening people and organisations with violent actions.

These organisations of criminals and assassins, supported and assisted by the State, have developed and extended their criminal influence over vast areas of the national territory. These elements undertake a campaign of mass terror with the co-operation of the State which turns a blind eye to these crimes. An increasing number of people have been affected by this violence over the past years. Over a million people, mainly peasants have been forced to flee their homes and the land where they

were born and always lived because of the terror of the paramilitary. Naturally for these hundreds of thousands of terrified families the State has no solution. Silently, the State has declared itself incapable of dealing with this situation. On the contrary everybody knows who is really responsible and the supporter of this fascist monster.

People are increasingly conscious about the necessity of eradicating this phenomenon in order to achieve peace in Colombia. However some official and non-official spokesmen grant a status of a political force to these paramilitary organisations, and the status of political leaders to elements like Carlos Castao, the "great general" of the Self-Defence Units of Colombia and the "commander in chief" of the massacres of Cordoba, Uraba and other regions of our country. This becomes understandable when the Supreme Court declared constitutional the law that legalised CONVIVIR, a paramilitary organisation created by the former liberal-fascist governor of Antioquia, Uribe Velez, a well-known instigator of the paramilitary movement in his region and the country and a prospective bourgeois presidential candidate in future elections.

The regime, the crisis of the system and peace

The economic structure of the country and the model of development assumed in the Constitution and the Colombian Laws embody the unjust privileges of the bourgeoisie and foreign multinationals which inflict on the Colombian workers a cruel regime of exploitation, with no legal and peaceful way to transform this system. On the contrary, as the crisis of capitalism deepens and the destructive results of neo-liberalism are felt more acutely, the possibilities of protest have become more and more restricted. The legislative and judicial branches of power complete the iron belt that strangles the people of Colombia.

Colombia is at a crucial point of the crisis

Today's critical situation manifests itself through the deepening of contradictions between the vast majority of Colombians and the ruling castes; through the deep crisis of the State and all its institutions, the erosion of a political system that is curtailing genuine democratic liberties. The bourgeoisie proposes two models of development, on the one hand certain sectors of the ruling classes defend the old State of traditional democracy, shut off and exclusive. On the other hand those who appeal for "modernisation", a superficial political reform or change a la Pastrana, which is a greater push for neo-liberalism. Both models are bourgeois, pro-imperialist, conservative in essence, never meant to favour the interests of the people.

As a result, the insurgency has become an expression of popular power and a real alternative for the people, a perspective for transformation of the reality of the country.

Today's political landscape is not very promising as a result of the factors mentioned above, the policies of the present government and the false opposition of the Liberal Party. The further application of the policies of neo-liberalism will increase unemployment, further reduce wages, further spread poverty and misery, since, as always, the burdens of the economic crisis fall on the toiling masses.

Therefore the Colombian people, justly, is exercising its right to rebellion and to resort to various forms of protest and struggle.

Thus, a few months after Pastrana took office the labour and trade union movement went out to the streets, held a three-week long nationwide general strike that involved almost half million state service workers and employees with solidarity from other popular sectors. This Government which talks so much about peace responded to the popular protests with repression and a blunt denial of all the demands put forward by the movement. However this movement succeeded in curbing the arrogance of the Government inspired by the IMF and the financial institutions of imperialism.

The growing actions and military capacity of the popular armed movement has become evident in the eyes of the whole world. The insurgency has inflicted important defeats on the Police and the Armed Forces. These institutions are undergoing a crisis of credibility in the eyes of the oligarchic classes that they defend.

The government, involved in trying to suppress the revolutionary war and to win the masses to its side in case it cannot achieve its military objectives, on behalf of the oligarchy and imperialism has proposed a peace that is more a hollow political gesture than a clear program of action to achieve a long-awaited goal. The Government is in reality aiming at dissolving and disarming the guerrilla or that the latter give up its objectives of struggle for popular power. Therefore the response of the insurgency should be to make clear its political objectives and content without giving up the revolutionary military struggle.

It is true that Pastrana met with Commanders Manuel Marulanda and Brice-o of the FARC (Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia) shortly before he became president, that he approved the demilitarisation of five municipalities as demanded by this guerrilla organisation, and that he participated in arranging talks set for January 7, 1999, that he blessed the Accords of Maguncia and agreed, when he was in office, to

hold a National Convention as proposed by the ELN (National Liberation Army), which have no precedents in recent history; he has referred in a positive tone to the statements made by comrade Francisco Caraballo about the positions of the Communist Party of Colombia Marxist-Leninist and the Popular Army of Liberation as leader and public spokesman of these organisations. But we all know well where this limited flexibility of the Government leads in reality, as the military pressure on the regions controlled by the insurgency has not eased.

A revolutionary response to the question of peace

From the point of view of the struggle for popular power and socialism, of the struggle for new political, economic and social demands to improve the situation of the masses and to create better subjective conditions for the revolutionary struggle, the Communist Party of Colombia (Marxist-Leninist) and the Popular Army of Liberation (EPL) have proposed our conception for the Dialogue for Peace.

We understand it as a great political debate on a national scale among different sectors of society and we reiterate our resolve to participate in a process of Dialogue that has as its main protagonist the broad working masses of the city and the countryside.

We appreciate the courage and achievements of those non-governmental civil organisations for Human Rights, some of whom have paid with their lives and have implemented many initiatives for peace and have helped to ease the atmosphere of tension created by the state and paramilitary violence. These organisations have also become a target of official and paramilitary barbarism. The main problem here is that some of these organisations, despite their intentions and desires, do not take account of the economic interests of capital that are the genuine cause of the present conflict, thus leaving room for the so-called "passive neutrality" that eventually assists the Government in labelling the guerrilla organisations as belligerent and violent. Eventually some of these organisations have attacked the popular insurgency in order to secure their liberty and their lives.

We are in favour of establishing joint proposals with the other organisations of the Guerrilla Coordinating body Simon Bolivar. We believe it is useful and necessary for the revolutionary process to elaborate a Joint Proposal, as took place in Caracas and Tlaxcala in 1991-1992. The political debate that we propose should make room for unity and communication among all parties interested in peace with social justice that will open the way to a New Colombia. We observe that important

points of identity with the proposals and some processes of dialogue have begun.

It is clear enough - as corroborated by a long History of violence - that the possibility of achieving a political solution to the Internal Conflict of Colombia is the main responsibility of the ruling class, of its political parties and its State. There is not other way: implement real changes that will solve the causes that gave rise to the political, economic, social, military, etc. conflict; another important point is that in this process there should be no intervention of the US Government and State which should respect the independent decisions of Colombians.

The correct political direction would create the necessary conditions for a secure peaceful process, without pressure and threats, a dialogue that would place at the centre the great majorities of the working class and the people with the participation of the revolutionary and progressive forces, whether armed or unarmed. Our proposal for Dialogue: A feasible proposal towards an open dialogue should be enriched by broad debates in which the people should clearly express what they need, what they want, and how to achieve them.

For our part for the plan of great transformations, we propose to consider the following topics:

1. SOVEREIGNTY:

- Independence and self-determination in relations with other States, without forbidden areas and with the strict fulfilment of the principle of equal relations.
- The cancellation of the external debt.
- The revision of all treaties and obligations related to the protection of our natural resources.
- The examination, change and abolition of economic and military accords harmful to the nation.

2. DEMOCRACY:

In the framework of the struggle for a democratic and anti-imperialist government we propose:

- Genuine democratic changes in the structure of the State.
- Democratic liberties which would guarantee the participation of citizens in the solution of the problems of the country, the right to life and the effective respect by the State of the human rights of the people.
- The abolition of paramilitary groups.
- Substantial changes in the system of justice and its application, beginning with the abolition of faceless judges.
- Freedom for all political prisoners.

3. SOCIAL JUSTICE:

- Should be based on profound changes in the economy of the country with regard to the appropriation and distribution of goods.

- Neo-liberalism should be abolished and the economy should be reorganized emphasising development with social welfare, without the interference of the IMF, the World Bank and the national and foreign monopolies.

- National industry should be stimulated and production should benefit the majority.

- Integral urban reform and agrarian reform.

- Liquidation of drug trafficking according to the criteria of national sovereignty and the substitution of cultivation based on social investment.

Moreover, we point to the validity of the following criteria related to the dialogue:

1. Peace should be based on the struggle for a new State and a new society, on the democratic transformation of the State and the society and in the improvement of the conditions of life and labour for the majority.

2. The decision to dialogue in the middle of the confrontation, without preconditions and openly.

3. To build the conditions that would favour the development of the broadest dialogue. The dialogue should become a great national debate; this way it would be possible to elect representatives of the regional and local masses to the dialogue.

4. The active and permanent participation of the different strata of our society. The people should democratically elect their representatives to the negotiating table with the national government; in this way representatives would be elected to regional and local negotiations.

5. The definition of an integral process of construction of peace.

6. The elaboration of an open agenda.

7. The State should protect the political rights of its citizens.

8. Paramilitary groups will not be recognised.

9. The international participation, without any interference in the internal affairs of Colombia. In this respect we are against the participation in the dialogue of institutions, governments or individuals involved in the dirty war in Colombia. In this sense we are opposed to the participation of the U.S. government in the dialogues.

February 1999

*Communist Party of Colombia (Marxist-Leninist)
Popular Army of Liberation (EPL)*

ECUADOR

POPULAR UPRISING IN JANUARY IN ECUADOR

When the workers and the people of Ecuador, through their struggle and combat in the streets rid themselves at Bucaram of the president of the republic in February 1997, we can say that this event marked in the clearest form that a period of upsurge in the struggle of the masses was on the agenda.

In fact, during the interim government of Fabian Alarcon the struggle of the people and of the various social sectors of the country showed its persistence, continuity and movement upwards. The sharpening of economic, political and social crisis; the pressure from bourgeois economic groups to take forward the implementation of neoliberal policies, enabled sectors that in the past had been passive to involve themselves in protest, in this way, becoming agents in the social struggle so that the so-called "modernisation of the state", which hid the real aims of privatising state industries in the strategic sectors of the economy of the country, could not be carried out. In this context one must note also the radicalisation of the people's forms of struggle, particularly among the youth.

When Mahuad took power in August 1998, despite the intense propaganda aimed at pacifying people's demands, the movement of the masses was not only maintained but actually advanced. After 45 days of government, Mahuad had to face the first general strike of workers, peasants, teachers, small traders, and students, all of whom rejected the economic package launched in September.

Always, when faced with protest, the government's answer was repression, this time costing 11 lives, the wounding of dozens of people and the imprisonment of about a thousand. Among the 11 victimised comrades, the trade unionist Saul Canar, and comrades Jaime Hurtado, Pablo Tapia and Wellington Burja were murdered.

March and July 1999 constituted two peaks of popular struggle. The terrible conditions of life of the working masses deteriorated even more, through a conjunction of economic measures which consisted of, among other things, the withholding of the bank savings of millions of Ecuadorians in March; and a rise in the price of food in July, which unleashed important mobilisations. On two occasions the answer was the popular uprising which paralysed the country for several days. In spite of the brutal repression and the state of emergency declared by the government the peoples of Ecuador seized the country; the government had to

retreat, thus allowing the people to gain important victories in relation to their demands, and in political and organisational spheres.

Those were struggles which began and developed through the demands of the masses but in doing so these militants set before themselves the aim of the overthrow of the president Mahuad, without, however, being able to achieve this. In March the Patriotic Front was re-activated and for the first time they took place the People's Congress which gathered together all the organisations which had taken part in the struggle.

Social democracy represented in the National Congress by the Democratic Left parties and Pachakutik, on two occasions held out means of escape to the tottering government. Thus, political negotiation saved Mahuad in exchange for him conceding a few points of the programme demanded by the popular sectors. Notwithstanding this, the government remained weak as did all the bourgeois institutions, and so the morale of the people was raised: since they had the conviction that they would be able to corner Mahuad and given the next opportunity, through their own struggle they would be able to get rid of him.

In March, our party in making an analysis of these successes, came to the conclusion that a flame continues to burn, which at any moment could burst into a fire.

A society in crisis

Our people have been involved during these months in constant and important struggles, in response to the accelerated worsening of the conditions of life, to the government's submission to the demands of the IMF and its neo-liberal policies, to the political interference of North American imperialism and its attempts to assimilate us like a colony, and to the scandalous corruption to be found in every branch of the regime.

And it cannot be otherwise since, during Mahuad's government wages were reduced, in their buying capacity by 170 per cent; the sucre was devalued by 450 per cent; in less than a year 300 thousand employees lost their jobs from the state and private sectors, filling the queues of the unemployed who in total now number 675 thousand (on top of which there are 1,100 thousand under-employed), and we can see thus that scarcely 27 per cent of the labour force are fully employed. To the foregoing we can add an annual rate of inflation above 60 per cent.

In 1998 the difference in income between the five per cent poorest and the five per cent richest was a factor of 109, while in 1999 this figure rose to 203; of the 12 million inhabitants, 7,700 thousand people could not supply their daily necessities of food, education and health. Out of this population sunk in poverty, 1,629 thousand are native. Of those who

survives in poverty, the poorest 10 per cent is made up of 240 thousand households who receive hardly 0.8 per cent of the national income with an average of 17.84 US dollars per month per household. According to official data, the basic monthly household basket of goods costs 180 US dollars, and the poverty line basket costs 136 US dollars, but the wages of a worker are just 47 dollars a month.

While these conditions of life are strangling the working masses the financial bourgeoisie has benefited with three billion dollars to aid its business; it has carried out the robbery of the century, stealing the deposits of savers; it has taken millions of dollars abroad and much of this money has left the country with government complicity. These corrupt bankers and businesses financed the electoral campaign of Mahuad, so producing a scandal which he wishes to be forgotten.

Ecuador is going through the worst crisis of the last 70 years with an economy in recession, which had negative growth of -7 per cent of the GNP in 1999; with general state budget of which 51 per cent goes to pay foreign debt.

These are the circumstances which had generated conditions in which discontent is constant. Within the working masses a profound discontent has been developing, a pronounced dissatisfaction which, from one moment to the other, has posed the necessity of making profound changes in society, leaving behind the present conditions of life.

That is why throughout the government of Mahuad, popular mobilisation was continual and the efforts of the bourgeoisie to carry through their neo-liberal programme, in accordance with their posture of total submission to North American imperialism, were set back. The Mahuadist government rapidly lost its way. Opinion polls carried out by companies for the same bourgeoisie, showed a president who, in the last few months, had a level of popular acceptance rated at no more than 8-10 per cent; and around 60 per cent were of the opinion that the president must go.

The patriotic front calls for uprising

In December 1999, the Front called for a popular uprising in the month of January against the exploiting and treacherous government. This had at its central aims to overthrow the Mahuad government, and dissolve the National Congress and the courts of Justice on the one hand; and, on the other, to install a patriotic government of national unity, made up of representatives of popular organisations, small and medium businesses, progressive political parties, patriotic armed forces, religious leaders committed to the poor, and all those progressive and democratic people who desired the well being of the country. This transitional govern-

ment was to be guided by a specific programme.

