



Nahuel Moreno

**Speech Closing
the 1972 PST
Congress**

Nahuel Moreno

Speech Closing the 1972 PST Congress

17 December 1972

Archive material by courtesy of Fundación Pluma

English translation: Daniel Iglesias

Editor Notes: Daniel Iglesias

Cover and interior design: Daniel Iglesias

www.nahuelmoreno.org

www.uit-ci.org

www.izquierdasocialista.org.ar

Copyright by *CEHUS*, Centro de Estudios Humanos y Sociales

Buenos Aires, 2021

cehus2014@gmail.com



Contents

Foreword	1
Speech Closing the 1972 PST Congress.....	2
Appendix	
“Three powers” or a single bourgeois power?	9

Foreword

On Sunday, 17 December 1972, the extraordinary congress of the PST was held at the Sarandi cinema, on Mitre Avenue in Avellaneda. The day before, on Saturday 16, the First National Plenary of the Workers' Front had been held at the same cinema, with the participation of 1,200 delegates, leaders and worker activists from all over the country. Presiding over the plenary were, among others, Mateo Fossa, Elias Rodríguez and Jorge Mera. For its part, in the Wilde cinema, the Juventud Socialista de Avanzada (PST's Socialist Youth) also held its congress on that Saturday, with the presence of 700 delegates and guests, representing 2,500 militants.

Both Leandro Fote and Jose Francisco Paez had declined their candidacies for the presidency. A sector of the youth insisted that the workers' character of the candidacies should be kept to the letter. This is one of the debates that Moreno took in his closing. The Coral-Ciapponi ticket was approved by the majority.

Moreno also referred to the positions of part of the Cordovan delegation that rejected the candidacies for executive positions. We have included, after his speech, an article, without a signature, published in *Avanzada Socialista* N° 43, on this subject.

The political framework of the deliberations and this closing speech by of Moreno was given by the document *A socialist and revolutionary electoral campaign*, published by the PST in January 1973. The texts collected in *After the Cordobazo* also refer to these issues. Both are available for download at www.nahuelmoreno.org.

All notes are by the editors

The Editors, January 2021

Speech Closing the 1972 PST Congress

Comrades: It is no coincidence that we have held three such spectacular congresses. If you read the daily news in the newspapers, you find a bleak picture from the political point of view. All the political organisations in the country, both bourgeois and on the left, except for a single party, have internal problems and divisions. There is only one party that marches on, slow but steady, without stopping and that is getting stronger every day, without internal crises, consolidating itself: our party.

This is a true panorama. We don't have to draw any conclusions from here yet but this is a fact. Here, comrade Thompson pointed out the case of Peronism very well; Peronism appears in the newspapers every day: the newspapers will need to have a special section, police-political or political-police because every day they shoot each other. In Misiones, they killed a candidate. Yesterday the official delegation of the national leadership of the Peronist party, which came to Avellaneda, was beaten and hospitalized; Campora¹ could not enter. They notified him that if he entered they would kill him; they told this to the Secretary-General, and the candidate for president of the party. You can read this in today's newspapers.

This, as you see, is a panorama worthy of a TV soap opera but not of a party, which, according to the bourgeoisie itself, is one of the parties that can reach the government. This shows the state of the bourgeoisie as well. Radicalism continues to be this gigantic zero of Argentine politics. If we take the melodramatic tone out of Balbin,² there is nothing left.

Let's not talk about the sad widow of Argentine politics, Stalinism. If you know a Stalinist, and you see him looking down, it is not that he is looking for small change or a progressive bourgeois: he is sad. They kept the wedding date but without the groom (the progressive bourgeois). This is not to say they will not succeed but they will have to improvise and very quickly; perhaps it will be Alende,³ the great procurer of the Italian consortiums, or some variant of the sort. The progressive bourgeoisie change. In 1945, Yankee imperialism was progressive, when Codovilla⁴ wrote: "those scoundrels who denounce the United States of Yankee imperialism when it is our older brother,

1 **Hector Jose Campora** (1909-1980) was an Argentine politician. Peron chose him as his "personal delegate" in 1971. He won the March 1973 election with 49.5 per cent of the votes. Fearing that he could not control the situation, the military made a deal with Peron for him to take over the government directly. Peron forced Campora to resign after 49 days in the presidency. The Peron-Peron formula won with over seven million votes in the elections of September 1973.

