

#56 July2002;1] CONTENTS;0]

3...Palestine on rations

4...Howard's border games with the refugees and Labor

...Defend Craig Johnston

5...New Zealand elections Labour landslides to victory.

6...CMFEU and green bans

7...Argentina Duhalde government of murder

Bush demands a blank cheque to invade Iraq

Before September 11, imperialists used to justify their massive array of armaments (including nuclear weapons) by the euphemism "defence". No one used to come out openly and admit that all this armament spending was for aggression, for plunder. George Bush has now declared that in their "war against terrorism" they have the right to attack anyone who they see fit. This month he declared that the US had the right to invade Iraq. In ci it is preparing 250,000 troops for the invasion

The US did, of course, invade the Taliban regime in Afghanistan and impose the Northern Alliance. It was not the Taliban who blew up the World Trade Center. They said that if the US had any proof against Bin Laden, they would hand him over. The US didn't negotiate, they (and their allies) invaded. Whilst the Taliban, itself imposed by imperialism, was thoroughly reactionary, the current regime is hardly progressive. Imperialism can play no progressive role in the Middle East or anywhere!

Saddam Hussein was not a party to September 11. What did he do to deserve this? Ten years ago, his regime in Iraq invaded Kuwait. Kuwait is an imperialist-sponsored statelet. Basically this sheikhdom amounts to a conspiracy between imperialism and the El Sabah family to rip off oil from the Arab People. We think that Iraq had every right to remove such a state. Iraq lost and the people have been forced to pay. The blockade has imposed severe hardship because of hunger and lack of medicine. It has been estimated that one million Iraqis have been killed. Now Imperialism controls the skies over Iraq and will strike it the Iraqi airforce flies over parts of its own country!

think Iraq is totally within its rights. Whilst it is true Iraq has weapons of mass destruction, so do many other countries who are not victimised. Iraq has not invaded any other country apart from Kuwait. It has no major expansionist ambitions. America demands the right to dominate the world. Woe betide anyone who threatens this domination either politically, economically or militarily. Iraq is singled out because it represents a minor challenge to U' hegemony — Iraq must be put in its place lest other dominated nations assert their independence and threaten the new world order.

There will be all sorts of rationalisations. Iraq is not democratic country, but neither is any other country in the Middle East. Basically if you are the ally of the US, a blind eye will be turned to democratic and human rights abuses. If you are the enemy these will be plenty of abuses of human rights dragged into the arena of world public opinion. The US will conveniently "forget" that these crimes are also committed by Turkey and Pakistan (for example). In any case, a US-sponsored alternative may not be democratic either.

Iraq is under attack because it refuses to allow UN weapons inspectors

George Bush will no doubt drag up the Kurds as a rationalisation. Yes, indeed, Saddam has been guilty of brutal repression, deprivation of their national rights. The Americans turned a blind eye when they were friends of Saddam. Kurds are also brutally repressed in Turkey and Iran. Turkey has been extremely nervous, If the Kurds get their state in Iraq, they fear that will this empower them to keep up their national struggle and destabilise Turkey. The US has reassured them that an independent Kurdistan is 'not on'. Will America take action against Turkey, their bosom ally over Kurdistan? No way!. Kurdistan is a nation divided between Turkey, Iran and Iraq. None of the above recognise their national rights. The Kurdish people are fighting all three countries at once. Imperialism is responsible for this situation. Imperialists pretend to care for Kurdistan when either Iraq, Iran or Turkey treads on its toes. But these are crocodile tears. Imperialism does not support an independent Kurdistan. The Kurds are a pretext for an invasion. They are not the real reason.

It isn't surprising that one of the first and most vocal country to back America is Australia. Alexander Downer is one of the most rabid of hawks. He compares refusal to act against Iraq to appeasement of Hitler! The Liberals have a strong record in going all the way with the USA. There is a bit more to it this time. America is defending its farmers, clamping down on imported foods and rural products. This hits Australia hard. Howard is crawling on his knees to America hoping to make Australia a special case, an exemption from restrictions. Howard hopes that by being gung-ho pro- USA, Bush will listen to Australia's plight. After all, Australian farmers need the American market. America always puts America first. Howard will probably be out of luck. He will still go all the way with the USA at the expense of Australian lives and the Australian taxpayer.