The programme of the Government for a New Ecuador contains measures whose character is popular, democratic and in defence of national sovereignty. It proposes, among other aspects, the fixing of the exchange rate of the sucre in relation to the dollar, and the confiscation of the shares in the hands of bankers, industrialists and big export-import businesses; a moratorium on the payment of foreign debt; the adoption of measures to reactivate as a matter of urgency the productive infrastructure; a general rise in benefits and wages; respect for the political rights of various nationalities and the Indian people, and the promotion of the cultures of such nationalities and peoples; opposition to the establishment of North American military bases; measures to put an end to and punish corruption in the country, etc. The Programme is to be carried out by the progressive and democratic sectors of society. It is not a plan for a revolutionary government and it was not possible at this time to conquer popular power. CONAIE also put forward a programmatic proposal, which basically coincided with that of the Patriotic Front.

Within this general framework and calling on the CONAIE to relate also to the struggle, the Patriotic Front on 6 January launched protests throughout the country with mobilisations in the cities, road-blocks in rural areas, meetings, etc. The government's answer was to declare once more a state of emergency, to unleash repression and to describe the movement as subversive.

It was evident that the struggle would take on greater intensity in the days to come; the instructions of Fuera Mahuad, Patriotic Government!! were being ignored on all sides and in fact the government was shaking. CONAIE in these circumstances called on its affiliates to organise a native uprising from the 15th of January and to occupy the capital of the Republic. In reality these actions began on Monday, 17th.

Mahuad knew that his days as president were numbered and in a bold political manoeuvre he decreed on 9 January the dolarisation of the country's economy. The bourgeoisie rapidly grouped itself around this proposition and supported it enthusiastically; some sectors of the population were confused by this measure and, in a certain sense, it caused the movement to hesitate. Nevertheless, this was momentary; the intense agitation with respect to the consequences which dolarisation would bring caused the unmasking of the real nature of this measure, and the masses then re-grouped for struggle. The sectors of the bourgeoisie who when faced with a popular demand for Mahuad's resignation had adhered opportunistically to this proposal, now dropped their banners and took shelter in the government's proposal; the people insisted that Mahuad must go.

A political movement

As distinguished from the uprisings of March and July 1999 which had at their centre demands around material needs, this last uprising was a political movement. The people struggled to overthrow Mahuad, to dissolve the National Congress and the Courts of Justice and to establish their own government. This was the overriding element of this struggle.

In the leadership of the uprising two tendencies were expressed, both agreeing on the need to overthrow the government, but with different strategic objectives and mechanisms of struggle.

The Patriotic Front which groups together organisations of the working class, of the peasantry, of the Indian movement, of the judiciary, of the students, popular and people's organisations in general, as well as democratic, progressive and revolutionary parties and political movements, among which our party is active, was one pole of leadership. This Front is a revolutionary project which subscribes to the idea of accumulating forces for the revolution, and which, with the objective of incorporating new sectors into the struggle, has worked to maintain the functioning of the Congress of the People.

The Patriotic Front called for the development across the country of various forms of struggle which would enable the demands of the movement to go forward. It called for a confrontation with the forces of order and for overcoming them through popular mobilisation.

The other element was the CONAIE which is also a popular project, but from within, and especially in its leadership, it has imposed reformist and social democratic positions which have moderated the role of those who are fighting because this organisation might play a revolutionary role.

Some of the main leaders and advisers of the CONAIE insisted, from the beginning, on giving a peaceful character to the uprising, separated from political involvement, agreeing in this way with the calls of the bourgeoisie itself to maintain the protest within the frame allowed by law and "the demands of civilized and democratic behaviour". They went further than this, because they condemned beforehand the possible interference of political agitators in the fight and showed their disposition "to denounce and to expel infiltrators".

In the development of the uprising, those same leaders were determined to concretise the unity of both tendencies leading the struggle, and, in the process, to give priority to its agreements with sectors of the Armed Forces, which, without a doubt, prevented the movement from being strengthened, mainly in the arena of political understanding of aims

and the forms of struggle necessary to accomplish them. Despite that position of the leadership of the CONAIE, in several provinces united actions were developed that harnessed the popular participation in the struggle at high levels.

The Patriotic Front made a call for the organization of popular uprising throughout the country and followed this through; the CONAIE invested their major effort in making specific agreements with a sector of the Armed Forces.

January has shown a degree of ideological and political development of the movement of the masses, showing more involvement with this type of struggle. The popular uprising has become the instrument of protest which has made the bourgeoisie back down on several occasions, which animates the confidence to fight, and affirms the combative way to conquer rights and victories.

In the past, the people hoped, in some sense, to find an answer to their claims in the National Congress. This happened for example when Bucaram was dismissed, and also in the uprisings of March and July 99. Today, on the contrary, the Congress is fearful of the fight and the people are hoping to establish their own government, overcoming the fear that if Mahuad falls a similar government may be installed. This search of the working masses to attain their own government reflects a new stage in their consciousness.

People tried to capture the government but were unable to achieve this. In the course of the uprising, government institutions were taken over such as the National Congress, the Supreme Court of Justice, several governmental institutions like ministries, General Office Controlling Public Spending, and, in most of the provinces the provincial governments, together constituting regional governments, chosen in popular assemblies, which express the desire of the people to create their own regime. Despite this, after the movement, these institutions stayed intact and the bourgeoisie itself appropriated the results.

One can conclude, at this point, that a sector of the people is going beyond discontent, and beyond the yearning of change, to become the protagonist of change itself.

A partial victory

The people conquered a politically and ideologically important victory, nevertheless this is partial.

With the mobilization of the masses we overthrew the government of Mahuad, which was maintained with the open support of the Clinton administration and the powerful economic circles of the country. Mahuad

fell and a government of continuation was restored.

We defeated the economic and political group of Mahuad, which was grouped around the Party of Popular Democracy (Christian Democratic); we inflicted a blow against imperialism and the bourgeoisie as a whole, on the ideological and political plane, because the bourgeois institutions were struck hard; the masses have lost respect for the institutions of the system.

North American imperialism saw, with absolute clarity, that their economic and political interests were in danger in Ecuador, in addition to its interventionist plans against the Colombian people; for that reason it threatened the commercial and political isolation of the country and mobilized its forces, obtaining declarations from the presidents of several States, as well as of the Secretary General of the Organisation of American States (OAS), in favour of "democracy".

As Marx indicates, the crisis has revealed the contradictions.

The Armed Forces are divided; within them acute political contradictions between the low officers have become evident and the top military leaders are jeopardized by corruption. The magnitude of the movement affected a sector of the Armed Forces, which identified with it.

It is clear that the High Command was compromised through a conspiracy to carry out a coup d'etat, through which it hoped to take advantage of the movement in order to seize the government - and in one sense it did so - but it was stopped by Yankee imperialism which ordered it to apply the procedure of constitutional succession, which the High Command, while ordering others to respect it, were going to violate. Also splits in the national Police appeared, since, in the course of the uprising some officers showed attitudes in support of the movement.

On many occasions, the hierarchy of the Catholic Church have tried to show their "political impartiality" and including their commitment to those who are "unprotected", and, faced with demands, they have tried to play the role of intermediaries. On this occasion, their agreement with dollarisation, their condemnation of the popular uprising, of the Patriotic Front, and its Program of Government and of the Parliament of the Indian People, damaged its image. In spite of this, within the hierarchy, we found voices and dissident positions, like that of the Bishop of Cuenca, Mnsr. Alberto Luna Tobar, that from the beginning identified with the protest and joined the Patriotic Meeting of the Azuay. In the same way, monks and nuns in other regions supported the uprising. This also shows the splits in the Church.

The distrust in the dominant classes and the political parties of the

bourgeoisie has grown and, with it, has also increased rejection of Courts of Justice and of the National Congress. After the uprising, 80 per cent of the population express the view that the national Congress would have to dissolve, because they saw that the great majority of deputies were co-responsible for the economic and political crisis; they were incapable and corrupt.

The confidence of the people that it is worth fighting has been fortified, as has their belief in the unity and organization; the popular and political organizations of the left are in better shape and have given birth to many leaders of different levels.

Anti-imperialist consciousness has grown. Something that remained constant in the struggle was opposition to the presence of North American troops in the base of Manta. All this promises positively for the revolution, which has taken a step forward.

In this process, subjective conditions have been developed.

The popular uprising of January of 2000, added to those of March and July of 99, can be described as a test of an insurrectionary uprising which prepares the way for the conquest of popular power.

The bourgeoisie and fright of the reaction

The oligarchies were unanimous in organising against the uprising, and unlike in February of 97, they used the people to get rid of Bucaram, and they openly put the "institutionality" to one side.

Furious speeches, demonstrations and denunciations were made against the Patriotic Front, the CONAIE and the people; warnings and threats came from all sides. The ruling classes knew that there was something major coming.

The popular uprising ended on 21 January in the morning with the setting up of a government of National Salvation, with the participation of the president of the CONAIE, Antonio Vargas; of Colonel Lucio Gutierrez, leader of the military uprising; and, the ex-president of the Supreme Court of Justice, Carlos Sol_rzano. To this we gave our support.

In the evening, those involved with the government accepted the replacement of Lucio Gutierrez by the Head of the Joint Commando of the Armed Forces, General Carlos Mendoza. That was the beginning of the end of the new government. Three hours later, Mendoza left the new government, saying that, from the beginning, he had only joined it with

the agreement of the Generals, in order to overthrow the government and to allow the Vice-president, Gustavo Noboa, to assume the presidency "constitutionally". The people described this as a betrayal of the movement.

In this way a change of puppets took place in the government. As soon as Noboa took over the presidency, in the Ministry of Defence and with the endorsement of the bourgeoisie, imperialism and the Military High Command, expressed its will to continue with dollarisation and the policy of neo-liberalism. A government continuing with the old policies was therefore restored.

The bourgeoisie which had been terrified by these events was now able to breath freely again, although with some anxiety, because they do not know what the future may hold.

Having recovered the reins they went on the counterattack. Taking advantage of the fact that temporarily they had overcome their internal contradictions, the bourgeoisie took repressive measures against those sections of the military who rebelled, against the popular and political leaders of the left and also against those deputies who had shown solidarity with the struggle. The dominant classes, when they see their system in danger, always unite furiously to punish those who dare to rebel.

The bourgeoisie, with Noboa at the top, has set out to restore a government of force and repression; and they have, at the moment, the political conditions in which to do this, and they have set the revolutionary organisations and forces as their target.

This new government counts on the support of all the bourgeois parties, which have supported the National Congress and all issues of the State, the neo-liberal policy of Noboa. Only the Democratic Left, has expressed their opposition.

Nevertheless, in spite of the support offered to it by imperialism, the military command, and the different economic and political groups of the bourgeoisie, it will not be able to solve the deep economic and political crisis. This is not about, as we logically understand it, a circumstantial crisis or a result of a "wrong model". We are facing a structural crisis of the capitalist system, which, in our country's case, has problems of such magnitude that we cannot see the possibility of them being overcome in a short time.

Insofar as objective conditions for action persist, we will see the development and fortification of the popular organizations, political revolutionaries, and, obviously the mass movement.

Momentarily the political crisis has been solved, but we are refer-

ring to the conjectural crisis which we are analysing. The social problems are so acute that we expect in a short time new general struggles, because the movement of masses is in a state of growth.

Limitations of the revolutionary forces

There also remain the limitations of the movement of masses and the revolutionary forces.

Above we outlined that important sectors of the people are proposing struggle to attain a popular government; nevertheless it is important to reiterate that, in reality, they do not understand the magnitude of what this means, of how to conquer popular power, how to organise it, what kind of programme must be implemented through this power; the forms of struggle necessary to win it and to defend it. These political and ideological limitations of the mass movement which are not unconnected with the kind of political action which the revolutionary forces undertake, mediate their action and limit their horizons. This is a primary and serious problem which we must overcome.

4The great ideological offensive unleashed by the dominant classes, imperialism and their acolytes against the people, has had some positive results for them. Those criticisms which condemn the use of revolutionary violence and support pacifism; which spread apoliticism and apathy; the social consensus; the defence of the bourgeois democratic system, are reproduced in the popular sectors, and it is this which guarantees the stability and persistence of the system and leaves the field free for the bourgeoisie to dominate the political arena.

The revolutionary organizations have shown weaknesses mainly within the workers' movement and that of the Indian's, and in general, it is well-known that the leap forward taken by the forces of revolution has not been sufficient to determine the course of the events.

Faced with this reality, it is necessary for the party of the proletariat to urgently adopt measures to overcome the existing deficiencies.

What is needed is an intense ideological offensive towards the masses to combat the ideas introduced by the bourgeoisie and to affirm the strategic aims of the party. What is Popular Power and how to conquer it; What is the way forward for the triumph of the revolution; The need for the people to develop revolutionary politics; and who are the participants in the revolution and what is the party as the leading force in it. These are, among others, the points which must be taken on board in the proposed ideological offensive. To persuade the people of the undeniable necessity of the use of revolutionary violence, is an obligatory task, even though

the people, because of the counterattack by the bourgeoisie, have a better awareness of this need.

The politics of unity, with all those forces interested in fighting the present government and in organizing the revolution in the country, is a basic issue for our work. For that reason, and in this sense, we are promoting the proposal of the Patriotic Front to unite the People's Congress with the Parliament of the Indian Peoples in Ecuador in a United Congress of the Peoples of Ecuador; we support the initiative of calling meetings of workers from various sectors and national unions for the establishment of a central United Organisation of Workers, as in other popular sectors.

We have a challenge before us to make this advance in the ideological, political and organizational construction of the organizations of masses and the forces of the party, itself.

All this must be developed in the middle of the struggle of the masses, of the Popular opposition to the continuing and reactionary government of Gustavo Noboa.

We have taken an important step; the popular movement and the organizations of masses and revolutionary policies have accumulated important experiences that show us the way to the conquest of greater victories. Our commitment to the working class of Ecuador and the international proletariat is reaffirmed.

February 2000

Marxist - Leninist Communist Party of Ecuador

GERMANY

"... physical elimination has to be prepared"

NEW REVELATIONS ABOUT THE ACTIVITIES AND DESTRUCTION OF THE GDR SECTION OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GERMANY/MARXIST LENINIST (KPD/ML) (II)

Herbert Polifka

The Destruction of the GDR Section

The investigation of the "enemy object" offered the possibility of switching to a harder line and striking a harsh blow in December 1980 and especially in March 1981: in all, eight members and supporters of the GDR Section were arrested and judicial inquests were initiated against them for offenses under Section 106 of the (GDR)* penal code ("subversive agitation against the state"); judicial inquests were also initiated against two other people who were not arrested. (cf. Informationen der Hauptabteilung IX/2 <Information of Main Department IX/2>* dated November 5, 1981, BStU, ZA, AU 2409/83, vol. 7, pages 189f).

The two leading activists of the GDR Section - one of whom being a qualified mathematician, the other one an engine fitter and piquantly employed in that function with the printing plant of (the SED central organ) NEUES DEUTSCHLAND - were sentenced to the maximum penalty of eight years' imprisonment each. The well known attorney at law, Wolfgang Vogel, too, was interested in defending them as a counsel.

One of the two persons chiefly responsible served his sentence at Brandenburg, the other one at Bautzen. While in prison, both of them applied for moving to the FRG but they were deported to the West after five and a half years' imprisonment only.