2 **Ricardo Balbin** (1904–1981) was an Argentine lawyer and politician, and one of the most important figures of the Radical Civic Union (UCR), for which he was the presidential nominee four times: in 1951, 1958, and twice in 1973.

3 **Oscar Alende** (1909–1996), was an Argentine doctor and politician, belonging to the Radical Civic Union, Intransigent Radical Civic Union and Intransigent Party, of which he was the founder.

4 **Victorio Codovilla** (1894–1970) was a leader of the Argentine Communist Party and became one of the most important leaders of Argentine and South American communism.

who should help us". And then the progressive changed. The bourgeoisie changes. What they do not change is their love for the "progressive" bourgeoisie.

On the other hand, comrades, the ultra-left is in a truly desperate state. The discussion continues about whether the guerrilla should be urban, rural, urban-rural or rural-urban. There are four variants, and also sub-variants. Now in Europe, we have found out, that the "models" are discussed, as in the Faculty of Sociology. Whether it is the Vietnamese model, or the Chinese model, or the North Korean model, or the Cuban model. It looks like a women's fashion course. Now the model in fashion is the Vietnamese.

We are in the reality of the process of class struggle; This is why we have brought that quote of Trotsky in our electoral document:⁵ those who propose the arming of the proletariat and the class struggle away from the political problems faced by the mass movement, when the moment of shooting comes, then they will not find the masses armed because the masses essentially get armed by a correct policy. When the masses are educated by a party with correct politics, they alone are capable of getting armed by themselves. Neither the ultra-left nor the reformists have understood the great secret of revolutionary Marxism, of revolutionary socialism. A secret which is very deep, methodological, but at the same time very simple. Every activist or union leader who rises to a revolutionary policy understands it because the reality of the daily class struggle in the factory requires him to learn this methodological problem, which Marx arrived at in other ways. The working class, as such, (not the vanguard) is not taught with propaganda, with examples, with attitudes of the vanguard itself. This is an elitist, aristocratic conception of the role of the party. The role of the party is another; the true Marxist has methodological confidence in the strength of the working class, in the experience of the working class, in the tradition of the working class. The true Marxist takes the point that this colossal force that is the working class is capable of overthrowing armies with its mobilisations; only that to achieve these goals, it needs revolutionary leadership, made by a revolutionary socialist party.

We have nothing to teach the working class, only to guide them in their actions. Trotsky used to say that no class learns from the head of others. They learn only from their actions. Four days before the Cordobazo, one of the largest guerrilla organisations said: "no mobilisations, be careful with demonstrations, no factory occupations". The ERP,⁶ specifically, said: "do nothing because the masses are not prepared". They said this from their newspaper four days earlier. Four days later the Cordobazo arises. This is the aristocratist criterion, carried from the outside; by great fervent revolutionaries who give their lives for the revolution but which is not the socialist and revolutionary concept. The masses can do everything if we achieve revolutionary leadership; there is no army or nothing to stop them. Hence, the fundamental Leninist criterion is that the greatest adversary of the revolutionary Leninist party is the consciousness of the masses themselves. The party has to make them get experiences from their actions.

The role of the revolutionary party today is to convince the Argentine working class that the Cordobazo was extraordinary, that it was similar to the year 1905 in relation to the 1917 revolution in Russia: a dress rehearsal, like when a theatrical play is performed. It was the dress rehearsal for the great workers' revolution, which will take place like the Cordobazo but spread throughout the country. This is the reason for the crisis of the reformists, the ultra-left and the bourgeois tendencies, who find no way out. There is a long and immense shadow that covers them all; it is the Cordobazo. The bourgeoisie does not know how to grasp that bull that subsists even though it is not demonstrating at this time, nor do the ultra-left know how to interpret it. Instead of saying: "the future is new Cordobazos that we have to prepare much better", they are looking for the foreign model that can be applied. But here no other model applies to the class struggle other than the general teachings of the Marxist method and what the Argentine masses themselves do. There is no other model; there is no

5 It refers to *A socialist and revolutionary electoral campaign*, available for downloading from www.nahuelmoreno.org.

6 ERP (People's Revolutionary Army) was the military structure of the Workers Revolutionary Party – *El Combatiente* (PRT-EC), led by Mario Roberto Santucho, during the 1970s, and which had been recognised as an official section of the Fourth International by the majority headed by Mandel and Livio Maitan since 1969, when they promoted guerrilla deviation.