What has the Labor Party got to offer to counter this grotesque sabre-rattling? The colourless lackey, Simon Crean, basically wants to concentrate on getting weapons inspectors to "inspect" Iraq. This is effectively a call for a more peaceful variant of imperialist domination. One ex-Labor leader who says something is Paul Keating. Keating stated in a Curtin lecture that he believes that being too close to the USA damages Australia's prospects in Asia. These "prospects" he talks about are imperialist ones and his "alternative is reactionary. Keating only wants Australia to differentiate itself from America a bit. In no way does he suggest Australia break from the alliance. Apart from Keating, who has retired, the rest of the parliamentary Labor Party has nothing to say.

All of this is thoroughly and utterly reactionary. We, the class conscious section of the working class must oppose it tooth and nail! This means action. Workers action against any Australian participation in America's imperialist invasion must be prepared now!

We must defend Iraq unconditionally. The only people we can entrust to remove Saddam are the Iraqi working class. It is possible that the imperialists might impose a government pledged to democracy which might even carry out some democratic measures. But the imperialists will demand their pound of flesh, or rather their reservoirs of oil. Imperialism is one thousand times more reactionary than Saddam Hussein!

We must have no faith in the "democratic" or "anti-imperialist" bourgeoisie in our anti-war coalitions. There may be some sections of the ruling class who find this blatant aggression repugnant. They may even be sincere. But in no way will they be party to any action which threatens their class interest — class struggle. It is only class struggle which can defeat imperialism. Forming a bloc with

these people is suicide for the movement. When class struggle is repudiated for broadness, especially in class terms, it is our contradiction not theirs.

We must have no faith in a capitalist government or the capitalist state. Bush and the imperialists are acting this way because they require a scapegoat to maintain world domination of finance capital. Now stalinism has been defeated, Iraq is a logical replacement. Bush is not mad, merely acting on his class interest. We must act in our interest. The struggle against the imperialist war drive must be linked to revolutionary struggle against the Australian state.

Build a workers' movement against the imperialist war drive!

Palestine on rations!

The Israel/Palestine issue has been a bit of an embarrassment for Bush. Of course he is fully behind the state of Israel. Irrespective of how much war criminal Sharon might embarrass him, there is no way Bush will tolerate Sharon being defeated. On the other hand he needs Arab support for the 'war against terror' and to isolate Iraq.

The situation in Palestine is well known. An unjust peace was imposed on the Palestinian people. Extreme religious groups, notably Hamas, realising the injustice and humiliation of the situation, launched a suicide bombing campaign against Israel, killing innocent civilians. Israel has replied by military occupation including destruction of cities and towns. Arafat has been kept under house arrest. Israel has used Bush logic by claiming that Arafat's refusal to act makes him guilty of "nurturing terrorists" and effectively a terrorist himself. Bush has taken a slightly more liberal line critical of Arafat but not considering him a terrorist.

The question of an independent Palestinian state has been posed. President Mubarak of Egypt went to see Bush urging him to endorse an independent Palestinian state. Without such a state he argued, suicide bombers would continue as Palestinians would feel there was no hope and that they have nothing to lose. Israel, of course, rejects such a state as it would be "terrorist". In reality Israel has been the region's number 1 terrorist.

Bush finally made a definitive statement. He expressed support for a Palestinian state as long as a new leadership emerges, as long as the Palestinians get rid of Yassar Arafat.

This puts a gun to the head of the Palestinian people. In a democracy, the people are supposed to be given the right to choose their leadership. Bush is effectively denying their rights. Bush does not make similar demands on Israel. Sharon is recognised as a war criminal even in his own country! On this Bush is silent.

Bush's statement pleases Israel. In response to demands for negotiations, they have always replied that there is no real authority to negotiate with. They have been arguing two ways. Arafat is either complicit in the terrorism or not really in control. Either way they reject negotiations. Bush has given them a rationalisation to occupy Palestine with impunity.

The prospects in the short term are very grim indeed. The Palestinians will remain isolated and desperate. As a result terrorist activities will continue as young Palestinians become desperate and

feel that life is not worth living and that they have nothing to lose by suicide bombing. Israel will intensify its brutal occupation.

It is the class conscious working class which must break through the isolation. We must militarily back them without showing any faith in any of their leaders, religious or nationalist. We must support the self-determination of the Palestinian people in a meaningful way.

There are some tendencies on the left who do not support Palestinian self-determination. The two represented in Australia are Workers' Liberty and the Spartacist League. Whilst there is a clear difference — the Spartacist League raise the need for revolution — there is some common ground in their analysis and logic. Both argue that Palestinian nationalism is 'racist' and "genocidal". They argue that a Palestinian victory would or could "reverse the terms of oppression."