The sequence of apprehensions resulted from the view to starting with the supposed "weakest link", i.e. the more wavering supporters. The StaSi supposed that their statements would result in sufficient incriminating material for apprehending the leading KPD activists. By apprehensions the StaSi were capable of further reconstructing the GDR Section's activities. In the dwelling of one person arrested, an encoded list of 150 names was found; within short time, the StaSi decoded 36 of these persons 24 of whom resulted in being "unofficial positions" of the MfS.

The GDR Section's supporters and sympathizers who could not be convicted of offences under criminal law were put under pressure by

temporarily äbringing into contact" (äquestioning about a matter"). Should they, under such circumstances, incriminate one another, so the MfS would have the required evidence. Should they, however, prefer to say nothing, the StaSi could not detain them but effectively bring them into discredit in the eyes of their fellow-comrades especially by quickly releasing them. No matter how, the MfS took all advantages (cf. Massnahmeplan der Abteilung IX der BV Berlin zur Vorbereitung und Durchführung der am 29.9.81 geplanten strafprozessualen Pruefungsbedingungen vom 26.8.81 <The Berlin District Administration's Department IX's Plan of measures dated August 26, 1981 for preparing and executing the examination conditions for criminal procedures projected as from September 29, 1981>, BSStU, ZA, AU 2409/83, vol. 7, pages 8-10).

The detained persons' next relatives, too, were äinvited" in order to be interrogated, and this in many cases under a legend.

In April 1981, a female relative of an arrested male attempted to commit suicide after the StaSi had clearly demonstrated her their äomniscience" and äomnipotence" in the course of interrogating her (cf. BSStU, ZA, AOP, 634/85, vol. 1, pages 257-260).

Divorce was suggested to my wife, and the prospect of forced adoption of our common child was hold out to her by explaining her that our family did not guarantee the child's education 22in the äsense of the GDR socialism". It was pointed out that the child (3 years old) was observed, too, with respect to his development.

Means of questioning were not only threatening remarks such as änot under 10 years of clink" or: äWe are able to forcedly divorce you", but also open death threats: äShould you be once more near the Albanian Embassy you must have in mind that we will be present all over the place. And how quickly can a traffic accident happen!" (cf. notes äFurcht und Elend der Stasi" - Die Lehren der Stasiverh÷re <äThe StaSi's dread and wretchedness" - The lessons from the interrogations by the StaSi>.)

That were, however, not only mere threats made for intimidation. In Poland, for instance, many comrades of the illegal Communist Party were murdered or assassinated by the organs of security. That has been evidenced sufficiently. In the GDR, the StaSi maintained a special unit of about 300 people who were at disposal in order to commit murders and acts of terrorism. Although this unit was intended for an operation in the West (in the so called äSpannungsfall" <case of conflict>), the unit could be activated for special tasks in the GDR. A member of the unit said that they have been trained in ämultiple variants" of the way how a person could be killed. This special unit was not only specialized in perfectly

executing faked motor-vehicle accidents but disposed, too, of all knowledge of faking suicides out of violent crimes (cf. the book "Stasi und kein Ende. Die Personen und Fakten" <Stasi and no end. The persons and facts>; Ullstein-Buch N_ 34773 <1991>, pages 213-215).

Provided unofficial collaborators (IM), too, were incriminated by name by statements of persons taken into custody, the State Security Service (StaSi) ensured that such an IM was "removed" from the GDR Section in the discreetest possible manner.

On principle, the StaSi arrested such persons who could be convicted of offences punishable under criminal law and who not were IM.

In spring time of 1981, the MfS started large-scale travelling obstructions and searches as supporting measures of the arrests. In all, 357 West German comrades of the KPD were not allowed to enter the country (according to MfS statements, 65 officials, 14 instructors, 16 couriers and 262 further activists of the Party were concerned).

How well the Mielke Ministry (MfS) was informed was demonstrated when in the MfS the question was considered whether the presence of an IM at the 5th Party Congress of the KPD in Winter 1983 was useful or not. Obviously, they came to the conclusion that the resolutions of the Party's congress anyway would be known and that it would be disadvantageous if the presence of a delegate of the Section allowed the KPD to claim its own presence in the GDR. Besides, the MfS got even knowledge of the contents of the speeches of some delegates as the congress was approaching with the aid of an unofficial collaborator (cf. Abschrift eines Antrages bzw. Stellungnahme eines Funktionärs der KPD zum bevorstehenden Parteitag, welche der IM einsehen konnte, vom 26.6.1983 <copy dated June 26th, 1983 of a KPD official's proposal or statement for the approaching Party Congress the IM was able to inspect>; BStU, ZA, AOPK 8236/87, pages 253-262).

The Public Outcries - the KPD's Activities of Solidarity

After the massive wave of arrests in the GDR, the KPD analysed its causes. Beside the insufficiently conspiratorial activities of the Section's comrades, reference was made to the supporting activities by the DKP (German Communist Party <at that time the West German party of the modern revisionists>) which worked as the MfS' prolonged tentacle (cf. Bericht der AG XXII der BV Berlin vom 22.12.83 zum Treffen mit dem Inoffiziellen Mitarbeiter der Abwehr mit Feindberührung <IMB> "Trabant" <The Berlin District Administration's Team XXII's Report dated December 22nd, 1983 on the meeting with the Unofficial Collaborator>).

rator of the Counter-Intelligence with Enemy Contact <IME> "Trabant", BStU, ZA, Neiber 91, pages 183-191).

Many activities all over the Federal Republic of Germany were started for the imprisoned communists in the GDR to be freed. Activists of the Party (KPD) occupied the Bonn offices of the ADN (General German News Service <of the GDR>) (in October 1981), tried to block crossing points of the Autobahn (motorway) at the frontier or chained themselves to the building of the Permanent Representation of the GDR at Bonn (in July 1982). In front of the border guard in the Bornholm Street, five comrades went on a four-day hunger strike (in December 1981). Twice, comrades tried to present petitions (with collected signatures) against the arrests to GDR organs (in October and December 1981). Six times (between December 1981 and May 1982), pamphlets were spread from West Berlin to the Eastern half of the city with the aid of balloons and thus the arrests publicized (cf. Information 230/82 ueber erneute Hetzschriften-Ballonaktionen von Berlin <West> aus, o.D. <Information 230/82 about new smear-script balloon actions from Berlin <West>, not dated>, BStU, ZA, Neiber 90, pages 155 f).

West German communists ventured into "the lion's den", too. In a totally surprising manner for the GDR authorities, four of these communists entered East Berlin, coming from West Berlin, and chained themselves in Alexander Place (in November 1981), far from that place, another one threw leaflets down from the balustrade of the "Centrum" department store at the same time (cf. Abschlussbericht der Abteilung XXII/8 zum OV "Sektion" vom 30.03.1989 <The Department XXII/8's Final Report on "Section" Operative Dossier dated March 30th, 1989>); BStU, ZA, AOP 2796/89, vol. 1, pages 216-220).

Eventually, a West German half-brother of one of the arrested comrades collected more or less 200 signatures for the release of the arrested communists and entered the GDR in the morning of November 18th, 1982 without questioning, delivered the petition at the GDR Ministry's reception office and went back to the West without any problem (among the persons who had given their signatures were Heinrich Boell <well known critical West German author who had become a moral authority by his understanding for the motives of the fighters of the so-called Red Army Fraction> whilst the West German authorities reacted to them in a very hysterical manner was held in great esteem by the GDR mass media> and Heinrich Albertz <former Governing Mayor of West Berlin held in great esteem there, too, who, in a very self-critical manner, took the responsibility in 1967 after - on June 2nd, 1967 - the West Berlin

police. in the course of student protests against the West Berlin visit of the Shah of Persia. had shot one of the students and who, some years later. put him-self at disposal as a hostage of urban guerrilla fighters in order to save the life of a politician captured by them for obtaining the release of their imprisoned comrades - Boell and Albertz acted as convinced Christians and did so by giving their signatures, too>) (cf. Report dated December 1st, 1982; further: AOPK "Springer", BStU, ASt Frankfurt on Oder, AOPK Cottbus 1819/84).

The MfS tried to parry that campaign in an effective and most discreet possible, too, manner. The comrades who had chained themselves were arrested. Two days after having been arrested, they were sentenced to imprisonment of six months and expelled from the GDR.

The MfS needed show less consideration for the Section comrades, the remaining activists, however, should not be able to start spectacular actions. ("In spite of all consequence of our measures, any confrontation which should result in spectacular actions of the 'KPD' or in other effects with a high grade of publicity must be avoided" - Neiber wrote this in reproducing Mielke's orders. Neiber's letter dated December 3rd, 1982).

Studies in Marxism-Leninism are Prohibited

Although many GDR Section's activists were arrested the Ministry believed it necessary to steel itself against the undermining "bacillus" called KPD in a special manner. Operative personal checks with the code name "Igel" (hedgehog) were introduced just against four of the arrested comrades as the MfS' Main Department VII, competent for the prisons, feared that these prisoners were able to have a bad influence on their co-prisoners by their "hostile views". 4 MfS' unofficial collaborators as well as 2 unofficial collaborators of the plainclothes police (activity scope I) were brought into play in order to prevent them from that.

One of the subversive intentions of a prisoner was to study the texts of the classical authors of Marxism-Leninism without being disturbed. The Ministry for State Security, however, interdicted that, thus running into great argumentation difficulties (cf. BStU, ZA, AOPK 427/85).

The MfS, however, did not leave it at that but realized "subversion measures", too, during the imprisonment. "By aimed political operative measures, the impression of co-prisoners of the former GDR Section's leader was deepened that the same was active for the MfS as a 'stool pigeon of the StaSi'. As a consequence, other prisoners are more and more distrustful against him and shun him-" (Zwischeneinschätzung der Abteilung XXII/3 zum OV "Sektion" vom 3. 1. 86 <The Department XXII/

3's Interim Assessment to the Operative Dossier "Section" dated January 3rd, 1986>, BStU, ZA, AOP 2796/89; Information der Arbeitsgruppe XXII der BV Berlin vom 12.4.85 zur linksextremistischen "KPD", <The Berlin District Administration's Team XXII's Information dated April 12th, 1985 on the extreme left "KPD">, BStU, ZA, Neiber 91, pages 73-75; Sachstandsbericht der Abteilung VII der BV Brandenburg zur OPK "Igel" vom 4.7.85 <The Brandenburg District Administration's Department VII's Updated Report dated July 4th, 1985 on the Operative Personal Checks "Igel">, BStU, Ast Berlin, AOPK 2172/83, pages 42-45).

And the MfS wanted to make provisions for the time after the release from prison, too. Mielke's agent, Gerhard Neiber, wrote: "In my opinion, it ought be considered how we can compromise the 'KPD' members, now arrested in the GDR, in their relations with other people and, above all, with the "KPD" so that we shall be able to release them from prison and to deport them into the FRG in order to promote the disintegration of the 'KPD' and to deprive the persons made East German migrants into the West of all possibilities of coming into contact with kindred spirits." (Neiber's letter dated December 3rd, 1982, Information 75/308/83; Vorschlag <der HA IX> des MfS ueber die Anwendung weiterer Moeglichkeiten zur Zersetzung der feindlichen Gruppierung 'Sektion DDR' der 'KPD' aus der Sicht des zu bearbeitenden Ermittlungsverfahrens vom 19.7.82 <The MfS' (Main Department IX) Proposal - dated July 19th, 1982 - of applying further possibilities of disintegrating the hostile group of the 'GRD Section' of the 'KPD' from the point of view of preliminary proceedings to be prepared>, BStU, ZA, AU 2409/83, vol. 7, pages 2678 f. In the author's personal environment the execution of such measures has been proved <cf. Bericht der Arbeitsgruppe XXII vom 1.12.82 (The Team XXII's Report dated December 1st, 1982), BStU, ZA, Neiber 90, pages 24-27>.)

Neiber wanted to allow a release from prison and deportation into the West only after the possibilities of compromising had been prepared (cf. Gerhard Neiber's letter to Harry Dahl dated April 14th, 1982; BStU, ZA, Neiber 90, page 225. Two relatives, too, of imprisoned KPD members were released into the West <and it was even agreed that they could re-enter the GDR> in order to make both persons suspected of having been active for the MfS for many years and of having moved into the West on behalf of our organs" <Information 75/3506/83>).

Preventive Measures Against the GDR Section's Reconstruction

Beside the fear that public media could report about activities of the

KPD, the MfS' main concern was to avoid that the KPD was able to re-organize the GDR Section. Therefore, all possible activities should be nipped in the bud. For that purpose, the MfS once more employed ist unofficial collaborators who were put in charge of suggesting their West German instructors now that a further engagement in the GDR would be meaningless or useless. To that aim, it was necessary for them to act in a clever manner: "Careful considerations must be made and the proper arguments must be worked out, useful by qualified IMs in order to prevent from the constitution of an own 'KPD' in the GDR. The arguments must be - for all IMs employable - so original that the enemy will not at all be able to suspect that they are steered by the MfS." (Neiber reproducing Mielke's instructions; cf. Neiber's letter dated December 3rd, 1982)

He continued with writing that - should the Party (KPD)* not be prevented from a further engagement - it must at least be made sure that ist structures within the GDR could be cleared up very easily. The best opportunities for such purpose were not offered by the organizational principle up till,22 consisting - similar to that during the Nazi rule - in different instructors who showed different GDR cells, which contacted one another in a conspiratorial manner only, how to act. The MfS would have preferred a special committee between the West KPD and the East KPD (with competence for the GDR cells) as - under such circumstances - unofficial collaborators could easily have gained an overall view. (The MfS tried to help ist IMs within the GDR cells to appreciate such ideas and to give them the proper arguments for the KPD leaders: "The invitation of an IM for participation at the 5th party congress of the 'KPD' (in November/December 1983) shall be used to exert personal influence on 'KPD' officials in order to prevent them from forming and propagating an independent party in the GDR. An independent party might be presented as breaking-up of the 'KPD' because of being in opposition to the all-German idea of the party and of possibly being interpreted in the GDR as an anticonstitutional association. The counter-proposal should be to have the further instruction of the personal bases in the GDR carried out by a committee which must consist of GDR citizens who solely should be instructed by well versed 'KPD' officials." <Report dated December 1st, 1982>.)

As the offensive measures (arrestations and refused entries to the country) did not suffice for totally suppressing the KPD activities (in the GDR)*, the MfS pretended the Section's disintegration to the Party leaders. As per order, its IMs declared "disappointment with the slow Party construction", hospitalizations necessary in short time etc. in order to

bow out of the Party. With the aid of its IMs, the MfS paralyzed the GDR Section's activities. The "GDR edition" of the Party's organ ROTER MORGEN was stopped. The intervals of instructors' visits increased from two months up to six months.