Indochinese model of revolution or anything like it. There is the model that the Argentine working class itself makes with its struggles.

Well, comrades, cleared up this general problem, let's go now to the second problem. Where is this electoral process located? This electoral process is part of a moment of certain decline in the workers' movement; the industrial workers' movement, after the defeat of Sitrac-Sitram,⁷ had a setback; the vanguard is assimilating the Sitrac-Sitram experience and evolving. This vanguard, this leadership, is learning, and in this process of assimilation and reflection there is a certain decline that is compensated by sectors of the middle class that did the great "popular uprisings".

Right at this moment, the electoral process takes place, to the good fortune of the government itself and the bourgeoisie.

We have to take part in the electoral process but being aware this is nothing more than an interlude, a moment in the true process of the class struggle, which is not going to take place in the electoral process but in new Cordobazos, new big strikes, which will be far superior to the previous ones (not inferior, as the ultra-left believes). And they will be superior because they will be based on the great experience of the class and the vanguard of their actions. We take part in the electoral process to prepare ourselves for that stage that will come, (as long as the bourgeoisie is not defeated), a stage of weak bourgeois governments, of governments which will strike right and left, without being able to provide a way out; of governments similar to Torres in Bolivia, or Allende today in Chile. The next period will be rich in these insurrectional or semi-insurrectional situations, in these situations of great strikes that will inexorably come.

In this situation of weak, unstable governments, hounded by the class struggle, the essential element for this situation to lead to the definitive victory of the working class is the existence of a strong revolutionary socialist party that knows how to lead and direct the working class in their struggles, not to teach them but to lead them. We essentially take part in the elections to prepare this indispensable organism for victory because the working class alone is capable of fighting, capable of drawing a tie, capable of obtaining partial victories but it is incapable of coming to power by itself. Thus, we take part in the elections to consolidate and strengthen the party and see if we can build a true party with mass influence in the Argentine workers' movement.

Well, comrades, although everyone knows this, we need to repeat it so we can discuss it and respond to some questions made by that old fighter, Comrade Milesi,⁸ in the plenary of the Workers' Front yesterday. Even though several comrades asked me to speak, I didn't want to do it yesterday. I thought the plenary attendees were very tired and with a proletarian spirit, we had to let the comrades leave it as soon as possible. But we have to discuss and clarify. We do not believe the bourgeois regime is divided into three independent branches (executive, legislative, and judiciary) and less today. We believe all branches of the bourgeois regime respond as a whole to the bourgeoisie and above all to monopoly capital. The independence of the powers ended: current Marxism recognises that monopolies manage the chamber of deputies, the judges, and the executive power.

7 SITRAC-SITRAM are acronyms for two unions associated with the companies ConCord and Materfer, subsidiaries of the Italian automotive multinational Fiat, in the city of Cordoba in Argentina. They are strongly linked to trade union disputes surrounding the Cordobazo of 1969, a milestone in the history of Argentine workers' movement. In 1971 they were repressed by the military dictatorship.

8 **Pedro Milesi** (1888-1981): municipal worker who became a union leader. He started in anarchism and then entered the PCP, from where he was expelled. He used the pseudonyms "Maciel" and "Islas". He founded a group in 1933 and was linked to the Guineys, Trotsky's early followers. It was called the International Communist League and published *Tribuna Leninista* [Leninist Tribune]. He was in different regroupings of the sectarian Trotskyism sector that rejected the tasks of national liberation in the colonial countries, opposing them to the socialist revolution. With Antonio Gallo, he formed the Socialist Workers League, which published the magazine *Inicial*. Milesi was always linked to union activity. In the 1960s he had settled in Cordoba, collaborated giving courses and talks in the Light & Power union, and participated in the plenary sessions of Sitrac-Sitram. He was called "Old Pedro". In 1972-73 he supported the policy of the front for workers' candidacies promoted by the PST. *Avanzada Socialista* No 41, 12 June 1972, published his interview: "The electoral struggle is one more way of working..." Sociologist Susana Fiorito and writer Andres Rivera created a foundation in Cordoba that bears his name.

