

# Intercontinental Press

*Africa*

*Asia*

*Europe*

*Oceania*

*the Americas*

Vol. 8, No.13

© 1970 Intercontinental Press

April 6, 1970

50c



—Photo by John Gray

**On James P. Cannon's Eightieth Birthday**

## **Importance of Revolutionary Continuity**

## Minamata Disease

A film has been produced in Japan on the so-called Minamata disease that has taken forty-three lives and crippled more than 100 in a small town of 40,000 persons since 1956. It is not really a disease, however. The citizens of Minamata were poisoned by mercury-laden waste dumped into their bay by the Japan Nitrogen Co.

The documentary was reviewed by Mark Gayn, writing from Tokyo in the March 10 *Toronto Daily Star*. "The film showed people unable to eat," Gayn said, "because their fingers and heads shook too violently. It showed children whose jaws could not close, whose limbs could not support them, and whose fingers were set like claws."

Researchers at nearby Kumamoto University as early as 1958 had traced the mysterious deaths to the mercury discharged by the plant. People died when they ate fish contaminated by the waste. "However," Gayn reported, "the company management refused to co-operate and would not provide the researchers with specimens of waste water. . . ."

"Few municipal authorities were ready to challenge the company. Eventually the case was brought to the attention of the central government in Tokyo, but it, too, did nothing."

Even the local union bureaucrats refused to question the company.

The company recruited scholars in various universities "to write reports proving conclusively that the ailment was 'mysterious' and the plant's waste had nothing to do with it." It was only last year that the company was held legally responsible for the poisonings.

At present, the company is bargaining with the survivors on the price it must pay for each death. One figure mentioned is \$40,000 per life, "but not everyone finds this acceptable."

### Correction

In the article by Leon Trotsky on the emancipation of women in our last issue (page 277), the first sentence should read: "I am greatly aggrieved that a lingering cold prevents me from taking part in your rally celebrating the fifth year of the party's correct and extensive work among women." Because of a slipup, we had it "fiftieth" year.

## In This Issue

		FEATURES	
		290	Minamata Disease
		305	The American Way of Life
U. S. A.			
Les Evans	291	Mailmen Send No-Strike Law to "Dead Letter" Office	
	291	"N. Y. Times" Urges Nixon to End Ban on Mandel	
Joseph Hansen	295	On James P. Cannon's Eightieth Birthday	
ITALY			
Richard Wood	292	Interview with Fiat Workers	
FRANCE			
Susan Lind	293	5,000 Protest Ban on Soldiers' Defense Meetings	
ANGOLA			
	299	Portuguese Army Admits Losses	
NORTHERN IRELAND			
	300	Interview with Eamonn McCann	
DENMARK			
Peder Jensen	303	Students Oppose Reactionary Legislation	
INDIA			
	306	Opening for the Left in the Syndicate-Indicate Split	
NEW ZEALAND			
	307	Demonstrators Win Bail for John Bower	
CANADA			
Dick Fidler	309	The "Red Power" Movement	
	310	Some Facts and Figures on Indian Poverty	
REVIEWS			
Gerry Foley	308	Moscow Novel Attacks Trotsky as "Zionist"	
DOCUMENTS			
	304	"Red Mole" Explains Split with "Black Dwarf"	
	311	Fourth International Calls for Antiwar Actions	
	312	Polish Coal Used Against Asturias Strike [Statement of the Fourth International]	
PHOTOS			
John Gray	289	James P. Cannon; 297, Joseph Hansen	
DRAWINGS			
Copain	300	Eamonn McCann	

Intercontinental Press, Post Office Box 635, Madison Square Station, New York, N.Y. 10010

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, Ernest Mandel, George Novack.

MANAGING EDITOR: Les Evans.

TRANSLATIONS: Gerry Foley, George Saunders.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.

Published in New York each Monday except last in December and first in January; biweekly in July; not published in August.

Intercontinental Press specializes in political analysis and interpretation of events of particular interest to the labor, socialist, colonial independence, and black liberation movements.

Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of Intercontinental Press. Insofar as it reflects editorial opinion,

unsigned material expresses the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism.

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 95 rue du Faubourg Saint-Martin, Paris 10, France.