StaSi Planned Bomb Attack on KPD Comrades

The Radio Roter Stachel (Red Spur Radio)

In the course of the year 1982, comrades of the Party managed to organize a portable very high frequency (VHF) transmitter by means of which they broadcasted the programme of Red Spur Radio on 101 Mc/s from West Berlin into the GDR, the first time at the end of April 1983 and then each first Monday of a month as from May 2nd, 1983. The programmes began every time with the identity melody of Tirana Radio or of (the Bert Brecht song)* "Vorwaerts und nicht vergessen..." ("Let's go and not forget..."). Thereafter came political news put into words in an engaging manner as well as the GDR Section's demands deliberately popularized. For instance, the text of the transmission dated January 1st, 1984 was as follows (extracts): "Red Spur Radio. Red Spur Radio. Red Spur Radio. You are hearing the radio of the illegal communist party in the GDR. We shall broadcast every first Monday of a month as from 9:30 AM via VHF 101 Mc/s. Peace movement: The SED (the GDR Socialist Unity Party of Germany) leadership forced their pressure on church and independent peace groups after the beginning of stocking up on arms in the FRG and the end of the Martin Luther year. In many towns the authorities proceeded against armement opponents and pacifists with house searches, arrests and imprinonments (...) Where is democracy in our democratic republic? The GDR is a prison of workers and peasants not only as it prevents its citizens who are fit for work except for the prominent party liners from leaving the country by walls and mines, by barbed wire and automatic firing devices, but also in the word-for-word sense as the prisons are not overcrowded by racketeers, speculators etc. but just by such sincere people who commit nothing but putting their own critical point of view. Is that socialist? Is that democratic?"

The transmitter was installed and operated for short time each in an air-raid shelter (from the time of the Second World War)* at Humboldtshain (<a forest in the West Berlin district and former stronghold of the workers' movement before the Nazi rule called>* Wedding). Very short broadcasting times (between five and twelve minutes) as well as hedging the hiding place by guards were to prevent the West Berlin police or the (West German postal service called)* Deutsche Bundespost

from tracking the illegal radio station down. Ten persons at least were directly concerned with this undertaking.

The operation of this transmitter gave Mielke and his staff quite a headache. At the latest since the end of the year 1982, the MfS had been informed of the fact that the KPD had invested in an underground transmitter. The MfS started measures in order to locate the position. Within few days, eight stationary and six portable radio beacons were employed. It was managed further to narrow down the position of the hostile transmitter by offensive measures of locating its position, prepared and executed - and supported by the Soviet brother organ - with the aid of a specially prepared motor vehicle and with appropriate technique of body direction finding." (Letter dated July 5th, 1983 of the leader of the Main Department XXII to Neiber)

After the Humboldtshain forest had been narrowed down as approximate position of the transmitter the StaSi sent their unofficial collaborators with contact to the enemy (IMB), immediately before the next broadcast, to the area in order to locate the exact position (cf. Vorschlag des Leiters der Abteilung vom 23.6.83 für die Durchführung von Offensivmassnahmen zur Störung der Vorbereitung des sogenannten 5. Parteitages der äKPD" <The department leader's proposal of taking of offensive measures in order to disturb the preparation of the so-called 5th Party Congress of the äKPD", dated June 23rd, 1983>; BStU, ZA, Neiber 91, pages 288-292; BStU, ZA, AIM 255/91, vol. 2).

Finally, the MfS were able to locate a deserted air raid shelter on a little hill and had the "scene of the crime" investigated for traces between the transmitting times. During the next broadcast, the Main Department III made video recordings of all suspected persons: Other IMs visited the West Berlin KPD activists being under consideration for direct participation in the operation of the transmitter exactly at the time of the announced broadcasts in order to obtain further indications of the question who ranked with the directly responsible persons.

As a whole, nine unofficial collaborators were employed for that. As from October 1983, specially trained people of the Main Department VIII/6 competent for observation and investigation were employed at West Berlin. These people should observe the dwellings of the KPD official, too, whose apartment was suspected by the StaSi to be the store room of the transmitter between the broadcasting times (cf. Information 320/331/83 der Abteilung XXII vom 9.9.83 zum Stand der Bearbeitung des illegalen Senders der äKPD" <The Department XXII's information 320/331/83 on the latest development of treatment of the illegal transmit-

ter of the "KPD", dated September 9th, 1983>; BStU, ZA, Neiber 93, pages 185-187).

In treating the Red Spur Radio, the StaSi took profit from the fact that the West Berlin Radio Controlling and Measuring Service (Funkkontroll- und Messdienst) was searching for the exact position of the transmitter. Police vans of the West Berlin police were ready for intervention in the Humboldthain area. At the time of the next announced broadcast on October 3rd, 1983, forces of both Berlin parts, West and East, were on the go in the Humboldthain forest - in vain, however, as the extensive search measures attracted attention. The park called Viktoriapark in the Kreuzberg district of Berlin was elected as position for the October broadcasting programme.

It was probably in the first days of January 1984 that the MfS decided no more to tolerate the transmitter operation. Neiber proposed several offensive measures for that purpose. Neiber took into consideration to have the transmitting devices stolen or destroyed by IMs. The GDR Ministry of Post and Telecommunication were to protest violently against the West Berlin Senate, the Deutsche Bundespost (German Federal Post Office) and the French Allied Forces (as the transmitting area belonged to the French Occupied Sector of West Berlin established after the Second World War)* for not having tuned their transmitting frequencies in coordination with the GDR ministry. Should this measure, too, have no effect, "physical elimination has to be prepared." Horst Maennchen, leader of the Main Department III, evidently toyed with the idea of destroying the transmitting device by using an explosive charge. The constructional parts employed for that purpose should be out of Western design only in order to avoid the suspicion that the GDR was involved in that crime. The detonation was to be made by remote control or automatically by starting the transmitter. (cf. Varianten- und Stufenplan des Leiters der HA III zum weiteren Vorgehen gegen den Sender "Roter Stachel" vom 23.1.1984 <The Main Department III Leader's variation- and step-by-step plan for further processing against the "Red Spur" radio, dated January 23rd, 1984>; BStU, ZA, Neiber 93, pages 67-69).

The operators of the transmitter would have been seriously injured or even killed but the GDR State Security did not shrink back from such measures against the KPD.

The MfS took profit from the fact that they succeeded in discontinuing the operation of the transmitter with the aid of IMs. At the MfS' behest, the IMs had persuaded the Party leaders in the West for months that transmissions could not clearly be received, that the news were out-

dated in content etc. Together with the tracing and search measures of the Federal Post Office, that fact definitely tipped the scales in favour of stopping the transmitter operation. The broadcast of February 1984 was the last of the Red Spur Radio. (Against a possible revival of the transmitter operation, the Department XXII/3 started the prophylactic Operative Dossier called "Sender" <"transmitter">.)

After the transmitter had been stopped the GDR State Security Service was able to note having "rejected the enemy's activities" successfully - from their point of view. That was the way in which it has been seen by the MfS in 1986. Mielke who had given top priority to that matter was very satisfied with his collaborators' performance. "Operative work up to now was led very well. Recognition for all comrades", he had his agent Neiber tell the collaborators of the Department XXII during a service meeting.

On direction level, it was decided that the treatment of the Party (KPD) in future should be delegated, above all, to the Main Department XX and to the Main Administration A as a delegation of the matter to the Department XXII ("Terrorism") did not appear useful. Later on, with the "list of hostile objects" (Geheime Verschlusssache <classified document; GVS> 4/85) it was precisely laid down what MfS' team should in future be competent for what "hostile object" (cf. Geheime Verschlusssache 4/85 vom 15.2.1985: Bekämpfung feindlicher Stellen und Kräfte im Operationsgebiet, die subversiv gegen die DDR und andere sozialistische Staaten tätig sind <ausser imperialistische Geheimdienste und kriminelle Menschenhändlerbanden> <Classified Document 4/85 dated February 15th, 1985 - Fighting against enemy services and forces in the operational area who are active in a subversive manner against the GDR and other socialist States (besides imperialistic secret services and criminal gangs of body trade)>; BStU, ZA, Dst, 103142).

From that time on, the Main Administration A II had to deal with the KPD in the West whilst the Department XXII/3 was responsible for controlling the remainders of the GDR Section. As the Section was a mere shadow of its former self, this Service team was able to confine itself to continuing some OPK (operative Personenkontrollen = operative identity checks)* of especially "dangerous" Party activists.

In the West, the KPD ran into a vital crisis as from 1983. As from 1985, it resulted in internal conflicts the course and confrontations of which were exactly registered by the MfS. The StaSi was highly happy of that development. This development was then, on October 5th 1986, sealed by the union with the (Trotskyist) Group of International Marxists

(GIM) to the Vereinigte Sozialistische Partei (United Socialist Party <VSP>).

The Marxists-Leninists in the Party started with reconstruction of the KPD in 1985.

The competent Service team for fighting against the GDR Section was wound up on September 1st, 1986, the residual tasks was continued by the Department XXII/8 ("International Terrorism", without great effort, however. In February 1989, the Department XXII/8 terminated the "treatment" of the residues of the GDR Section definitely. (cf. Beschluss der Abteilung XXII/9 zur Archivierung des OV "Sektion" vom 22.2.1989 <The Department XXII/8's Resolution of filing the operative dossier called "Section", dated February 22nd, 1979>; BStU, ZA, AOP 2798/78, vol. 1).

The MfS - the revisionist SED's shield and sword

The State Security Ministry began its activities (in 1952) with approximately 4,000 collaborators and disposed of about 100,000 full-time StaSi people in 1989 at its end. Approximately 500,000 unofficial collaborators were there in addition (cf. "Die offizielle Bilanz des letzten DDR-Innenministers" <"The official balance of the last GDR Minister of Interior">, <report in the West Berlin newspaper>* DER TAGESSPIEGEL, September 8th, 1990).

We have to add the estimated number of 6,000 "officers in special employment" ("Offiziere in besonderem Einsatz" <Oibe>) as well as an unknown number of so-called "unknown collaborators" (U-Mitarbeiter). With all them, the StaSi were the biggest employer of the whole GDR.

The whole country was kept under dragnet surveillance and spying. At the end of the GDR, there were holdings of StaSi dossiers measuring 180 current kilometers with about 6,000,000 personal dossiers. (The GDR total population came to 16.8 million residents.)

Fear of prosecution by this "machine of omnipotence and lawlessness" was poked with premeditation, being an important support of maintaining the power of the revisionist SED..

It does not matter whether Mielke indeed believed to be a communist or not. With an annual salary of 79,062.50 MDN (GDR marks) (whilst the GDR lowest wages were of 4,000 MDN per annum), he was capable of having a fantastic conduct of his life. A classy lifestyle was one of these "leaders'" features. The countryside had been parcelled out by hunting grounds among these top nobs. And like aristocracy, they banged away into wild boars, red deers, hares etc. Mielke solely blowed 60,000

MDN of the annual budgetary means for his own passion for hunting, in this case - hunting for animals. We can say that the SED chiefs lived already in communism although in a äcommunism of philistines”.

Whilst their methods and their working style were those of gangsters, all things were done with a red glamour. They called their State Security äsocialist” and their collaborators ätchekists”. In the MfS’ opinion, the äenemy” is ädangerous” and äshrewd”, working in a äcriminal” matter, with äblackmail” and äintimidation”, äwilful deceit”, äterror” and äcunning”. The own doing, however, is described with attributes like ärevolutionary”, äscientist”, ätrusting”, äcreative” and äprogressive”.

With a schizophrenia to a such high degree, it is no wonder that - on November 13th, 1989 in the (former East German) People’s Parliament Erich Mielke, äthe popular and honoured labour leader”, claimed - with respect to his relation with the maltreated GDR citizens: äIch liebe euch doch alle.” (äBut I love you all.”)

Summary

The StaSi was the tool of the revisionist SED. Their working manner, their methods and their underhand practices corresponded with their revisionist way of thinking.

In the diary äThe Superpowers”, Comrade Enver Hoxha wrote that the revisionist parties have nothing but a formal existence (as communist parties), äas other laws, other principles, other issues are working.” And he continued with writing: äKhrushchov and his hangers-on are crooks” who are commuting their countries into police states. They have an excellent command of the method of äpretending something never happened”. That is a very good description of the revisionist GDR.

The SED regime had taken the lead of the revisionist GDR society. They did not base their power on the ä99.9 per cent” of the population (election results) but on the State Security willing to commit every crime, on the 22VoPos (members of the so-called People’s Police), on the army (the so-called National People’s Army NVA)* - the Wall and the barbed wire fences included -, and on the Soviet Army. The SED party machine wanted to command the country to the end of time. Almighty and with features of megalomania, the SED bigwigs wanted to rule. They were afraid of nothing but general public. The masses were - in their eyes - good for nothing but for being manoeuvred. Their motto was: äYou are working well and we are ruling well!” and äWe take care of you.” (Welfare socialism)

Socialism is nothing but a necessary stage of passage into commu-

nism. That is our actual end. We are, however, no dreamers of pure phantasy who believe that communism could be realized from one day to the next. Socialism - with all its weak points and half measures of the social situation - is forming people. That may be negative, too.

It is, however, not possible to overcome the old shapes of division of labour and every hierarchy. In leading officials, an awareness of ruling, of being better, of knowing all things better had developed whilst, in persons who are performing executive activities, a mentality of subordination, a feeling of inferiority had spread out. Such originally unconscious tendencies resulted in a base of changing power in society. The ones become real rulers, the working people get again ruled. The leaders and directors are no more suspending but cementing the contrast between the those at the top and those at the bottom. Such process results in establishing a new class of slavedrivers who call themselves 'socialists'.

We call such stage of passage revisionism. It is no more socialism but still no open capitalism. The way is pointed for capitalism. Such formation of society has not the right to exist in today's period, the period of imperialism and of socialism and will, sooner or later, lapse back into capitalism, or the way ahead will again pointed for socialism. Socialism, however, would include the overthrow of the revisionist clique. That was the aim the GDR Section of the KPD fought for, at great cost.

An important support of maintenance of power consisted in the fairy tale of 'areally existent socialism' in the GDR. This propagandist tale spread by them must not at all be questioned. Here you have some of the main reasons of massive prosecution of Marxists-Leninists in the GDR. Unmasking the social cover meant an threat of existence for the revisionists and must be prevented to great length, even by murder and terror.

For long years, the KPD in the GDR conducted a comprehensive fight for a state which could have been rightly called socialist. It came in grief but the fight was not useless. The experience, the lessons drawn from it will be very useful for further knowledge of the passage society from socialism to capitalism. And up to the fall of the GDR, comrades of the illegal GDR Section of the KPD fought for the downfall of the revisionist regime, against the assumption of power by the capitalists and (the West German Federal Chancellor)* Helmut Kohl, for the reconstruction of socialism. In spite of the StaSi's efforts they were not able to totally suppress the Marxist-Leninist resistance.

And today? The revisionist society formation has passed into capitalism/imperialism according to the predetermined pattern. The KPD continues existing, is developing. The SED disappeared but was survived

by successors and uncritical hangers-on in several other organizations who have been wallowing in GDR nostalgia and admiring that society as "socialist" till now. The MfS has been annulled but parts of it are now working for the German federal secret services.

Supplement: In 1981, the StaSi searched my dwelling at Magdeburg "officially". That resulted in a charge (against me)* because of "public degradation" (of the GDR)* according to section 220 (of the GDR penal code)*, 2 years of prison were sentenced suspended on a 3-year probation and a fine of 7,000 MDN.