This I pose as a theoretical question; to accept that there are three powers, one rules, the other legislates, etc., is to accept the ideology of the bourgeoisie. Lanusse⁹ says it every day: the judiciary, the legislature and the executive are independent. We Marxists say all three are servants of the big monopolies, of imperialism and the bourgeoisie. This is the class, not legal, analysis of the problem.

The second problem is that we have to be concrete. It is a Marxist problem. Anyone who has a mania for discussing general issues (I am not referring to the one who takes general issues to deal with specific problems but the one who has a mania for discussing general, historical, future problems), even with great goodwill, is committing a Marxist, socialist sin because Marxism is a doctrine for action and you act in the moment. The general analyses have to be done but from there we have to begin to make the concrete analysis, otherwise, it will not work. For example, yesterday, Comrade Milesi said: “We have to be concrete, comrades; if we go to the executive branch, we will direct the police.”

And I wonder: very well, we have to be concrete. Does anyone think we are going to win the elections? This is the first concrete problem. As a “concrete issue”, it is crazy because there is no possibility we will win the elections, or get millions of votes, or anything like that. Both the presentation of a presidential ticket and the candidacy for deputies and also tomorrow fighting for judges to be appointed by the working class have one goal: to establish a dialogue with our class comrades. This is the entire secret of Marxist, revolutionary socialist politics: by what means do we establish a dialogue with our class comrades in the factories, with the vanguard elements, a dialogue to make them break with bourgeois ideology, make them come to our socialist ideology (or, at least, to a class ideology that may not be socialist). That is the whole problem. The tactical problems today are by what means we better reach our comrades; by what means do we best reach a dialogue with them.

Let us put aside this question of whether we will win the presidential election. Now the concrete problem is that there is no possibility of winning and we take part in the elections essentially to make propaganda and educate the working class.

So let's go to the concrete, real problems. If we are called to participate in a TV show, where all the candidates for president are invited, can you imagine a note signed by the comrades who agree with that position, saying we do not attend because there are three powers of the state and we run for elections to the Legislative Branch but not to the Executive Branch? Isn't it much better to attend with the candidate to use that space on TV and make thorough propaganda? To dialogue with the workers, isn't it much better if we have a candidate for president who says that the police must be dissolved, that the army must be dissolved, that popular courts must be held, that everything must be expropriated, that we have to make a plan and also say that if he becomes president, they are not going to let him do absolutely any of this if they do not make a workers' revolution and destroy the army? Only “spinsters of both sexes” will want to convince me that political virginity is lost through this means. The problem is, what does the presidential candidate say? That's where opportunism appears if in front of the TV he doesn't say that. It's a dangerous tactic; we have to bring proven comrades. I say all this because of what we will point out later regarding the workers' candidates. We take part in the elections to make thorough propaganda and establish a dialogue. Everything possible to establish a dialogue without leaving the positions, presenting the revolutionary positions, everything that is using the means the bourgeoisie gives us, forced by the process of the class struggle itself, it is a crime not to use it.

That is not what we, the party secretariat, says. There is a man who I think knew something about making a revolution; he did it with almost no deaths, with very few deaths. Lenin wrote a book called “*Left-Wing Communism: an Infantile Disorder*”, about the obligation of true revolutionary socialists to use all these means for the class to educate itself. We believe we must present ourselves to all the candidacies, to say, “here is a working-class and socialist alternative” and use all the tribunes we can. This will be extraordinarily helpful to the goal of education. Including the teaching that a

⁹ **Alejandro Agustín Lanusse** (1918–1996), de facto president of Argentina from March 1971 to May 1973. Great architect of the so-called Great National Agreement. On 25 May 1973, he handed over the presidency to the Peronist candidate, Hector Cámpora.

president who does not destroy the army, does not liquidate the police, does not impose judges and does not install a new type of parliament, will not be able to go forward with the revolution. Because the proposal of going only to the bourgeois parliament under the pretext of attacking the bourgeois executive divides. We believe we have to attack the justice, parliament and the executive as a whole and not just the executive. The difference between one position and another does not matter; we must question the bourgeois order from these positions. So far, I have not seen any revolutionary Marxist party that has won a majority election. The Bolsheviks, who took power, called an election for the Constituent Assembly and they lost it, and they had the government. So, as good Marxists, when we have the chance to get 51 per cent or 60 per cent of the votes in a country, and the bourgeoisie lets us run for election, and the army also accepts it, at that moment we are just going to discuss whether we are going or not to elections; or we avoid the election directly and take the civil power because if we have 60 per cent of the electorate and we do not take power before going to elections we are stupid.