TO SUBSCRIBE: For one year send \$15 to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010. Write for rates on first class and airmail. Special rates available for subscriptions to colonial and semicolonial countries.

Subscription correspondence should be addressed to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York 10010. Because of the continuing deterioration of the U.S. postal system, please allow five weeks for change of address. Include your old address as well as your new address, and, if possible, an address label from a recent issue.

Copyright ©1970 by Intercontinental Press.

## Mailmen Send No-Strike Law to 'Dead Letter' Office

By Les Evans

Thousands of postal workers voted at a spirited meeting in New York March 25 to return to work, ending the week-old strike that had paralyzed the mail service in cities across the United States. The strike was a powerful demonstration of the strength of the American working class and although a final settlement has yet to be reached, it must be counted as an important victory for the labor movement.

The postal workers successfully challenged the long-standing legal prohibition against strikes by federal employees. Whatever retribution Nixon may seek against the union organizations or individual leaders, it is plain that the 200,000 participants in the strike will not be tried and that the law which brands them as "felons" has become a dead letter.

The strikers returned to work as much because of a government promise to grant substantial pay increases as because of Nixon's use of troops. The whole episode of the militarization of the post office showed the weakness rather than the strength of the federal government.

When, after days of threats, Nixon finally called out the army on March 23, he restricted his action to only one city, New York. The 30,000 army, national guard, and other troops were not used as armed bodyguards for strikebreakers, but were themselves to move the mails — Nixon discreetly called them "a supplemental work force." In fact they made little dent in the mountains of mail that had piled up. Where they did come in contact with postal strikers, the widespread fraternization that resulted suggested that the usefulness of these forces in a real confrontation with the workers was highly questionable.

The postal workers returned to their jobs because they had been promised a 12 percent pay raise, retroactive to last October; top pay after eight years' seniority; government recognition of the right of collective bargaining for the postal unions; total amnesty for

all strikers; and improvements in health insurance and other fringe benefits.

Now that the workers are back on the job, the government is trying to whittle down these concessions, but it remains to be seen if this can be done without provoking another walkout.

Given the fact that the postal workers lacked a national leadership committed to the strike, and the fact that they are divided into a multitude of local and national craft unions — seven of which are now engaged in negotiations with the government — it would have been remarkable indeed if they had been able to stay out until a definitive settlement was achieved.

Nixon has ordered 10,000 national guardsmen to remain on duty in New York, to put pressure on the ranks of the postal workers to accept an inadequate settlement worked out in Washington between the strike-breaking government and the union bureaucrats, who opposed the strike from the beginning. Not a single member of Congress, despite the fact that many owe their offices to union backing, supported the postal workers.

Nevertheless, the impact of the strike has gone very deep and the lesson of the government's inability to end it

without making concessions has not been lost on other sectors of the labor movement.

On March 25, the very day the postmen returned, hundreds of air-traffic controllers called in "sick," stranding thousands of airline passengers during the Easter weekend. This thinly disguised strike is in support of the demand for restoration of full union recognition to the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization, which was canceled last summer after a similar "sick" strike.

The *New York Times* lamented the growing labor unrest in a March 26 editorial: "The only certainty on the labor front these days is that nothing stays peaceful for long. The postal service is fast returning to normal after its first strike in nearly two centuries.

"All that is left to worry about is the 'sick' strike by Federal air controllers in New York and other Eastern cities, the rejection of a tentative strike settlement by municipal employees in Atlanta, the renewed threat of a national rail strike, and the possibility of shutdowns next week in all the country's trucking operations and perhaps in New York's newspapers as well."

### Speaks for 'Right to Hear'

## 'N.Y. Times' Urges Nixon to End Ban on Mandel

[The following editorial appeared in the March 26 issue of the *New York Times* under the title, "The Right to Hear." The *Times* is the leading bourgeois newspaper in the United States and is widely read in other countries. The fact that it felt compelled to run an editorial of this nature indicates the pressure that has been generated on the campus and in liberal circles to reverse the arbitrary ruling of the

Nixon administration barring Ernest Mandel from lecturing in the country that claims to be the main bastion of the "free world."]