In 1994, a new search of my dwelling and preliminary proceedings took place "officially", because of "maintenance of the KPD". This time, the measures were taken by another company: the German federal state security. Thanks to our campaign and to national and international solidarity, this attack was repulsed and the preliminary proceedings were stopped.

As at the time of StaSi, today's spying, prosecution and terror will not dissuade us from our fight. On the contrary! With the downfall of the revisionist regime, capitalism has shown its features again clear and without make-up. The "victorious" capitalism is a society formation in decline. Necessity of fighting for socialism has shown itself more clearly else.

(Text from: Roter Morgen No. 24 of December 24, 1997, No. 1 of January 21 and No. 2 of February 5, 1998)

**) Translator's explanation.*

IRAN

“PRECISE UNDERSTANDING OF A GIVEN SITUATION AND HOW NOT TO RUN AND HIDE BEHIND THEORY”

A professional organisation is made up of people who do the same job and who organise themselves to protect that which is concerned with their job. For example, the Union of Cordonniers involves cordonniers who make demands around and defend the job conditions of their profession in relation to their bosses as well as to the public authorities.

Of course, there exist many different jobs and professions and naturally a variety of unions have been created to defend the rights of each group of workers.

Every professional/trade body has its own particularities. Nevertheless, every trade has points in common which it shares with others and which it must defend. Workers on the one hand belong to the organisation associated with their particular job, and on the other hand they belong to a social strata which is the working class.

In small trades such as shoemaking or haberdashery as well as some others, if the person concerned is not a wage worker but is self-employed, in other words an artisan, he can be a member of a professional organisation which may defend his rights, but socially he will belong in the class and in the ranks of the petit-bourgeoisie.

The special nature of professional organisations resides in the fact that they fight, within whatever laws are in operation, to improve the conditions of life of the members of that profession and to obtain better working conditions. They formulate job related demands within the context of their country's constitution. At present, within the capitalist countries the unions are fighting, not in order to topple the government and install socialism, but rather to lessen the degree of the workers exploitation and to improve their conditions of life. The gaining of political power is not on their agenda. They are thinking, for the time being, of improving the conditions under which production is carried out. The trade organisation is not the part of the proletariat which, normally, has in its programme the setting up of a socialist regime. Those workers who wish to bring down the capitalist system must organise themselves within their political organisation, the party of the proletariat.

If a trade organisation were to put the seizure of political power in its programme, it would change itself into a political party and would thus provoke the exit of workers from its organisation. Thus, it would lose its popular support and its trade union aspect.

It is for these reasons that a strike by a trade union organisation

must, sooner or later, with or without the intervention of public forces, and given the present balance of forces, arrive at an agreement and a negotiated settlement with the employer. The organisation cannot demand directly the abolition of the bosses. A strike which is taking place over issues of conditions or of wages does not have the aim of or any claim to changing the structures of society. Some leftists think that a workers_ party has to be, today, capable of conducting of a sectional strike up to the point of revolution and the toppling of the regime. Such adventurist points of view have been seen in the past history of Iranian workers_ movements, when the revolution was expected at the end of every strike. Trade union organisations have to remain popular organisations. They must bring together the majority of workers in their trade or professional area. A bakers_ union without bakers does not make any sense. A popular organisation with very few members cannot have the necessary impact or power to put pressure on the employers and as a result of this it can be easily attacked by the employers. There are other organisation which, without belonging to a particular job or profession, make demands and claim their rights through a particular pressure group within that society. Those organisations which defend the rights of women, ecological, and anti-tobacco organisations are of that kind. The specific nature of an organisation in defence of the rights of women comes from the character of its demands, within a chauvinist society which denies rights, sometimes the most elementary, to women. Such an organisation operates also within the context of the laws, on the one hand demanding from the government the establishment of laws in accordance with their demands, and on the other, fighting against the chauvinist culture which is rooted in society. This is not a trade or professional organisation, since its members come from every profession; however, it may become a popular organisation and may represent a large number of women coming from different strata of society. The first condition under which this kind of organisation can exist and work, is the existence of a regime which is relatively democratic and which allows the practice of various activities authorised by its laws and its constitution, that is to say, a regime which tolerates reforms without thinking that they threaten society. An increase in wages, changing of opening and closing hours of stores, the daily working hours, holidays, the right to divorce and the care of children are not issues which threaten to overthrow the foundations of the regime. Changes and reforms and the re-groupment of various interests are possible only in a society experiencing normal and peaceful conditions. In time of war, to call a strike in order to demand an increase of wages will suddenly take

on a political aspect even if it is organised by a trade union group rather than a political one.

Suppose that during the Second World War in Nazi occupied France, professional organisations had said that they were not concerned with the war because politics was not their business. The rejoinder would have to be that war is always political and that at the least it is the visible and logical continuation of politics, and that moreover, in the case of a Nazi and fascist victory, all rights and democracy would disappear for everyone.

That is to say that all these ideas are fluid and relative and must be interpreted carefully, taking all the circumstances into account. In this kind of situation the condition of organisations belonging to intellectuals are more delicate and complex, since there is always a social aspect to their professional activity. These organisations by nature are not in the business of demanding political power. The majority practice their profession with the aim of greater development of democracy, such as freedom of thought and of religion, freedom of expression. These associations fight for democratic rights since these are a necessary condition for their survival. There is a difference between the professions of intellectuals and those of others. The shoemakers trade union can work and produce shoes under non-democratic conditions. An organisation of bakers can make bread under repression, but how can one imagine that the practice of the writers' trade in the same situation!

All this goes to show that one cannot refer dogmatically to writings and texts defined in advance and under other circumstances. Without an analysis based on the precise given situation, one will reach only false conclusions, non-scientific and non-dialectic about the situation. In Iran, these kind of professional organisations are not facing a capitalist regime which has emerged through the normal evolution of the forces and conditions of production. They face religious fascism which forbids even in its constitution the right of free speech, the right to form organisations and every democratic right. In this situation, it is the constitution itself which must be changed. One cannot talk of a constitutional context in which such and such a right ought to be committed to be exercised. Under the old regime at least democratic rights were contained in the constitution and were exercised normally. However, the new Islamic regime does not even recognise them.

The fate and the future of organisations such as those defending the rights of women or writers or artists who do not accept the regime's blackmail is clear. Those who do have the authorisation to work are those

who are complicit with the regime, since these regimes need their intellectuals to justify the regime's crimes.

The intellectual wishing to be respected and respectable in such a regime will ignore the oppression of women and the exclusion of half of the citizens of his/her country - his sister, his mother or his wife- in order to create, far from all that, his works of art. Those intellectuals and artists who produced works of art in the Hitler period while closing their eyes to the murder of millions in the USSR and in Poland - are they not the shame of all humanity? Those who close their eyes to the murder of people of Yugoslavia and do not demand their right to life, how dare they demand freedom and the right to create organisations and demand support from others. If anyone tries to separate out rights, the fundamental human rights, he is in fact trying to gain advantages for himself rather than claiming democratic rights for everybody. An organisation which has no physical, moral and emotional link with the collective destiny of millions of women and men in its own country is not worthy of respect.

However, within the Toufan organisation we do not think that because there is a reactionary regime in Iran therefore it is not necessary to fight for and demand freedoms and democratic rights. Knowing that the Iranian government has forbidden in its constitution every fundamental liberty in the country, except for their own friends, we must not be duped and content ourselves with demanding that everyone works and agitates within the confines of this so-called constitution. It is necessary to force on the regime a recognition of rights and democratic freedoms. Even if they are not recognised in the constitution the regime must be forced to stop hindering the exercise of these rights in practice. In order to achieve this the balance of forces has to be transformed. This can happen if, instead of demanding rights or advantages for such and such a particular group, we demand democratic rights for the entire people. To achieve rights only for Iran's intellectuals, writers, or artists would not put right the question of general freedom in Iran, and the regime would not become a democratic one. The lie of the religious bourgeoisie is underway.

Making a breach in the regime is possible only through the revolutionary pressure of the workers and not through the good will of the whiny president or other rubbish talking ministers who are apparently sympathetic. Only the gathering of all the Iranian people to overturn the regime can be the solution to achieve the end of the regime and the deliverance of the people. One cannot demand of a reactionary regime that it should reform itself. It is necessary to force it. Those who think that it is possible to reform this religious regime from within are deceiving themselves.

Religion is fundamentally in contradiction with science, citizenship and democracy. That is why Europe has separated it from public life. Those who think that through reforms they may be able to push this regime to revolutionise itself or extinguish itself are stupid and have not learnt any lesson from 20 years of the regime through sword and blood. These are looking to use the false promises of the Khordeh II and the smiles of Khatemi to give credibility to the regime instead of putting their pen and their words at the service of the people for their information and orientation in order to overthrow the regime. In the battle for power between different factions of the regime, they have chosen the camp of Khatemi and not that of the people. The experience of the Khordeh II has shown that by taking action one can win reforms, but by simply demanding change one achieves nothing. This reminds us of the story of the father who asked his son what job he would do when he was grown up. The child answered that he would be a dustman like him. The father replied "I wanted to be a doctor but I became a dustman. So if you want to be a dustman just imagine yourself being something else!"

Labour Party of Iran (Toufan)

SPAIN

GLOBALISATION, FRONTIERS, UNEVEN DEVELOPMENTS

The globalisation which we are witnessing, driven by imperialism and its instruments (IMF, WTO), poses problems to which we are forced to respond. The ideologues of the bourgeoisie by one means or another, are attempting to theorise and in many cases to justify globalisation, for example through MAI (which for the moment has been frozen but not eliminated).

The gathering in Seattle at the end of last year laid bare the real financial and political interests which are in play and being used against the people of course. Let us leave on one side for the time being the analyses of Seattle -which together with MAI is an imperialist strategy of the first order- but let us underline the poisonous campaign which imperialism, principally the US, is undertaking to convince people of the benefits of the globalisation. Thus the unbearable Francis Fukuyama (the prophet of the "End of History") returns to the fray and with total self-confidence states:

*"Globalisation is one of the most progressive forces in the world today. (...) Globalisation in the form of **direct foreign** investments on the part of multinational companies creates employment (...) and bring with it the need for greater transparency and openness, education, new technologies which follow best practice (...) the WTO can become not only the defender of economic freedom but also of the freedom of humanity in general."* (1)

According to this Yankee philosophy, globalisation is the panacea for all the ills of the world. And according to the economist Thomas Freidman it requires a "world government" capable of centralising and directing this process. Naturally this world government must be headed by the US, something which Clinton himself has said more than once.

Globalisation like the MAI agreements (temporarily frozen) is, in brief, when we rid ourselves of all the fancy rhetoric and propaganda, neither more nor less than the general enrichment of the richest and the continuing impoverishment of the poorest, by means of the elimination of all government regulations and barriers for the "benefit of free trade". This is the essence of free trade, a theory which moreover has nothing new about it since it was developed by the English economist Ricardo (1772-1823), who stated that free trade allows **different countries** to

profit from the advantages of "an international division of labour". Obviously, by "different countries" we have to understand different bourgeoisies in those days, and different imperialisms today.

According to the economist Martin Seco:

"International trade doesn't take place between countries with different economies (developed, capital intensive; underdeveloped in labour power), but rather it takes place between first world nations with economies at the same level and with similar industries; the countries of the third world hardly participate at all in commercial exchange and in the most extreme cases they remain practically isolated from world economy, and are unable to compete in any aspect." (2)

This is what is actually happening and it is one of the reasons why Seattle was a partial failure for imperialism. But, let us be aware, this imperialist failure was not a victory for the people, even though we saw the participation of the most varied popular organisations. This is a delayed contest, while international capital marshals its forces for the next match.

As has been said by some sociologists such as the French writer Edgar Morin we saw in Seattle the beginning of the 21st century, "the initial struggle of the coming century, that which outlines its features: on both the human and the planetary scale". However, what of the working class, the proletariat, the popular masses? For these gentlemen they are passive classes and sectors, without any activity of their own, who trust everything to the unions which pressure them to reach compromises even with the WTO. In Davos, union representatives have just engineered an agreement between the WTO and ILO on "the expansion of trade and labour standards". (3)

When in his speech at Seattle, Clinton proposed the cancellation of the debt of those countries "on the road of development" in order that "their children might be able to buy mobile telephone and personal computers"- he was not just making a bad joke. Not only was it more evidence of the habitual ignorance of the Yankee leaders, almost all of them semi-literate, but he was simply talking about what the powerful companies are hoping to obtain through the course of the three years duration of the WTO meetings. This is not to put an end to the poverty and backwardness of these peoples (poverty and backwardness created by the greed of colonialism). What the Yankee imperialists hope for (as also do the Germans, French, Spanish, etc.) is to put these countries even further into debt with new "generous" loans ... for investment in personal computers and telephones while the people suffer real hunger and dreadful poverty

and lack the most basic necessities for health. This is the implacable law of capitalism: trade before freedom; ever greater increase of profit without letting up on the infliction of misery and suffering for the people.

This reality has been made evident in the recent meeting in Davos (January, February 2000) where we saw launched "the new economics" which may bring about an absolute disaster in the so-called third world. According to the president of the World Bank, James D. Wolfensohn, 60 per cent of the 6 thousand million inhabitants of the planet live in the third world and of those, 2 thousand million earn less than \$2 a day and around a thousand million are completely illiterate. But trade is going well, as far as the Clintons, Blairs and Schröders, etc. are concerned.

* * *

For some apologists for globalisation this will result in the setting up of some kind of world government, without barriers or restrictions to hinder its function, or as suggested by Ricardo Petrella, of the Catholic University of Lovaina, the necessity for "the establishment of a planet wide democracy (...) which is already on the order of the day in our present society".

At first sight it might seem that this "planet-wide democracy" with its "world government" should overcome not only governmental economic barriers, but also all frontiers (not only geographical ones) and should achieve a world at peace, in which all peoples would be equal in their privileges and duties, as a result of a perfectly regulated system (Fukuyama). It could appear that one is talking about universal socialism. However, it is evident that the Japanese-American philosopher and his followers have in mind everything being under the control of a king of super imperialism, that is to say globalised capitalism.

In fact the more we look, we do not see the disappearance of frontiers, but on the contrary the opposite. For example, with the collapse of the USSR and the triumph (momentary, yet a triumph which cannot be denied) of imperialism and globalisation, **three federal states** (the USSR, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia) have split up partly of their own accord, and partly the intervention of imperialist powers (among these one must include the Vatican). They have since converted themselves into **22 states**, thus creating many more new frontiers.

Imperialism in its highest stage cannot remove itself from the inherent contradictions in its situation. **Imperialism which by itself tends towards globalisation, is obliged to overcome barriers but at the same time it creates further barriers and frontiers in order to defend and extend its interests.** In the present uni-polar world, with the incontest-

able hegemony and predominance of the US, frontiers multiply or disappear according to the convenience of the dominant imperialism. However at the same time there enter into the picture the interests of other imperialisms, who although they may not yet be able to dispute the terrain of the US, create their own economic, political and military networks (for example the "German revenge").