Well the fact is this. Israelis have a state. It was created by imperialism. It was created by kicking out the Palestinians, depriving them of a nationality. Revolutionaries in this context must explicitly support the national rights of the Palestinians. We do not put the two nations on an equal footing. We support revolutionary unity between Arab and Jewish proletarians. But to achieve this unity we must give explicit support to Palestine and military support to Palestinian nationalists. "Wont this mean genocide.. .kicking Jews into the sea." i what we hear from left Zionists. Well not recognising their nation state in the current context does not mean killing them as people. "Wont this reverse the terms of oppression". Currently Israelis backed by imperialism.. Palestine is not. Yes, in a different context, the Israelis may lose imperialist sponsorship and Palestine may gail imperialist backing. But that is a different context. We must base our programme on the balance of forces as they stand at the moment. Imperialist sponsorship of Palestine is extremely unlikely.

Historically, it is understandable why Jews fear being a minority given that they have been scapegoated over centuries, not just by the Nazis but also other reactionaries. But Jews should analyses why, the historical conte in which the persecution was carried out. The point is that Palestinians were not to blame for it and should fbi have been deprived of their country. Palestinians have no agenda to exterminate Jews. They just want their country back.

Howard's border games with the refugees and Labor

Howard now has a formula. He whips up chauvinist hysteria over 'defense of Australia's boundaries' promising more repressive crackdowns against refugees and he watches Labor squirm. Simon Crean is consistently exposed as weak and equivocal. He is a man who accepts the fundamental chauvinist premise and either must be seen as going along with the agenda (and therefore no opposition) or alternatively a paler weaker more equivocal version of the government. If you accept the chauvinist logic , Howard is doing the job "defending Australia". A question mark is placed over Labor. All this lost Labor the last election.

The latest gambit in Howard's game is to declare a whole string of islands not part of Australia from the point of view of asylum seekers. This includes the Torres Strait, Cocos and Christmas Islands. The Australian government wants the benefits from these islands. This includes mining and fishing rights. But it chooses to exclude them if they become an inconvenience. If you're Asian you only have to travel a couple of hundred miles to reach Christmas Island. It is thousands on miles from the

Australian mainland. Howard wants to deprive poor refugees of any chance of getting an easy ride to the Australian mainland.

Crean's response is to oppose this as unnecessary. He thinks that depriving them of the chance to reach Australia by island hopping will merely provide them with an incentive to come directly to the Australian mainland. This is a pretty puny and unprincipled basis for opposition. Nor will it be convincing. Once again Labor is seen by chauvinist mainstream Australia as equivocal. So Labor will once again fail to win over the chauvinist vote and Liberals will look optimistically to possibility of winning seats in Labor's heartland such as western Sydney.

The opposition to Howard is generally based on moralism. Yes, the conditions of those forced to live in Womerah, Villawood, north West Cape etc is barbaric and horrific. And these conditions must be denounced. But the main issue is that class conscious proletarians must have no interest whatsoever in "defending Australia" We must chose our class interest — opposing immigration controls — instead of playing the bosses game, arguing on what basis people should come into this country.

Communist Left calls for a workers movement to smash all immigration controls, fight all racism and free the refugees!

It is only the working class who have the power to force the government to release them. Governments don't listen to morality. They do listen when bosses stand to lose their profits. Bigger demos based on students may get more publicity in the short term. but they dont fight the system. so in the final analysis, they are impotent.

AMWU. Defend Craig Johnston

Simon Crean has once again raised the issue of an Accord between a future Labor government and the trade union movement. Labor promises so very little these days. So it is difficult to think of what he could possibly offer in exchange for class peace. Many militants have a painful memory of the last one. Basically while workers suffered, carrying out their part of the bargain, Hawke Labor gave them nothing. Crean is putting the Accord on the agenda of Australian politics. He could only be doing this if he had some support from the trade union bureaucracy — including "lefts" such as AMWU and CMFEU. As far as the leadership of the Australian Manufacturing workers Union is concerned the spirit of the Accord still permeates their politics. They want responsible unionism meaning responsible to Australian capitalism. They are still blatant protectionists. Whilst they have not changed fundamentally, they have realised that they have to do a bit on the militant grass roots level — so long as it doesn't threaten their overall framework. That is why they are prepared to tolerate the Activists group in NSW.