\* \* \*

Barring an internationally known Belgian economist from the United States on the ground that he is a Marxist is an insult to the college

professors and students in this country who want to see him as well as hear him in an atmosphere allowing for the free interplay of ideas.

Dr. Ernest E. Mandel, editor of *La Gauche* and author of "Marxist Economic Theory," was refused a visa last year under the exclusion section of the McCarran-Walter Act. This vestige of the restrictive nineteen-fifties era particularly strikes at teachers and writers for advocacy of and affiliations with leftwing causes. As a result, Dr. Mandel and his hosts had to cancel lectures at Columbia, Princeton, Amherst and other colleges. The Government was made to look silly because Stanford University heard him any-

way via a trans-Atlantic phone hook-up.

On a previous visit to this country, Dr. Mandel had unwittingly broken a "rule" banning discussion of Communist economic doctrines. The fact that he was one of the outspoken critics of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia apparently had no effect on the authorities. Now a group of professors from six American institutions has called upon the Attorney General in Federal District Court to give the reasons why Dr. Mandel cannot be admitted for lectures and debates this spring or fall. He has again applied for a visa. Instead of simply citing the immigration law, the Attorney General is being asked to explain the na-

ture of the criteria for preventing free scholarly exchange. This could clarify — and expose — the law's shortcomings.

Congress ought to re-examine and eliminate restrictions that in effect merely try to deny entry of ideas into this country. In the present atmosphere, a change in the immigration law covering political exclusion would be too much to expect soon. But the Attorney General could avoid further embarrassment to the United States by following the advice of Secretary of State Rogers, who disassociated himself from the ban last year. Dr. Mandel should be allowed to speak here so that he can be heard — and challenged.

## Interview with Fiat Workers

---

# How Council of Workers' Delegates Was Formed

By Richard Wood

Turin

The past year has seen an immense upsurge of workers' struggles in Italy. One aspect of this has been the appearance of "councils of workers' delegates" in a number of factories.

At the end of March, I interviewed two young workers from one of the Fiat automobile factories in Turin, probably one of the most politically advanced factories in Italy. Rocco, nineteen, a member of the Gruppi Comunisti Rivoluzionari [GCR—Revolutionary Communist Groups—the Italian section of the Fourth International], and Dino, twenty, told me of the development of the council of workers' delegates in this giant factory, which employs 56,000 workers. Both Dino and Rocco are members of *Iniziativa Operaia* [Workers Initiative], a political formation existing in a number of Italian factories which is supported by the GCR. Both men are elected delegates to their council.

The councils first appeared after stormy actions in May-July 1969, which reached a high point in a massive street battle with the police on July 3, in the area immediately surrounding the factory and in the nearby housing projects where most of the workers live. This struggle had been organized from outside the fac-

tory by student-based "spontanéist" groups.

Although it was opposed by the union officials in the plant and by the traditional workers parties (most notably the Communist party), the struggle won wide support from the Fiat workers. The issues involved were general problems facing the Italian working class, including the high cost of living, the workers' housing situation, rent, etc.

"During this struggle," Rocco said, "the workers' delegates began to appear and raise issues directly connected with the factory. Members of the PSI-UP [Partito Socialista Italiano di Unità Proletaria—Italian Socialist party of Proletarian Unity—a left split from the Italian Socialist party] came up with the idea first. *Iniziativa Operaia* also supported the proposal. The delegates are elected on the basis of one from each work squad of from twenty to sixty workers. The delegates are subject to instantaneous recall.

"In this first stage, the delegates were opposed not only by the union bureaucrats—and were elected against their wishes—but they were also opposed by the 'spontanéist' groups outside the factory. The spontanéists say that any organization whatever is 'repressive' and 'authoritarian.'

"The idea of the workers' delegates developed in the period from July to September. At first there were just informal meetings of the delegates, but in September, when contract negotiations opened, we formed a Council of Workers' Delegates [*Consigli dei Delegati Operai*] representing the factory. After the formation of the council the union bureaucrats changed their tactics and gave official sanction to the body and entered it."

Dino described how a delegates' council was formed in the section of the factory where he works:

"In early September there was a five-day strike in Section 32. On the first day the work unit delegates met and formed a council which led the strike. There are about forty work units in Section 32, and on the council there was one union representative and the rest were directly elected by the workers.