This is known perfectly well by the Washington government, which does not like the domination of Germany in the European Union and the growth of the possible new powers such as China or Japan, since sooner or later these will dispute the hegemony of the US. Brzezinski, who was minister of national security in US, has written clearly:

"The capacity of the US to maintain its effective world supremacy, depends on how it approaches the complex balance of forces in Eurasia; the priority must be keeping under control the growth of other regional powers, to stop them threatening the world supremacy of the US. If one uses the most brutal terminology of the epoch of ancient imperialism, then we can say there are three fundamental demands of imperialist strategy: to stop underground alliances and to keep the satellite states dependent in terms of security; to guarantee the protection and obedience of the tax payers and to prevent the barbarians from making alliances among themselves."

We can see Germany, Britain, France, Italy, Spain, etc. as the satellite states and China, Japan and Russia as the barbarians...

Europe and the world day by day are becoming increasingly dependent on the US, and the US will do everything possible by every means to avoid any change in this situation. They take upon themselves the right to intervene economically, politically and militarily wherever their interests require it. This leads inevitably to the sharpening of the contradictions between imperialisms, which showed itself as the motive in the aggression against Yugoslavia in Kosova. And in its turn this causes changes in the inter-relationships between the imperialist forces, the breaking of alliances and the establishment of new ones, confrontations, etc.

Does globalisation tend to reduce unequal development? I believe that one can say categorically that it does not cause any reduction in inequality, but on the contrary it increases it. Today's world is not the result of friendly agreements between imperialist powers, capitalist countries, etc., but rather of **ferocious competition among them, each devouring the other**. The collapse and defeat of Russian social imperialism is an irrefutable proof of the uneven development of imperialism and of its internal struggles.

We can affirm that not only are the differences between the rich and poor countries and between the first and third worlds (and the second) not diminishing, but in fact these differences have never stopped increasing. One of the main aspects of globalisation is that of deregulation that is to say a greater flexibility in functioning, in investment, in production at the lowest possible cost, along with decentralisation of the processes of manufacture and assembly.

Deregulation involves privatisation of the public sector, transport, communication, health, etc. and also complete freedom (against the workers) of labour contracts, for example the right to sack with out compensation. All these measures do not contribute to the harmonious development of the various countries. On the contrary they require a merciless struggle, the search to crush the opposition. With complete cynicism this was recognised at the previously mentioned meeting at Davos by an American businessman, Michael D. Capellas: "There is only one message: eat them before they eat you"...

The paradoxical result is that in the epoch of the scientific-technical revolution, of the enormous development of communications, of journeys into outer space etc., we see through out the world (not only in Africa, Asia and Latin America) situations which remind us of the English Industrial Revolution, when the working class was exploited at starvation level wages and with exhausting working days, and with almost no social security. We are witness to ferocious efforts, particularly in Europe to eliminate the social achievements which the working class has conquered through struggle during the last century. The attacks on social security, health, and public education in favour of private (generally religious) education, the lack of opportunities for youth etc. etc. are part of the order of the day for globalised capitalism.

Marx in "Capital" and Engels in "The Condition of Working Class in England" analysed the industrial revolution which began in England in the 19th century and drew conclusions which today, disregarding differences of time and nuances of meaning, are completely relevant, however much they may annoy social democrats and opportunists of every type.

The proletariat in spite of the intervening developments, continues to be the essential and determining element (organised and led) of the class struggle. The class struggle has not disappeared as is claimed by bourgeois propagandists, nor will it disappear as long as classes exist. Neither globalisation nor any imperialist systems can ever bring classes to an end. There lies the motor of history.

* * *

A final and simple consideration: in this imperialist society which is globalising its economy and because of this will globalise its main policies, in spite of the inevitable contradictions and inter-imperialist clashes, it is already URGENT to “globalise” our own work, our resistance, our struggle shoulder to shoulder with the proletariat and the popular classes.

It is urgent and it is a necessity which Marxist-Leninists cannot fail to meet.

1. “Wall Street Journal” and “El Pais”, Madrid 19.12.99
2. “El Mundo”, 7.12.99
3. “El Mundo”, 1.2.2000

R. Marco

February 2000

From “October” of Spain

Communist Organisation October of Spain

TURKEY

COMBINING LEGAL AND ILLEGAL WORK: ONE OF THE FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS OF OUR PARTY

Combining legal and illegal work and organisation and improving them in accordance with the changes and developments in conditions has always been one of the most significant questions for our party, as with all the revolutionary parties of the proletariat. It is one of the main questions facing our party and revolutionary workers' movements at present, and it will continue to be so.

The question of combining legal and illegal work in a systematic way has gained greater importance under the present conditions. These are characterised by: on the one hand, lack of political freedoms and continuous attacks of the dictatorship and its preparations for new attacks; and on the other, the revolutionary workers' movement destroying schematic and narrow-minded understandings which have their roots far in the past, and taking practical steps in making maximum use of every opportunity and instrument to develop its legal and semi-legal work and organisation, at the same time as the advanced and awakening sections of the class are organising themselves as a legal party.

The question for our party and the revolutionary workers' movement on the national and international scale is not whether or not to accept as a must and as a matter of principle combining legal and illegal work systematically in every field of struggle. The question in this respect has been solved on the international scale in terms of the revolutionary workers' movement, having taken into consideration the main features of the new and the last phase of capitalism at the beginning of the century and the tendencies generated and developed by capitalism. In this respect, a clear line of demarcation has already been drawn with the other - bourgeois and petty bourgeois- currents of socialism.

The Second International at its Second Congress in 1920, was held when fascism, the most vigorous, the most terrorist and the most reactionary form of bourgeois hegemony, had not yet appeared as a form of state in history. At this Congress Lenin's theses were adopted. These theses drew attention to the intensified attacks of imperialism and reactionary forces and their plans for new attacks. They emphasised once again that "in every country, without any exceptions, even in the most free, and the most legal and peaceful ones in terms of class struggle being least violent, a systematic unity of legal and illegal work and organisa-

tion had become a must and a necessity based on principles. When we study these theses we can see that they do not deal with this question only on the basis of principle, and that they emphasise the main points with regard to legal and illegal parties.

Having stated the necessity of all legal communist parties forming illegal organisations in order to be prepared for systematic illegal work and for the moment when the persecutions of the bourgeoisie begin, these theses drew particular attention to illegal work and organisation among the soldiers, navy and police organisations.

The theses also stressed that the revolutionary parties of the working class should not restrict themselves to illegal work and organisation in the countries where communist parties were banned and therefore had to organise and carry out their activities illegally. They went on:

“On the other hand, under any circumstances, without any exception, it is necessary not to be restricted to illegal work, and to carry out legal work, overcoming every difficulty and forming various legal publications and organisations, changing their names often if necessary.” (Lenin, Selected Works, Vol.10, p.192)

The absolute necessity of combining legal and illegal instruments and forms in a systematic way has been proved even in the most democratic and civilised capitalist countries at times when democratic rights and freedoms have been restricted or completely put aside, and when fascist dictatorships have been established. This has undoubtedly been proved by the practice of the working class. Moreover, the Comintern and the communist parties as its branches in every country have improved this practice by applying it creatively to concrete conditions.

The revolutionary parties of the proletariat have been able to drive back the attacks of the class enemy and fulfil the tasks they have undertaken to the extent that they have been able to improve their abilities to combine and develop legal and illegal work in every field of struggle and activities in accordance with changing conditions and possible developments. Therefore, class conscious workers and their party have a valuable historical inheritance which they have not been able to make the maximum use of so far, and which has been acquired at the expense of the lives and blood of millions of the proletariat and working people.

The process after the Second Congress of the Communist International shows that the factors which made it an absolute necessity and a matter of principle for the revolutionary parties of proletariat to combine legal and illegal work and organisation systematically have intensified rather than disappearing. Therefore, the importance of class conscious

workers and their organisation planning and carrying out their work with this principle in mind has not weakened but increased.

Solving this question as a matter of principle and drawing a demarcation line with other currents has a determining importance. However, doing this is just a beginning. Adopting a principle and interpreting it correctly are different from, what is most important, putting it into practice. When the history of the revolutionary workers' movement is studied it can be seen clearly that these are not the same things.

The history of the revolutionary workers' movement shows that, as in all the main questions of revolution, in this question too, the struggle between proletarian socialism and bourgeois and petit bourgeois socialism continues uninterrupted; that this struggle has its echo in the ranks of the revolutionary workers' movement; that tendencies emerge reflecting the stance of these bourgeois currents; and that these currents may sometimes become dominant even in the most experienced and advanced parties, causing destruction of revolutionary work.

Revolutionary Marxism and proletarian socialist current gained dominance in the revolutionary workers' movement particularly with the victory of the October Revolution. As a result of this, left and right currents had to back down and appeared to accept the principles of revolutionary Marxism. However, in fact, they continued their struggle against Marxism and its principles. Claiming to be interpreting these principles, applying them creatively to new developments and concrete conditions, and improving them, they were in the meantime trying to dominate the workers' movement. In this respect, the most extended and most effective attack in terms of its consequences took the form of modern revisionism after the World War II. Opportunist trends which had been prevalent before revolutionary Marxism, whose influence in the workers' movement had weakened but not vanished, and the bourgeois strata which constituted the social basis of these tendencies in the workers' movement, made use of the many-sided developments which took place around the world after the World War II. Modern revisionism became dominant within the revolutionary workers' movement under the conditions when imperialism and world reactionary forces launched a new attack, uniting all their forces under the leadership of the USA. The dominance of modern revisionism in the revolutionary workers' movement led to many-sided developments whose effects still remain at the present time. This includes and goes beyond the transformation of the revolutionary parties of the proletariat into reformist and counter-revolutionary parties, and the collapse of socialism, except for the Socialist People's Republic of

Albania.

With the dominance of revisionism, as a kind of bourgeois socialism, over the revolutionary workers' movement, the passing of the practical and theoretical gains and experiences of the revolutionary workers' movement on to the young generations of the working class and socialist-leaning intellectuals was interrupted, and most importantly, the key arguments in fundamental points became blurred. The petit bourgeois interpretation of revolutionary theory and practice became influential amongst the young generations of revolutionary workers and intellectuals, and within their movement.

The proletarian socialist current in Turkey developed at a time when there was just such a confusion in the international arena, and when an unfinished process of differentiation was still taking place between the proletarian socialist current and petit bourgeois socialism. The proletarian current developed from within the ranks of a petit bourgeois radical movement, which was following a left path isolated from the working class, also, however, opposing the modern revisionist treachery with a petit bourgeois socialist perspective. This movement was undergoing a process of self-criticism.

It is inevitable that the new always bears traces of the old which gave birth to it. And it was impossible to eliminate those traces all at once and completely. The powerful effect of the elitist revolutionarism, which was inspired by the Kemalist movement and its belief that things change from the top down, the dominance of bourgeois socialism among the advanced workers, the historical weakness of the revolutionary movement of the lower strata, etc., all these caused those traces to remain for a long time. One of the fields in which these traces have remained strongly evident has been that of legal and illegal work and organisation, and the relations between them.

Moreover, the problem is not just limited to the revolutionary communist movement having traces of the petty bourgeois radicalism which gave birth to it. There are other factors which constitute the basis for deviations and the emergence of different tendencies on this question, as on the other questions of revolution. Among them are: the undeniable effects of bourgeois ideology and perspectives on the workers; many-sided bourgeois attacks on the revolutionary workers' movement; people from other strata and classes joining the working class, and their carrying with them the perspectives and habits of the classes they once belonged to; the workers and the young revolutionaries who organise and struggle in the revolutionary party of the workers not being able to rid themselves

of those effects at once, etc.

Above all, combining legal and illegal work in a systematic way is a practical question which directly depends on concrete conditions, and which needs constant renewal in accordance with the changes in these conditions. The conditions in which the revolutionary party of the proletariat struggles change constantly in every aspect - social, political and economic. In accordance with these changes and developments, the party always needs to review, renew and reorganise its work in every field. If the party does not renew and reorganise its work in time, it cannot improve its relations with the masses or drive back the attacks of the class enemies. Also, the relation between and the form of combining legal and illegal work and organisation is the other element which needs constant renewal.

It is insufficient for the party just to do some partial reorganising, keeping its existing structure intact, at times of turning points leading to important changes in political conditions and in the balance of power between the forces of revolution and counter-revolution. In such times it becomes unavoidable for the party to reconstruct itself at all levels and in every field of work and organisation. The later the party comprehends the situation and makes the necessary fundamental changes, the heavier the destructive consequences will be.

The September 1980 military coup and the following period was the most obvious and striking example of this. Another example is the 1990s, not as striking as the military coup period but not less important in terms of its consequences, and whose effects lasted longer. The former was characterised by the dictatorship's launch of a new wave of attacks, and the change in the balance of power in favour of counter-revolution. The latter, however, was characterised, under the conditions of intensifying repression and terror, by the expansion nevertheless of the field of existing democratic rights and freedoms. The workers' movement gained the possibility of having a daily paper and forms and instruments of parliamentary struggle, and was able to organise as an independent party, and to obtain new positions in the unions.

As far as our party is concerned, the September 1980 coup and the following years showed the inadequacy of the party in reconstructing its work and organisation in every field and the relations between them in accordance with the then changes in the objective situation. However, the 1990s showed the party's success -despite its delay and shortcomings- in reconstructing and renewing itself in accordance with the new changes and in overcoming its mistakes and shortcomings. This develop-

ment has posed new problems as well as new opportunities.

Since the process of its formation, our party has sincerely accepted and tried to put into practice the idea that no form of struggle and organisation should be rejected or fetishised, and that in particular legal and illegal work and organisation must be combined in a systematic way. However, on the other hand, the history of our party in this respect is the history of making and then correcting mistakes in combining and improving these two things in accordance with the conditions; it is also the history of the emergence of different tendencies and the struggle against them.

It is an undeniable fact that the revolutionary communist movement, which differs from other currents in its orientation towards combining legal and illegal work in every field, has not however shown its ability to fully utilise legal opportunities. It has not been able fully to renew the relations between the legal and illegal work in line with the changes in conditions; it has also been influenced by the theses and practice of petit bourgeois socialism in this aspect; and that it has not been able to distance itself from schematic approaches. Although it has weakened in the present period, one cannot say that we have completely erased the confusion and prejudice caused by this petit bourgeois left influence in the approach to legal and semi-legal work and organisation, as well as illegal. In other words, there are still beliefs which belittle the importance, in terms of the revolutionary workers' movement, of the most limited democratic rights and positions, which the ruling classes and the dictatorship have had to recognise.

The process undergone shows that serious blows have been dealt against schematic understandings, but they have not been overcome completely. They still show themselves in different forms and cause distortions on the same basis but in different directions. Every militant of the revolutionary workers' movement must analyse their understanding and practice, being aware of its shaping under the influence of petit bourgeois radicalism and socialism fed by the Kemalist upper-strata revolutionarism which can be summarised as "for the people but despite the people, above the people and independent from the people". They must free themselves from these influences, learning from life itself and from the steps taken by the revolutionary workers' movement of which they are a part, and from the possibilities presented by this movement. It is not unusual that the prejudices caused by schematic understandings stemming from superficiality and petit bourgeois influences, with the addition of mental laziness, prevent us from learning from the theory and

international experiences of the working class taken from life and the struggle itself. In this respect we sometimes lag behind those workers who have just joined the struggle, and we do not show the ability to learn from them. This also prevents us from systematising and improving what we do and adopt, and from renewing our consciousness and the theoretical equipment which constitutes the basis of this consciousness.