Now let's get down to the tactical issues that arise. Very important problems that have to do with the relations between the workers' front and the party, with the goals of the party and the workers' front. The problem of the workers' front is very new, it is just beginning to be established. It is not well specified what its dynamics will be, how we will take this problem of the workers' front and the party. It is not a question of finding out how the leaders of the workers' front can see it, they may have a point of view diametrically opposed to ours, and we will be very respectful of how they conceive it. The comrades can campaign together with us, independently, pointing out criticism, they can even say what they think of us, maintaining the unity of action regarding the electoral process, but we do not ask that they think like us, we will not think like the other comrades either, we will not do demagogy. We do not believe under any circumstances that this workers' front will be truly transformed into a mass workers' front. In other words, we do not believe the working class, as a whole, in this election will vote for the workers' front: The workers' front is the beginning of something and in reality, it is the grouping of the union vanguard to expose itself in the political field. It is an attempt to do that, nothing more than that. We do not believe here that we have the world by the tail, or something suchlike. As good Marxists, we have to be very realistic and objective and remove any electoralist perspective that we will get millions of votes or hundreds of thousands of votes, despite the whole situation evolving very quickly in our favour. We Marxists have to be rather pessimistic in evaluating this evolution.

The goal of the workers' front is to achieve that for the first time in our country this formidable vanguard, which was anti-capitalist and sometimes anti-imperialist in the field of daily and economic struggles, rise to political independence as the first stage of the total crisis of Peronism. That first the vanguard and then the workers' ranks break with that bourgeois political leadership and break with the bureaucratic and sinister Peronist union leadership that has tied it to the yoke of the bourgeois cart and that makes the metalworkers of Avellaneda not vote for the union leadership of the Metalworkers Union of Avellaneda, and that they are the base of nothing less than a great oligarch, with a tragic last name in the history of the country, such as Manuel de Anchorena,¹⁰ and on the other hand, by the work of the leader Miguel¹¹ from the Federal Capital, the metalworkers of the Federal Capital, go and vote for Campora, who is at the moment fighting like cats and dogs with Anchorena. We do not believe that in this election the working class will break with this process. The only thing that will probably happen is that it will go into a state of scepticism, apathy; some sectors of the working class will start voting against it. But it would be a colossal victory if we manage to get the vast majority of the best activists of the working class to propose themselves as an alternative

10 **Manuel de Anchorena** (1933–2005) was an Argentine rancher and politician, member of an old landowning family installed in the 18th century in the Río de la Plata. He was nominated as a candidate for governor of the Province of Buenos Aires accompanied by the metalworker Luis Herrero. Then the Superior Council of the National Justicialist Movement expelled him from the party, accusing him of “serious acts of indignity” and of “contravening the express provisions” of Peron. Later he was appointed ambassador to the United Kingdom by Peron.

11 **Lorenzo Miguel** (1927–2002) was one of the historic chiefs of the Peronist trade union bureaucracy. Head of the powerful metalworkers union (UOM) since 1970. During the government of Isabel Peron, he linked with Jose Lopez Rega to give birth to the Argentine Anti-Communist Alliance or Triple-A a death squad that appeared on the scene in 1973. After the coup against Isabel Peron, he was sent to prison, but his close relationship with Junta member Admiral Emilio Eduardo Massera protected him.

and say: all the bourgeois, bureaucratic scum on that side, and those of us who have a class-struggle criterion, at least class-struggle, that the working class must be the one that has to run the country, who just think that, on this side.