"The demand of the five-day strike was for a wage increase. Because of the strategic position of Section 32 in the production line, production was nearly halted and the management suspended 23,000 workers. The effect of this action was to initiate a series of struggles around the contract negotiations throughout the factory."

Only 10 percent of the workers in

this Fiat plant are unionized. There are four unions. The largest union is led by the Communist party, another by the Socialist party, a third is dominated by Catholic unionists, and the fourth is a company union.

"In the negotiations," Rocco explained, "the union bureaucrats who were engaged in the talks with the bosses treated the factory-wide Council of Workers' Delegates as a consultative body. But the council forced the bureaucrats into taking a much more militant stand than they would ever have conceived of taking by themselves. So there was a kind of tug-of-war between the bureaucrats and the council.

"The demands put forward by the council were backed up with action. In this period there were strikes going on somewhere in the factory all the time. The atmosphere was very tense. The formation of the council enabled the workers to organize effective strike actions inside the factory itself. What happened was that there was a staggered strike. Not every worker struck at the same time; each worker struck about twelve or sixteen hours during the week, but as part of a strategic work section.

"This had a number of advantages. First, workers were docked only for the time they were formally on strike, although production was effectively curtailed throughout the factory. Second, this enabled the workers to feel their power, as the factory became a kind of permanent mass meeting.

"Demonstrations were organized inside the factory. Thousands of workers would march through the plant with placards, demanding that the clerks join them, etc.

"There were some comical aspects. Often the workers would force foremen or low-ranking management personnel to march with them, carrying signs, sometimes with slogans against themselves. For example, at the head of one procession an unpopular foreman was seen marching with a sign reading 'I am an ass.'"

Some clerks, evidently feeling superior to their blue-collar brethren, were opposed to the strike actions, which led to some altercations between the production workers and the clerks.

About 6,000 clerks work in one building in the factory complex. One day in October the workers marched on this building to try to get the clerks

to go on strike. The bosses had the place surrounded by 100 private cops, but the workers were armed with hammers and other tools, and the cops were soon defeated.

"Earlier," Dino said, "some of the clerks had been abusing the workers from the windows, feeling secure with the private cops to protect them. But after the workers got into the building, the clerks were persuaded one way or another to join the strike.

"Outside, several squads of regular cops had arrived, as well as a large group of students who had come to support the workers. Pushing started between the cops and students, and then the cops began arresting students and putting them into vans. The workers climbed the walls around the factory and released the students, taking them inside where they broke open their handcuffs. The cops retaliated by shooting tear gas into the factory, but when the workers left for the night the students were able to escape."

"In this period," Rocco said, "the council was able to impose militant forms of struggle on the union bureaucracy. In the first part of November, Fiat always puts on a big exposition of its new model cars, and many workers wanted to hold a demonstration at this showing. The idea was current in the factory, but the bureaucrats were able to prevent the demonstration from taking place. As a result, from November until the contract was signed December 20, the struggle went through a period of sta-

bilization. The workers realized they needed better organization, and there was a growth in the organization of workers' delegates."

I asked Rocco how the workers viewed the contract. "It represented a victory for the workers," he said. "It was the best contract ever signed for Fiat, although at the level of the Turin plant more could have been obtained. There was about a 10 percent wage increase for all workers. Formerly we had worked a forty-four-hour week and were paid for forty-eight. Now we work forty-two hours and are paid for forty-eight, with the prospect that in two years the workweek will be further reduced to forty hours with no reduction in pay. There were other benefits on accidents and sickness, and on rights in the factory. We won the right to hold assemblies in the factory, including ten hours of paid assembly time during the year.

"Despite the signing of the contract, the struggle inside the factory continues. For example, any attempt by the bosses to speed up the line results in an immediate response from the workers."

An indication of the continuing mood of combat among the workers is the fact that the Council of Workers' Delegates, essentially a struggle organization, continues to function.

"Practically all of the 1,200 work units in the factory are now represented in the council," Rocco said. "And the council meets regularly once a week; more often when there are emergencies."