Legal and semi-legal work, organisation and revolutionary work

Although in the present era, that of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, it is an absolute must and a matter of principle to combine legal and illegal work in a systematic way. The question of how this combination can be achieved and the form it should take will obviously vary from country to country as well as according to the period the country is going through.

The conditions in Turkey are different from those of capitalist countries which are run by bourgeois democratic regimes, and where, despite restrictions, democratic rights and freedoms have been gained and guaranteed under the laws and constitution of that country. It is a reality of our country that although the capitalist relations of production have been dominant for a long time, there has not developed a revolutionary-democratic movement of the lower classes which would enable the democratisation of society on a bourgeois-capitalist basis or at least launch this process by overcoming the obstacles in front of it. Democratic traditions are weak; political freedoms and democracy have never been achieved, and as a result of this the national question has not been resolved.

As a result of the struggle of the oppressed and exploited classes, particularly the workers, the revolutionary workers' movement has gained significant positions which cannot be ignored, and the scope of de-facto political freedoms has widened. However, there are still legal and constitutional restrictions and prohibitions in speech, press, media, strikes, trade unions and collective bargaining, meetings and demonstrations, and breaches of personal and residential immunities which deny democratic rights and freedoms. Despite all "democratisation" and "liberalisation" packages, these restrictions, rather than being lifted, have become tighter in some respects. These restrictions do not allow the workers and the oppressed to organise and struggle for their long and short-term demands and interests and to participate in political and social life as an independent force.

This is a country where even the bourgeois socialist parties which have no real power among the masses, and those bourgeois parties which

have challenged the official line of the ruling core of the state are being taken to court, closed down, and their leaders charged. This makes it an absolute necessity and a matter of principle to combine illegal and legal work in a systematic way. This is necessary not only in order not to be caught unprepared for the possible attacks of the dictatorship, but also to make its existing attacks ineffective, to carry out revolutionary work, and to improve legal work and organisation according to a revolutionary line.

The working class movement cannot develop as a revolutionary movement by remaining within the limits of the existing constitution and laws or the limits determined by the rights gained and used de facto. Under such conditions neither is it possible to organise and carry out an uninterrupted revolutionary work. For this reason, the revolutionary workers' movement cannot limit its work and organisation to laws or to restricted and incomplete de facto gained rights. Let alone in our country, even in the most democratic and civilised countries, it is not bourgeois laws and legality but the short and long-term demands of the working class which determine the limits of the work and organisation of the revolutionary workers' movement. In this respect the revolutionary movement of the working class differs from the bourgeois liberal workers' movement and bourgeois socialism.

Under the present conditions of our country, the revolutionary workers' movement must have an illegal base. Even its most open work has to go beyond legal limits; it has to be combined systematically with illegal work which should also be the determinant of its content. As stated by Lenin -although under different conditions- "in terms of the form of organisation, the illegal organisation adapts itself to the legal one; but in terms of the content of our party's work, legal activities adapt themselves to illegal ideas". (Lenin, On the Question of Organisation, p.85)

The revolutionary workers' movement does not organise and work according to bourgeois laws and legalities, but according to the short and long-term interests and goals of the working class and to the requirements of the struggle for its ultimate emancipation. However, it has to utilise fully the opportunities presented by bourgeois laws and legalities, no matter how restricted they are, and the institutions and organisations, including the most reactionary ones, which are supported and joined by the masses. As long as it is getting the support of the masses the revolutionary workers' movement carries out activities even in the most reactionary institutions, including parliament, which is used as an instrument to deceive the people, as well as in every kind of economic, political and social organisations of the masses. Its work is based on the ultimate eman-

icipation of the working class. If necessary it forms new organisations and tries to utilise fully every kind of right and position without underestimating them, even though they may be restricted. It is not satisfied only with this, it also struggles for the improvement of rights and positions gained legally and used de facto.

The revolutionary workers' movement considers it as its task to utilise these positions for the improvement of revolutionary work, and believes that legal and semi-legal work and organisation can be developed according to a revolutionary line. This is what differentiates it from other currents. The revolutionaries and their organisation, devoting themselves to the emancipation of the proletariat, cannot behave like narrow-minded petit bourgeois on this question, as on other questions.

A narrow-minded revolutionary, without thinking, considers the illegal work and organisation of a petit bourgeois radical kind as revolutionary, and the legal and semi-legal one as reformist, criticising it for remaining within the limits of the system. With this kind of understanding they fetishise illegality; and either refute legal or semi-legal work from the beginning- but this stance is no longer seen very much in our country- or, at best, claim that the legal and semi-legal should in every way be subject to the illegal, as they have heard the argument from somewhere that reforms are subordinate to revolution. With such understanding, the narrow-minded petit bourgeois and their organisation consider the legal and semi-legal work and organisation merely as an instrument which should serve and strengthen the illegal. Therefore, all mass organisations like trade unions and other professional associations and the work in these organisations become in their eyes mere instruments in the service of the illegal organisation. Just as with every other question, here the form and the essence are mixed up. The question of reform or revolution is therefore reduced to the relation between forms and instruments, which represents an example of complete confusion. Yet this question is inseparable from other things such as the essence of work and organisation, the program and tactics which determine this essence, and the political line. (1)

The conclusion to be drawn by class conscious advanced workers from the narrow, limited and temporary nature of the possibilities presented by legal and semi-legal struggle is that they should not belittle them but utilise them fully. Even the most limited and incomplete legal rights and positions gained de facto constitute an opportunity to be used fully for the development of the workers' movement and revolutionary struggle, and a weapon to be used against the enemy. Contrary to what is

supposed, the importance of the systematic improvement of legal and semi-legal work and organisation is not lessened, no matter how tight the scope of democratic rights and freedoms and of legal and semi-legal opportunities may get. A party which does not make maximum effort to do this cannot escape from becoming a marginalised organisation divorced from the masses. Neither can it succeed in joining with the broad masses of workers and working people and developing their movement, winning over its fundamental and auxiliary allies, and isolating any wavering forces.

Furthermore, even the most reactionary, the most terrorist and the most aggressive bourgeois dictatorships cannot absolutely destroy the opportunities of legal and semi-legal struggle, as was the case even with Hitler's fascism. However, it is clear that as conditions deteriorate it will become more difficult and risky to utilise and develop these opportunities in a revolutionary way. The question is one of showing the ability and determination to utilise and further these opportunities even under the most difficult conditions as well. We must improve our perspective and readiness to use legal and semi-legal instruments and forms in a revolutionary way even at times when the attacks of the dictatorship intensify and legal rights are further restricted. Also a systemic combination of the illegal and the legal under every condition is a must to make this a reality. An organisation which bases all its work and organisation on bourgeois legality, and which has no illegal basis, or one which is inexperienced in developing legal work and organisation cannot achieve this under difficult conditions at all.

The revolutionary workers' movement, when utilising legal instruments and opportunities, will not limit itself, especially in the content of its work, to legal boundaries. It will push these boundaries outwards, but also will refrain from an attitude which would make it impossible for it to utilise these instruments and opportunities in a systematic way. For this reason, so long as political freedoms have not been completely won, the legal and semi-legal work and organisation of the revolutionary party of the working class will inevitably have different levels of restrictions, depending on conditions. Therefore, it is necessary to face these obligations and not to pay any attention to the distortion of this necessity by small groups which are completely distanced from the mass movement.

The revolutionary workers' movement will overcome these limitations by combining legal and illegal work and organisation in a systematic way in all its ranks and organisations. When the wrong understanding of the traditional left has been overcome, it will be seen that this is

what is being done. This wrong understanding considers illegal work and organisation as something isolated from the masses and from their movement and organisations. The question is to make this work of combination more systematic and to take it forward, away from the style of the petit bourgeois revolutionary, to the style of the workers.

We must also mention the fact that one of the outcomes of the dictatorship's prohibitions and restrictions, its indifferent violations of its own laws, and its fierce attacks on factories and workplaces, is that the breaking of laws starts becoming legitimate in the eyes of the masses. Their prejudice towards obeying the law starts to weaken, and the awakening and struggling workers start orientating towards utilising the forms and instruments of illegal struggle. This expands the grounds and instruments for combining the legal with the illegal. In combining and advancing the legal and illegal, the workers are often more creative and talented than the experienced revolutionaries.

We should learn to make use of every gap skilfully, apply the rules of war when necessary, override legal boundaries and gain the greatest possible advantage without getting bogged down in formalism and secondary issues, and without losing the opportunity of using in a systematic way the tools we have in hand. In this respect we cannot deny that we have made childish mistakes. However, another fact we cannot deny is that despite our errors and the vast number of things we still need to learn and improve on, we have become more experienced, mature and advanced in using legal and semi-legal instruments and forms.

We cannot be satisfied with the advances we have made so far. We are not yet in a position to utilise legal and semi-legal opportunities in the most productive and best way. (2) Despite the progress we have made, there are still limitations, and most importantly, the continuation of existing habits, in the use and improvement of instruments and forms which would develop our work and organisation as a whole and in every aspect. We have still not overcome completely judgements and habits stemming from the kind of work and organisation peculiar to narrow illegal circles. More importantly, the application of these methods and forms to legal work and organisation is hindering progress in these areas, preventing legal opportunities being used in the most advanced way, and also hindering the broader section of the awakening working class and people from organising and joining the struggle.

In the last few years, the revolutionary working class movement has made advances in breaking the petit-bourgeois schematic understandings and practices, in improving legal and semi-legal work

and organisation and in utilising instruments in this field. However, although these are weakening, there are still some ideas persisting which disregard legal and semi-legal work and organisation, and consider it secondary to illegal.

Leaving aside the bourgeois socialist parties and currents which limit their work and the workers' movement completely within the laws of the dictatorship, there is a strong tradition in the left in our country of belittling legal and semi-legal work and organisation. Illegal work is considered to be revolutionary, and legal to be reformist or an alternative which weakens illegal work and organisation, and may be even a trap to be kept at a distance from. Moreover, the restricted nature of legal and semi-legal opportunities and the arbitrary practices and terror of the dictatorship violating its own laws, when combined with theoretical backwardness and superficiality and traditional left influence, have caused the emergence, especially within the revolutionary youth, of tendencies which underrate and belittle legal and semi-legal work and organisation. What also feeds ideas underrating legal and semi-legal work and organisation is lack of understanding of the necessity of being prepared for the possible attacks of the dictatorship, and of the need to have an illegal basis to do that, and lack of concern with the long term interests of the movement.

Legalism, and relying on and limiting the struggle to bourgeois legalism is confused with the importance and the necessity of developing legal struggle and organisation. What differs proletarian socialism from bourgeois socialism and the revolutionary workers' movement from the reformist movement has nothing to do with minimising the development of legal and semi-legal work and organisation, or with not fully developing and using legal instruments and forms. It has to do with carrying out one's work and organisation according to a revolutionary line, without limiting them to legality, and with systematically combining the legal with the illegal and developing both. The revolutionary workers' movement, fighting to destroy the hegemony of capital and to found a new society, has to fulfil this aim by using the legal and semi-legal instruments and forms at the highest level and to the greatest degree possible. In this respect it has to be ahead of all other currents and parties.

The precondition for developing legal and semi-legal work and organisation on a revolutionary basis is the existence of an illegal basis, an iron core which does not limit its programme, tactics, organisational structure and relations or any of its work to the existing laws. This is the actual leading force of the movement with its combination of elements, theo-

retical equipment, relationship with the masses, devotion to its class duty, and determination. In other words, it is the accomplishment of an organised unity of the most advanced and determined elements of the working class. This unity has iron discipline and is based around a programme and tactics reflecting fully, with the perspective of ultimate emancipation, the short and long term interests and aims of the class. Such a core will be able to repulse the attacks of the class enemy and renew its work and organisation in accordance with changes in conditions. Also, it will and should use every concession and every limited right given by the enemy to placate the people. This should be done with the perspective of organising the people, and advancing their struggle and revolutionary work and organisation.

Preparation for possible developments, illegal work and organisation

It is a reality of our country that the limited rights recognised by the law as well as those not recognised but practised de facto can fully or partially be arbitrarily put aside in parts or the whole of the country. The existing constitution and legislation allow this to be a natural practice of the political regime. It has become natural for the state, particularly for its intelligence organisations, police and special teams to violate its own laws and set up special organisations for this if necessary. It has become a known fact for the workers and working masses that the country is not ruled, even in appearance, by representative institutions and by the so-called governments set up within these institutions, but rather by the core made up of the military general council and the generals. It has become more and more obvious that the constitution and legislation are drawn up by this core. According to this ruling core's analysis of what is required to deal with problems arising for them out of a certain period, new legislation can be immediately passed and/or implemented as law, and then inactivated when no longer necessary.

The international situation and the trend of its development, the place of Turkey in this process, and the economic and political situation of the country have together demonstrated that the rise of class struggle and of new attacks from the dictatorship aimed at the existing limited rights are not issues belonging to the far future. In the coming period, in the area of democratic rights and freedoms, as in other areas, the level of positions gained de facto or legally will depend not only on international factors but also on the struggle of the oppressed and on the balance of power between the ruling classes and the ruled, as well as on many other factors which we cannot predict today. Gaps may widen in the ranks of the dic-

tatorship and legal and semi-legal opportunities may become greater as a result of internal contradictions and the struggle of the proletarian and working masses. However, conscious workers and their organisation should not forget that these opportunities are always temporary unless the hegemony of imperialism and the bourgeoisie is overthrown. The wider the sphere of political freedoms and the better use that proletarian and working masses make of them, the closer the possibility of the ruling classes putting to one side or denying the gained freedoms and legal opportunities, and the occurrence of civil war.

In the same way as the expansion of the scope of political freedoms and democratic rights does not remove or decrease the necessity and importance of illegal work and organisation, so the restriction of the scope of legal work and organisation does not remove its necessity, or decrease its importance.

It is generally understood on the left that fulfilling the movement's requirements, being ready for all possible developments and being the representative of the short and long term interests and aims of the movement, must mean to found an underground organisation ready to meet the intensifying attacks of the dictatorship, and to position its forces accordingly. Although this is not openly and exactly expressed in this way, the expectations and understandings are in this direction. There was a time when the idea of forming an organisation which would be able to survive under any circumstances emerged in our ranks. This idea was re-ignited by the "left"-appearing liquidators especially after the September 1980 coup, in the name of criticising the past. It is necessary to eliminate this idea and expectation in order to fulfil the tasks of the present day, and to prepare ourselves for possible developments.

It is not possible to foresee how the forthcoming period will take shape, with what forms and content the attacks of the dictatorship will be carried out, and what stages they will go through, and with what characteristics the struggle of the oppressed and exploited classes will develop. This depends on many national and international factors whose direction of development we cannot predict in the present period. Therefore it is not possible to build an organisation from today which could meet the requirements of unknown conditions of the future. Nor does the working class need such an organisation.