We will draw a line to start delimiting on one side those who are in favour of the working class; on the other, those who are in favour of all bourgeois and bureaucratic variations. We do not believe there is more progress than that, with a certain impact that it will have on the electoral process, but always a minority impact. This would be formidable to educate many workers, who, perhaps, will vote for a bourgeois ticket with a “winner’s criterion” but to all those that we reach what we tell them will open their minds, they will get ideas. We have to believe in the dynamics of ideas, in teachings based on our own experience. Many workers will probably vote as ordered by Peron and others because of the influence of the union bureaucracy. But our campaign will tell them that there is no way out this way, only the struggle gives the way out. When the struggles arise and they see us, in front, those of us who did this electoral campaign, to be with the struggles and the bureaucrats on the opposite side, calling to scab, or bullying, as in Chocon, as in San Nicolas, the most sinister bureaucracy, the construction one. The workers will say “if they are right in the union arena because they are the ones who lead our struggles, they were also right in the political arena”, “we must no longer vote for Peron or for what the bureaucrats tell us, we must start voting for what this front or this party told us.” That will be the great triumph of the party, not in the electoral process but later because of the education that it has begun to do thanks to the electoral process.

Therefore, comrades, if the process is to start educating the vanguard and the most advanced of the working class, the problem of the candidates is very important; it is a tactical problem, where many factors take part, as in any concrete problem, not only the fact of whether or not they are workers; there is more than a single factor. We know of two possible candidates among those we consider workers: Comrades Leandro Fote¹² and Jose Paez,¹³ who do not accept to be candidates. We have to search with a magnifying glass to find a worker, a prestigious union leader who accepts. Several conditions are needed: The first condition is that this comrade or union leader begins to understand the role of the party, of the political organisation of the vanguard. Let’s not elect as a candidate a union leader who begins to speak on radio, TV or by any other means and gives any type of position. The second condition, we need the candidate to be a good speaker, a very good debater because he will confront our adversaries on TV or radio, he will have to speak on the podium. This is a factor of enormous importance, which is combined with the others; he has to be a guarantee of political conduct, finally, union and class-struggle conduct after the elections.

These three factors are indispensable. We should not take just one into account; “choose a worker leader and that’s fine”. Besides knowing how to speak, we must also achieve that he knows how to behave on TV because the essential role of our participation in the elections is the propaganda role; in short, to make an impact. The element that he is a worker is a propaganda element but no more important than how we manage to develop and explain our ideas in front of other adversaries and candidates and in front of the workers’ and vanguard public themselves. These are decisive elements and these three elements are what we find in Comrades Fote and Paez. In all honesty, we don’t find it in Comrade Flores.¹⁴

12 **Leandro Fote** (1937—disappeared in 1976): Worker in the sugar industry, in 1961 he was a union delegate at the San Jose sugar mill and by 1964 secretary general of the union. In 1965 he was a provincial deputy, integrating the workers’ bloc of the Provincial Action party. Within this party, FOTIA formed an independent faction and raised workers’ candidacies. That of Leandro Fote was proclaimed, for the first time in Argentine history, in an assembly at the San Jose sugar mill and became one of the best examples given by the working class itself, on how to use elections to develop their class independence politics. He was a militant of Palabra Obrera, PRT, and when this divided of the PRT-El Combatiente. He was kidnapped-disappeared by the Armed Forces on 12 January, 1976.

13 **Jose Francisco Paez** (1936–2005) was a union leader of Sitrac, one of the class-oriented unions in Cordoba that propitiated the Cordobazos. In 1972 he was won to Trotskyism by the PST and was a candidate for governor of Córdoba in the March 1973 elections and for vice president in the Coral-Paez ticket in the 1973 presidential elections. He was part of CC of MAS and one of the main working-class leaders of Mornnoism.

14 **Gregorio “Goyo” Flores** (1934–2011) was an Argentine Trotskyist political and union leader. As part of the leadership of the SITRAC union, he actively participated in the second Cordobazo of 1971. He was later arrested and sent to

Within the cadres of the party itself, we have several comrades who could be great candidates but we find they are not good mass speakers. The party has evaluated all these conditions and come to the tragic situation that on the Workers' Front the only comrades who meet this condition of being good polemicists, good speakers capable of the political understanding of the process of unification of the workers' vanguard in a political movement and who offer moral guarantees; the only two comrades who, after adding all those qualities, as if it were a chemical phenomenon, meet those conditions, they both reject it, and within the party, we have no one (except for Comrade Nora Ciapponi) who meets these conditions. Unfortunately, we do not have comrades who are great propagandist orators and agitators, and then the party, to be able to make thorough propaganda in the working class, defend these positions in the face of the working class, proposes the two comrades, believing they meet these indispensable conditions; except for comrade Coral, who lacks one condition, not being a representative of the Workers' Front. But we believe that regarding the other aspects, the inequality is compensated. It is also compensated by the existence of Comrade Nora, a great union leader, a great party leader and also a woman.