## 5,000 in Paris Rally

## Protest Ban on Soldiers' Defense Meetings

By Susan Lind

Paris

On March 12 the chief commissioner of the Paris police department notified the Committee for the Release of the Imprisoned Soldiers\* that a mass meet-

\* The Committee for the Release of the Imprisoned Soldiers was formed to defend the rights of three conscripts, Serge Devaux, Michel Trouilleux, and Alain Herve, who were court-martialed in February for distributing leaflets criticizing the army in their barracks and for cir-

ing planned for March 17 was banned. Then on March 13 the minister of the interior announced that "All meetings organized by leftist organizations likely to impair the morale of the army are banned throughout the country."

On March 18 the French left re-

culating a petition protesting a physical attack on a soldier by a noncommissioned officer.

sponded to this latest attack on democratic liberties with a mass united-front protest meeting of more than 5,000 persons at the Mutualité in Paris. The meeting was supported by every shade of the French left except the Communist party and some Maoist and anarchist groups.

This is the first time since the Algerian war that the French government has banned public meetings held in a private hall.

The Ligue Communiste [Communist League — the French section of the Fourth International] feels that the banning of meetings in defense of soldiers' rights is part of a policy of the government to restrict the functioning of the left as a whole, including the possibility that revolutionary groups may be banned entirely, as they were after the May-June events in 1968. The Ligue Communiste was an initiator of the Committee for the Release of the Imprisoned Soldiers and was one of the central organizers of the March 18 protest meeting.

The crackdown on democratic liberties by the French government began last November when street demonstrations were banned. Leftists of all tendencies have been harassed by police and arrested while selling their newspapers on street corners. Individuals have been held for three or four hours at police stations for "identity checks," and some have been charged and tried for "obstructing a public street" or for "resisting arrest." People have also been picked up for simply passing out leaflets or pasting up posters.

All these activities are legal under the French constitution, and there is no law permitting the police to hold people to check their identity cards. At present about 100 members of different left organizations are facing trial on various trumped-up charges.

A broadly representative press conference called by the soldiers' committee on March 17 helped to build the meeting at the Mutualité. Participants included representatives of the Ligue Communiste, the Parti Socialiste Unifié [PSU — United Socialist party], the Union Nationale des Etudiants de France [UNEF — National Union of Students of France], *Lutte Ouvrière* [the group around the newspaper *Workers Struggle*], *Convention des Institutions Républicaines* [Convention of Republican Institutions], Parti Socialiste [PS —

Socialist party], the Confédération Française et Démocratique du Travail [CFDT — French Democratic Confederation of Labor], and the Fédération de l'Éducation Nationale [FEN — National Education Federation — the biggest teachers' union].

The main hall of the Mutualité was packed for the rally, with people standing in the aisles and more outside who couldn't get in. The audience heard spokesmen for all the organizations present at the press conference, as well as representatives of the Organisation Trotskiste [OT — Trotskyist Organization], the Alliance des Jeunes pour le Socialisme [AJS — Alliance of Youth for Socialism], and the Alliance Marxiste Révolutionnaire [AMR — Revolutionary Marxist Alliance].

An additional speaker was Charles Tillon, a former Political Bureau member of the Parti Communiste Française [PCF — French Communist party]. He was chief commandant of the FTP [Francs-Tireurs et Partisans — Snipers and Partisans], the underground resistance organization during World War II. The audience spontaneously began singing the *Internationale* when Tillon commended the success of this first united meeting against the repression.

Here is how the CP explained its refusal to endorse the meeting, in the March 19 issue of its paper *l'Humanité*:

"Presided over by a leader of the Socialist Federation of Paris, the representatives of the various ultraleftist groups spoke one after another, as well as representatives of the UNEF, the Convention, the PSU, and Charles Tillon. . . .

"Krivine [Alain Krivine, of the Ligue Communiste] repeated his habitual anti-Communist attacks, in particular accusing our party of 'capitulation.' . . .

"We struggle and we will continue to struggle to defend freedom to carry on work for democracy and socialism. But we likewise make clear our refusal to in any way give credence to the policies of the ultraleftist groups which are utilized and manipulated, if not directly sustained, by the government."

The Maoist groups also refused to participate, even though one Maoist organization, *Gauche Proletarienne* [Proletarian Left], has had twenty of its members arrested recently and one of its public meetings banned by the government.