The militancy of Craig Johnston and Workers First goes way beyond that. They are serious trade unionists, prepared to fight on the trade union level. As far as the leadership is concerned, they are a blot. They threaten their efforts to establish AMWU as a respectable union, responsive to the needs of capital. So the Victorian leadership dominated by Workers First has to be smashed. Part of this campaign is setting Johnston up as a rapist. The statement against him is dubious. It also serves to protect the leadership from his union challenge. The leadership don't care that the AMWU is being labled a 'rapists union' as long as it helps them get rid of a factional opponent.

Communist Left states categorically that we have no political faith in Workers First. By being mere unionists they cannot fight the chauvinist politics which has led to all this. Communist leadership is needed. However, Workers First are both serious union militants and the Victorian leadership supported by the rank and file and must be defended against this anti union attack.

New Zealand elections Labour landslides to victory.

Helen Clark, leader of the New Zealand Labour Party and prime minister, has total dominance of New Zealand bourgeois politics. Victory for Clark Labour is a virtual certainty. Current opinion polls estimate NZLP support to be 48% of the total vote. The Nationals have a mere 24%. The rest is shared by minor parties. Clark has the support of the major classes within New Zealand. The ruling class like her as an economic rationalist. They know that they have nothing to fear and everything to gain from Clark Labour. She may not be quite as ruthless about rationalism as Roger Douglas. But what she loses on efficiency, she gains by getting popular consent for ruling class attacks.

Being a woman and “politically correct” she is in favour with sections of the middle class. She has also liberalised the ECA anti-union legislation. This has allowed unions to organise on a grass roots level. This they appreciate. They, on the whole, have no offensive ambitions. The unions appreciate the breathing space.

Whereas Clark shows that she is a leader, Nationals have no direction for the future. People also remember how painful the previous government was. Such pain is now not necessary. So why vote for National? They face a flogging. Nationals are so puny that they are not even the real opposition in terms of the major issues debated. The largest supported minor party (according to current opinion polls) is the Greens. Their major issue is genetic engineering. There is indeed concern and paranoia about the prospects of introducing genetically modified crops to New Zealand. Certainly the Greens are the most consistent opponents of genetically modified crops. But this opposition is reactionary. The fact that mankind can make better food (etc.) by genetically engineering crops is progressive.

It can be pointed out that capitalism might stuff it up, using gm crops in a way which might harm the environment. but capitalism can stuff up anything. Should we not have industry as, under capitalism, it might mean pollution? The Greens are anti-social progress. Their paradigm is both reactionary and utopian.

One member of New Zealand’s Socialist Workers Organisation (in solidarity with the ISO) showed his colours by arguing, in a Sydney meeting, that mass rallies through Auckland against gm could, with correct intervention, produce a revolutionary vanguard. There were middle class protests around a reactionary demand.

The Greens are replacing the Alliance (also opponents of gm) as the main party of New Zealand middle class radicalism. The war against terrorism divided the Alliance. Those backing Jim Anderton split in support of the wardrive. This split, now called Progressive Coalition, has one percent support. The Alliance has less than point five. Its future as a mainstream party seems doomed.

Another issue which is part of the public debate is racism. Here the main racist argument against the government is being made by Winston Peters of New Zealand First. He is tapping NZ chauvinism very effectively and whipping up the same sort of paranoia against non-Anglo immigrants as John Howard

and Pauline Hanson. Winston Peters led an anti-economic rationalist split from the Nationals. His racism has intensified. Now he even opposes Maori electorates.

The other issue NZ First is dishing up to the electorate is law and order. Both they and ACT NZ want tougher jail sentences. ACT NZ is a new right economic rationalist party formed by Labour's finance minister Roger Douglas and led by former NZLP leader Richard Prebbles. Whilst they diverge strongly from NZ First, who support state intervention, they sound very similar on non-economic issues — racist and reactionary. Currently Act NZ is less racist because it is courting Asian businessmen who have NZ nationality. Both are competing for sections of the middle class.

None of the above is worthy of any working class support. The working class are totally excluded from the New Zealand political agenda. And this is the fault of the far left, notably the Socialist Action League (which became Communist League) Workers' Communist League and the Communist Party (which is now Socialist Workers' Organisation). None of these groupings have fought for the independence of the working class from the capitalist state. Yet it is the working class who have suffered and will continue to suffer from the crisis of capitalism.