We believe then that if we do not put on the football shirt of workerism, of a workerism that many learned through the diffuse photographs of the publication *Avanzada Socialista* itself; if we don't put on that shirt, that pose, if we deal with the problem of electoral propaganda, how we can use it much better in the sense of developing our positions and we add and weigh all the factors that have to be a part in the service of this campaign, seeing which is the most useful tool in the propaganda sense, most useful in the development of the Workers' Front on the one hand and the party on the other, and essentially, as Comrade Gabi and Comrade Daniel put it very well, in the sense of the development of the party, because for the party the essential goal of participating in the elections is the development and strengthening of the party. Seen this way, comrades, we believe that up to now nothing more than general recipes has been suggested to us: "let's choose another worker", etc.

The problem is concrete: who meets the conditions of agitator, great propagandist, great polemist, moral guarantees to be able to use the propaganda that the regime provides us when going to elections, to fully develop our program of the socialist revolution in Argentina. So far, the Secretariat considers there are no other better candidates who meet all that sum of conditions than Comrades Coral and Nora Ciapponi.

the Rawson prison for his union activity. He was a sympathizer of the Revolutionary Workers Party until the Videla dictatorship, a period in which he joined the Partido Obrero.

APPENDIX

In *Avanzada Socialista* No 43 (20 December 1972) there was extensive information on the participation, debates and resolutions of the plenary on Saturday and the congress on Sunday to which Moreno refers. In a small unsigned article, it polemised with the comrades who argued that no candidates should run for executive positions. We reproduce it to expand the position on this point.

“Three powers” or a single bourgeois power?

Some comrades from the Cordovan delegation were against the Front presenting candidacies for executive positions (president, governors) and senators. They argued that candidates should only run for deputies and councillors. They substantiate this by claiming that in the Chamber of Deputies, for example, it is possible to form a working-class opposition bloc without capitulating to the bourgeoisie. In the executive, on the other hand, no revolutionary should hold a position since those positions are intended to apply bourgeois legislation and repressive apparatuses against the workers’ movement.

This position, although those who hold it are honest comrades, is wrong. It is the bourgeoisie that has created the myth of the independence of the three powers. In reality, there is only one state, with all its branches — executive, legislative and judicial — controlled by the monopolies. To accept that there are three powers and that, because it is better, in one of them it is valid to present candidates, is to endorse the propaganda of the bourgeoisie itself. The revolutionaries, far from making differences between the presidency, the legislature and the judiciary, as bourgeois institutions, must equally denounce them, as guardians of the old social order. This is the socialist interpretation of the state. The other is a legal schema, useful for the bourgeoisie. If the Workers’ Front were to endorse it, it would be collaborating with the bosses in their attempt to get the masses to trust parliamentarism.

But, besides, the doubt or opposition of the comrades does not correspond to the real and concrete conditions in which the Front will fight the electoral battle. It is unrealistic to worry today about what we will do with the police and the army if we win the elections. Because of the unfair control of the news media, because of the intimidating campaigns launched by big capital and the state apparatus itself, it is practically impossible for a workers’ and revolutionary slate to outnumber the bourgeois parties in votes. In our country, long before a workers’ and revolutionary slate can

win more than 50 per cent of the votes, the attacks of the reaction and its proscriptive measures in defence of the bourgeois “order” will raise the struggle for power on another terrain.

Our participation in the elections, even knowing it is impossible to win them, has one goal, which is to establish a broad dialogue with our class brothers, to convince them to break with the ideas and with the parties of the bourgeoisie and to endorse working class and socialist positions. We facilitate this dialogue much more by bringing candidates to all positions, and especially to executive positions, which are the ones which will allow us to maximise the use the propaganda possibilities (radio, TV, etc.). Our presidential ticket candidates will be the ones who can most effectively denounce and fight the bourgeois state, its three powers, during the electoral campaign.