When the question of being prepared for possible developments arises, pessimistic and hopeless petit-bourgeois first think of the future period as one of intensified attacks from the dictatorship, of an unbridled terror, of intimidation of the oppressed and exploited classes, and of the

complete removal of every kind of legal and semi-legal position and opportunity. The idea of and attempt to form an organisation framed to meet a period of intensified attacks by the dictatorship, before these conditions have emerged, means turning one's back on the real tasks of the period, separating legal and illegal work and organisation from each other, isolating the cadres and organisations which should carry out revolutionary work among the masses, weakening revolutionary work, and most importantly, sabotaging revolutionary preparation. An organisation which does not fulfil the tasks and responsibilities required by the present conditions and period, which cannot show the ability to use all its energy and opportunities in an effective way, and which does not organise and position its forces accordingly, cannot prepare itself for the changing conditions of the future.

The only basis of preparation for the conditions when the attacks of the dictatorship will intensify (as well as for the revolution) is to fulfil the tasks of the present period, and to position and organise our forces in the most effective way to fulfil these tasks. It is to use all forces and opportunities to raise the level of consciousness and organisation of the masses and their determination and capacity for struggle. It is to develop among the masses, especially the advanced forces of the proletariat, the spirit of resistance against all attacks and of struggle for their short as well as long term demands, no matter in which direction conditions may change. It is to establish a nucleus and basis in the main fields of organisation and work such as mass organisations, schools, factories and workplaces, a nucleus and basis which knows what to do without standing helpless in the face of changing and tough conditions, which reorganises itself and the masses in accordance to changing conditions, and which has the ability to re-arrange all its relations and work. The more experienced, advanced and broad these nuclei are, the more prepared the revolutionary workers' movement will be when faced with intensifying attacks from the dictatorship and other possible developments.

Although the main elements mentioned above are fundamental, they are not enough when considering the conditions in our country in connection with the international situation and the trend of its development. The revolutionary workers' movement needs to have a minimum illegal basis and relations in order to reorganise itself and its work under the conditions when the dictatorship launches new attacks. These attacks may take the form of a state of emergency, martial law, a military coup, etc. and include banning political parties, trade unions, the press, and legal and semi-legal work and organisations, either temporarily or per-

manently, partially or completely, and conducting a mounting campaign of arrests. The party must have an illegal basis not only because of this but also in order to be prepared for new tasks emerging from the leaps and explosions of the mass movement.

The need for the revolutionary workers' movement to have a minimum illegal basis and relations which will enable it to reorganise itself and its work in the face of possible developments, including the most intense attacks by the enemy, is different from founding an organisation framed to meet conditions before they have emerged. The former implies the restructuring of the work and organisation of the revolutionary workers' movement depending on the changes in conditions, the repositioning of its forces, and having the minimum basis to carry out this restructuring and repositioning. However, the latter does not preoccupy itself with the issue of restructuring and repositioning, but argues instead for the formation beforehand of an organisation structured and ready for future conditions which, in fact, cannot be known beforehand. The former, being dialectic and materialist, depends on the development of class struggle, thus it is progressive and realistic; while the latter, being lifeless, metaphysical and idealist, is therefore regressive, a futile talking, exhausting revolutionary energy and possibilities in vain.

In the present period, the illegal organisation of the revolutionary workers' movement must be as tight as possible, and it must consist of the most determined, the most advanced, the most experienced and tested elements of the movement. Its illegal basis and work must be one that goes far beyond our comprehension and practice so far. The revolutionary workers' movement does not need to reactivate the work and organisation of its previous period, adapting them to the present or readjusting those aspects which do not fit properly in the present. Any attempt in this direction would play not a progressive role but a regressive one in terms of the movement; and it is bound to be unsuccessful.

We are going through a period of renewal and advance of legal and semi-legal instruments and forms, work and organisation. However, this is also a period of reconstruction of the illegal basis which is imperative under any circumstances (organisational structure, its relations, its style of work, etc.), and of reshaping its relations with the legal. As far as the most experienced elements of the revolutionary workers' movement are concerned, this process has to be one of re-education and re-organisation as an illegal organisation with the most conscious, most determined and most devoted new and fresh forces of the working class. The question before the revolutionary workers' movement today, as was the case yes-

terday, is not whether or not to accept this necessity, but how to raise its activities to a level that meets these requirements.

What is of special importance is the need to improve the quality of illegal work and organisation, to organise the leading core of the revolutionary working class, the most conscious, determined and sacrificing elements of the working class, as an illegal basis of the movement and develop them in illegal work. It is to renew this basis constantly, and to turn this organisation into one that combines those elements who give practical leadership to the movement. This is an important point because it is completely different from the work of those parties and currents who organise outside the working class and independently of it, who consist of non-class elements, and who impose themselves on the workers' movement as the party of the working class, their vanguard force, general staff and leadership. It is different from their attempt to seize the leadership of the workers' movement. This is one of the touchstones which distinguishes various currents of socialism from each other and reveals their position vis-_-vis the working class and their movement.

As might be the case in other countries, it is a tradition in our country as well that the intellectuals who first come face to face with socialism and revolutionary theory, even at their best, substitute themselves and their self organisation in place of the advanced sections of workers. They then present the organisation they have founded as the party of the working class. They carry out their activities with a perspective of increasing their party's influence among the workers, and deal with the question of relations with the workers on this basis. (3) Yet, the actual task of these intellectuals is to establish links with the workers; to carry out a systematic and uninterrupted agitation and propaganda and organisational work among the workers; to give maximum assistance to the awakening sections of workers in order to raise their level of consciousness, their experience of struggle, and their ability to organise, and to enable them to organise as an independent force, i.e. as a party. They should consider themselves as no more than a part of this organisation.

To the extent that the illegal basis of the revolutionary workers' movement is based, in terms of its combination, on the advanced sections of workers leading the movement, and that the most conscious, self-sacrificing and determined elements of the class make up the organisation of the actual leading core of the movement, illegal work and organisation will become more settled, and the possibility of combining it with legal work and organisation will expand. This combination should be realised in a systematic way and according to a line which will strengthen and

advance both aspects. If this is not implemented, illegal work and organisation will be, at best, on the margins of the workers' movement, and it will have limited links with the workers. Under circumstances when attacks are intensified, even its limited existing links with the masses will break, and the organisation and work will not be able to stop becoming narrowly intellectual and facing many impasses. Nor will it be able to avoid suffering heavier blows at every attempt at reorganisation.

From what has been said above it is clear that an illegal organisation is not one which is cut off from and outside legal work and organisation. On the contrary, under the most severe conditions when legal and semi-legal work and organisation become narrow, the illegal organisation, apart from very special technical apparatuses and cadres, in fact, consists of organisations which are based in legal and semi-legal workers' organisations (trade unions, cultural, economic, political organisations, etc.). These combine legal and illegal work at every level with differing degrees of illegality. It is in fact a question of whether systematic work will be carried out among the masses whatever the circumstances, and whether relations with the masses will be maintained. Moreover, especially under the conditions when the party is organised as an illegal organisation, it is a question of whether the party will represent the organised unity of the most conscious and determined elements of the class, with ever stronger links with broader section of the working class; or an organisation which is isolated from the class and which is condemned to call on them from outside, despite its desire to join with the workers' movement.

This is because the organisation and movement of broad masses does not have an illegal character even under the most grave conditions. What is illegal is the movement and organisation of a small minority.

No matter how radical its slogans are, an organisation or movement which binds its work and organisation within the narrow boundaries of illegality, in fact, submits to the ruling classes and their dictatorship, and to the laws which determine their prohibitions. Reformism and petit bourgeois extreme leftism are therefore two sides of the same coin.

The reconstruction and development of illegal apparatus and work, and fulfilling its requirements is not a particular task of any one organisation within the revolutionary workers' movement. It is one of the fundamental tasks of all its cadres and organisations, although mainly of the most experienced and advanced. Any contrary approach to this question is a reflection of an understanding which considers legal and illegal work and organisation in isolation and as an alternative to each other, and which

approaches illegality with a Blanquist understanding. It is also a reflection of a distorted understanding of the responsibility of the revolutionary workers' movement to reorganise itself in accordance with any fundamental changes in conditions.

The revolutionary party of the working class, and the most advanced elements and organisations of the revolutionary workers' movement, differ from other currents in their practice, in fulfilling the tasks and responsibilities of the period they are in, always taking into consideration the long term interests of the movement, its general trend and possible developments. Representing not only the short term but also the long term interests of the movement is not only limited to the question of the relationship between programme and tactics on the one hand and strategy on the other. It also necessitates penetration into and determination of all aspects of daily practical work and the relationship between them. While the revolutionary workers' movement tries to improve its legal and semi-legal work on a revolutionary basis using all possibilities, it also carries out this work with a perspective taking into account possible developments and in a manner which leaves the class enemies and the dictatorship the minimum possibility of obtaining information about its work. Its legal and semi-legal work should not narrow the elements and instruments of illegal work and organisation, but should improve and consolidate them.

The most open work of an organisation which does not limit the content of its activities to within the law has to override the law in terms of its instruments and forms. A form of work which centralises all internal relations without taking into consideration possible attacks from the dictatorship, and which limits itself to the instruments of communication under the dictatorship's control, is not a form which takes into account the conditions of the country, anticipating the future and long term interests of the workers' movement, and improving activities among the masses. In this respect too, it is important that our activities, organisations, and all our relations must be concentrated in factories, work places, and working class areas.

The organisation of educational work among advanced workers and revolutionary youth, paying attention to the necessity of illegal work and organisation, should constitute one of the aspects of our work, which should not be postponed or underestimated. This work should be combined in a creative way with instruments and forms not limited to those under the full control of the dictatorship.

One of the most important gains of the revolutionary workers' move-

ment over the last ten years has been the demolition of schematic understandings moulded by the influence of petit bourgeois socialism. The movement, thus, has orientated towards the maximum possible utilisation of legal opportunities. Moreover, in relation to this development, an open legal workers' party has been founded, new positions have been gained in the trade unions and in cultural fields. Undoubtedly, these gains are increasing the opportunities for the most advanced section of the class to improve the basis and area of illegal work, and most importantly, to demolish the misinterpretation in relation to this side of the problem: that understanding which reduced illegal work and organisation to conspiratory organisation and work. But it is important not to adopt an attitude which hinders the advanced workers from making maximum use of legal instruments. This would also hinder the awakening workers from organising themselves in their own class party, would discourage their initiatives, would weaken the most significant gains of the last ten years, and impede their further development.

(1) Another example of this confusion of petit bourgeois revolutionary appears in considering forms of struggle. They fetishise violence and the armed actions of narrow groups which are in fact nothing more than individual terror. They declare peaceful forms of struggle reformist and non-peaceful ones revolutionary, without considering their politics. They mix up essence and form in this question too, and sacrifice the former to the latter.

(2) Their reflections have been emphasised in the previous issues of Devrimin Sesi (Voice of Revolution), as well as in other materials of revolutionary workers' movement.

(3) This is generally attached to the fact that socialism and revolutionary theory develop outside the workers' movement, that within the narrow framework of spontaneous movement the workers are not able to acquire socialist class consciousness and the workers' movement is not able to become a political movement. It is true that revolutionary theory is developed by the intellectuals who have the possibility of obtaining and developing scientific knowledge, and that, despite some exceptions in every country, intellectuals are the ones who come face to face with the revolutionary theory and socialism in the first place (However, it must be emphasised that this does not happen independently of the working class and its movement; that, on the contrary, it is one of the many-sided consequences and reflections of the emergence and development of the working class and its movement). It is also true that, within the narrow

framework of spontaneous movement, the workers will not be able to acquire political class consciousness, and the workers' movement will not be able to develop as a movement putting ultimate emancipation at its centre. This is a result of the fact that the means of production and distribution are in the monopoly of the bourgeoisie, and, as an inevitable consequence of this, scientific knowledge is in the monopoly of especially its intellectuals, and that the workers and working people in general have been pushed into the whirlpool of ignorance. However, the question here is not whether we accept this fact or not, and it should not be limited to the discussion of this fact. On the contrary, despite all the distortions of bourgeois and petit bourgeois socialist, the problem begins after the acceptance of this fact, in other words, with regard to the conclusion which should be drawn from this fact, to the steps which should be taken, and to the line which should be followed.

(Text from: Devrimin Sesi -Voice of Revolution, central organ of TDKP- No.201, April 1999)

Ayşe Aras

Revolutionary Communist Party Turkey (TDKP)

Unity & Struggle

Organ of the International Conference of Marxist-Leninist Parties and Organizations

Published in :

Arabic, English, French, Spanish and Turkish in the responsibility of the Coordinating Committee of the International Conference

Any opinions expressed in this journal belong to the contributors

Contact Address :
**Revolutionary Democracy,
5-B, Sudhir Bose Marg,
University Enclave,
Delhi-110007, India.**

Published half-yearly by Vijay Singh from 5-B, Sudhir Bose Marg, University Enclave, Delhi-110007 and *printed* by him at **Classic Offset Printers and Packagers**, 1/6704, East Rohtas Nagar, Delhi-110032. *Composed by Image Graphics*, B-35 & 43, Patel Chest, Delhi-7. Ph.: 7257243,244,305, 98111-09750.
Editor : Vijay Singh.

On Sale
Half-Yearly Theoretical-Political Journal
REVOLUTIONARY DEMOCRACY

September, 2000
Vol. VI, No.2 includes :

Labour Movement in India as Reflected in the Indian Labour Year Book 1997, *C.N. Subramaniam.*

Bonded Labour and the Tea Plantation Economy, *Souparna Lahiri.*

Planter Raj to Police Raj, *Sanjay Barbora.*

Victory to the Lawyers' Struggle, *Mazdoor Mukti Sangharsh Samiti.*

Mumia Abu-Jamal and The World Proletarian Revolution, *Ray O. Light.*

The Class Essence of the War in Chechnya, *Proletarskaya Gazeta.*

Interview : The Revolutionary Struggle in Ecuador, *Pablo Miranda.*

The Transition in Western Sahara, *Jagdish Sharma.*

The Nazis and Monopoly Capital, *Allan Merwin.*

Speech at the Session of the Politbureau of the CC of the AUCP(b),
19th August 1939, *J.V. Stalin.*

ECCI Secretariat Directive on the Outbreak of War, 8th September, 1939,
G.M. Dimitrov.

Man of the Year, 1942 : Joseph Stalin : Die But Do Not Retreat, *Time Magazine.*

Marxism and Mr. Bettelheim, *Sunil Sen.*

Correlation of Classes in India, 1951, *Institute of Oriental Studies, Academy of Sciences of the USSR.*

Two Last Conversations, *Svetlana Allilueva.*

Fourth International Seminar on the Problem of the Revolution in Latin America.

Resolutions of the International Conference of Marxist-Leninist Parties and Organisations Held in April, 2000.

Socialist Realism, *Jakup Mato, Rinush Idrizi, Vangjush Ziko, Anastas Kapurani.*

Short Story : The Colour, *Samaresh Basu.*

Subscription

Annual Individual.....Rs 40/-

Institutional.....Rs 70/-

Life.....Rs 500/-

Remit by Money Order only to :

The Manager,

Revolutionary Democracy,

5-B, Sudhir Bose Marg, University Enclave, Delhi-110007