It is urgent that a revolutionary communist party be built. Such a party would stand for parliament. They should do so on the basis that the only government that can serve our interests is one based on independent workers' and oppressed people's power. For a workers' and small farmers' government!

Helen Clark might seem humane in her interpretation of the monetarist agenda. There are plenty of people who are suffering right now. Make no mistake, when the economic crisis hits harder she will take the gloves off and hit working and unemployed people even harder. Or alternatively, make way for an extreme right party which will. We must be prepared for this by building a political alternative to Labour.

CMFEU and green bans

The CMFEU is an amalgamation of unions which includes building workers, miners and engine drivers. They are a militant union who (correctly) see safety of their members as a priority.

Currently the union is under attack. They are attacking the legal proceedings against them as a "kangaroo court". So they should. Capitalist state intervention against the union movement must be opposed unconditionally. We might, perhaps, agree with some of the state's criticisms. Democracy in the union, especially workers' democracy, has been something lacking. Capitalist courts, however, are not interested in workers' democracy, they are interested in union smashing. With whatever faults, the CMFEU is better than no organisation at all. It is only the workers' that we can entrust with imposing workers' democracy.

Apart from showing their credentials on safety, the union in its defence is courting the radical middle class. One rally outside the courthouse was an exercise in nostalgia. A key guest speaker was former NSW BLF state secretary Jack Munday. He mainly discussed the green bans union which the union under his leadership became famous for. Jack pointed out that the CMFEU too have enforced some green bans and that a defeat for the CMFEU would be a defeat for both resident action and the ecology movement.

The CMFEU absorbed the BLF which unionised builder labourers as opposed to skilled workers. So at first sight he doesn't seem out of place. But in reality, although the CMFEU is an amalgamated union, the real leadership is the old BWIU, the tradesmen's union. This union, led by Pat Clancy, Tom and Don Mac Donald of the old Socialist Party opposed green bans to the hilt when Munday led the BLF. In fact at the Rocks, BWIU scabbed on BLF. When the Maoist Norm Gallagher made a deal with the bosses to smash the Munday led BLF. The Clancy gang did nothing in defence of Munday despite the fact that he leadership had overwhelming support from the rank and file. Communist Left has immense criticisms with that leadership. However we would have defended them on the principle of workers democracy. Gallagher imposed organisers who had been defeated in a fair ballot less than six months before the Munday leadership was forced to surrender.

Well what's changed? Well the Munday leadership were forced into bed with Clancy considering them the better of two evils as opposed to the ruthless and opportunist Maoist Gallagher. Munday was a leading member of the Aarons led CPA which was at one stage the militant pole of the trade union bureaucracy. The defeat of that militancy forced them to the right. They rebuilt their bridges with the Socialist Party bureaucrats who they once denounced as conservative. In fact the Aarons led CPA was now so conservative it was selling to the Hawke and the bureaucracy — the Prices and Incomes Accord. Basically under the Accord unions sacrificed wages and conditions, at least in the short term, in exchange for pretty minor gains from the Hawke government. Workers sacrificed but the 'gains' never arrived. These 'gains' incidentally were minor reforms which workers usually expected to see from a Labor government. They included wage indexation.

The Socialist Party, to its credit, rejected the Prices and Incomes Accord for very good and principled reasons. This forced the bureaucrats out. Initially they were part proAccord Association for Communist Unity. The rapid liquidating CPA was a bit too middle class for their liking. Although the MacDonald family were persuaded to become part of the CPA's liquidated successor the Ne Left Party. But basically exCPA and exACU unionists made all sorts of blocs at the trade union level. The current CMFEU is one of them.

The spirit of the green bans lives, but in a more minima and liquidated form. There is no way that the CMFEU leadership, especially those allied with the old BWIU will use working class power to fight the destruction of the environment, They can boast a few green bans successes such as the Green Ban Park Erskineville and stopping a MacDonalds being erected on Moore Park. The old BLF under Munday thought it could "tame the concrete jungle" under capitalism. They had no programme to fight the crisis of unemployment when it hit the building industry. This meant they were ripe for takeover by the Federal leadership of Norm Gallagher who was backed by the bosses. The BWIU did nothing to defend them.

Basically the CMFEU want to utilise the respectable middle class aspects of the BLF. They want to liquidate the spirit of class militancy. They certainly reject the Munday BLF's (inconsistent) hostility to bureaucracy.

Revolutionary communists support building workers defending working class housing. At the moment, low income Department of Housing tenants are under threat in Erskineville. some of the residents support approaching the CMFEU. We hope they respond with positive action.

In some circumstances we would place black bans to defend the environment. But we would not kow-tow to the middle class ecology movement nor middle class resident activists as the old BLF did.

But, irrespective of what bans are placed, we have no illusions in permanent workers control under capitalism. Action must be linked to a transitional programme, linking the interests of building workers with other workers and proletarians to overthrow capitalism.

Unlike some such as Workers Liberty, we do not glorify the old BLF. but there are positive lessons from their struggle which should help the political development of the movement today. We certainly hope that the likes of MacDonald don't get away with whitewashing BLF history by raising only the respectable and not the class struggle and militant aspects of NSW BLF history.

Argentina: Duhalde government of starvation and murder

President Duhalde of Argentina has just announced an election. This has been denounced as a tactic to head off the millions of Argentines who have lost faith in the system. This may be part of the reason. But Duhalde has been exposed. He cannot please the IMF who are demanding an even greater sacrifice. He certainly cannot please the militant masses, angry at unemployment, working for nothing and starvation. Currently, the official percentage unemployed is 21. If you have worked for one hour per week you are classified by the government as "working"! Half the population of Argentina is currently surviving on less than the Australian dole. Wages are not being paid. It is quite common for Argentinians to spend their days scrounging through rotten fruit in order to find the few decent pieces needed to feed their families.

In Argentina there is currently a delegation from the IMF "Commission of Notables". This delegation of imperialists will no doubt show sympathy for Argentina as long as the government behaves "responsibly". It is a bit difficult for Duhalde to behave any more "responsibly" — and expect government workers to survive on their meagre salary.

Understandably this reactionary delegation was met by a militant demonstration of Bloque Piquetero Nacional, the MIJD Popular Assemblies student organisations and unionists. Out with the AII! was their main demand. They were referring to both IMF and the Duhalde Government, Millions of people have suffered

Duhalde is critical of the IMF. He is pleading for a better deal for Argentina. But he considers the militant picketers to be a greater enemy. hopefully, the death agony of Duhalde will be the death agony of Peronism.

Currently there is an upsurge of militancy, from working people and especially from the militant picketers. Demonstrations are pretty common these days. But the largest was in response to the blatant murder of two picketers by the Argentine police. Unemployed don't merely demonstrate in Argentina they fight the police physically. The police fight back with both rubber and real bullets.

The Argentinian state is well aware of the issues at stake. The police force and the army will defend the government and the bosses by force if necessary. They will put the interests of capital before the lives of ordinary people.

Therefore we must be prepared for force also. Over the past year the Argentine working and exploited have shown their preparedness to fight. However, preparedness to fight and a revolution are often unfortunately distinct. Working class struggle is only revolutionary when they consciously support the dictatorship of the proletariat and fight for demands which lead to that conclusion — the expropriation of the ruling class and a workers and small farmers government.

In Argentina, given that it is predominantly a semi-colony where rural interests are significant, it is extremely important that small farmers be won to the proletarian vanguard. They must be won on our terms that of the proletarian vanguard. Those who liquidate working class interest behind the banner of the peasantry usually tie the revolutionary movement to capitalism. In other circumstances, they betray the revolution by creating a bureaucratic deformed society — a workers and peasant's state. This is what happened in China, Vietnam, North Korea, Yugoslavia, Albania and Cuba. This Stalinist abomination is hardly desirable.

The Argentine factor is spreading to Uruguay. There the government closed the banks after a 55% reduction in the value of the currency. This was met by riots in the street and a general strike. Uruguay is a major trading partner of Argentina, so economic collapse in Argentina will be felt there painfully also. It will also be felt in other Latin American countries. There have been riots against privatisation recently in both Peru and Bolivia.

As the economic crisis is internationalised, so too is the workers movement. The building of a revolutionary communist international is a life or death necessity. A revolutionary movement confined within one country will be defeated.

Revolution or death! These alternatives are posed for the Argentinian proletariat, point blank! In no other country is it so clear that capitalism cannot provide wages and conditions let alone a decent superstructure. The ruling class offensive will intensify meaning more starvation and state murder. We are confident that this will be with a strong militant and decisive Argentinian working class. But victory requires revolutionary consciousness. The construction of a communist leadership is required in that country —urgently!