The repression has not succeeded in curtailing the activities of the Committee for the Release of the Imprisoned Soldiers. More than 1,000,000 leaflets and 100,000 posters have been printed, in addition to literature issued by local chapters of the committee which have formed in almost all major cities and towns.

The committee is continuing to circulate a petition for the release of the three soldiers, which has now been signed by hundreds of thousands of people from all walks of life, including members of the CP, teachers, mayors of towns, religious figures, scientists, and trade unionists.

One of the defendants, Alain Hervé, has already been released because the time he spent in "preventive detention" counted toward his four-month sentence. Trouilleux, who was sentenced to eight months, and Devaux, who got a year, are still in prison. There is no new information concerning three other soldiers imprisoned on similar charges in Landau, West Germany.

The committee has also taken on the defense of a soldier facing court-martial in Périgueux, France. Two soldiers were killed at that base by allegedly defective equipment and as a protest, a group of their comrades held a strike of silence. The strike leaders were subsequently harassed by the army brass and one is scheduled to be tried.

Each week the committee receives scores of letters from soldiers and their families testifying to the intimidation and lack of democratic rights in the army. Publication of this material as a "white paper" is planned.

Even the CP has been forced to say something about the growing soldiers' movement through its functionaries in the Confédération Générale du Travail [CGT — General Confederation of Labor]. The March 18 *l'Humanité* published a communiqué issued the previous day by the CGT.

"For several months," the CGT declared, "we have witnessed an outbreak of harassments and penalties against young soldiers. Without approving certain more or less provocative activities of irresponsible elements, the Youth Center [Centre Confédéral de la Jeunesse] of the CGT cannot remain silent in face of the measures against young soldiers being taken by the military authorities at the instigation of the government."

# The Importance of Revolutionary Continuity

By Joseph Hansen

[The following is the text of a speech given in Los Angeles by Joseph Hansen, editor of *Intercontinental Press*, at the celebration of James P. Cannon's eightieth birthday. The meeting was held March 21, although Cannon's birthday is February 11. He and his companion, Rose Karsner Cannon, who died two years ago, celebrated their birthdays together; thus the meeting also paid tribute to Rose.

[Other speakers included Cannon's stepdaughter Walta Ross; his grandson Matthew Ross; the well-known California labor attorney and battler for civil liberties, A. L. Wirin; Patricia Iiyama, Socialist Workers party candidate for California treasurer; and Herman Fagg, SWP candidate for California governor.

[Oscar Coover, who chaired the meeting, read numerous greetings to Cannon, some of which came from his comrades and friends in other lands.

[Cannon responded by voicing his thanks to the participants and by quoting from a speech made by Rose Karsner in 1962. Her words were so appropriate to the occasion that it almost seemed as if, through Jim, she were participating, too.

[For a full report of the celebration see *The Militant* for April 3 and April 10.]

\* \* \*

Not long ago, while I was reading my favorite newspaper, *The Militant*—which I understand you can buy in the bookstore at the entrance to the hall [laughter]—I ran across an item that I would like to have clipped to read here tonight.

But many years ago, it became impossible for me to clip *The Militant*. I clip only ordinary newspapers like the *Los Angeles Times*. *The Militant* I save and have bound at the end of each year so as to be able to refer to it in the easiest way. So, instead of clipping this item from *The Militant*, I copied it.

The headline reads: "WHO ARE THE EXPELLED COMMUNISTS."

The article begins:

"JAMES P. CANNON—Member of the Central Executive Committee and Political Committee. Joined Socialist Party at Kansas City in 1908. Joined I.W.W. in 1911. Took part in the organization of Left Wing group in Kansas City in 1918. Editor of local Left Wing weekly paper, *The Workers' World*, in 1919. Delegate to National Left Wing Conference, New York City in June 1919 and was elected member of Labor Committee of National Left Wing. Foundation member of Communist Labor Party. First District Organizer St. Louis-Kansas City District, 1919-1920. Organized first underground Communist groups in mine field of Kansas and Southern Illinois. Elected to the Central Executive Committee at first underground convention at Bridgeman, Michigan, May 1920 and re-elected at every subsequent convention of the Party. Editor of Party legal paper, *The Toiler*, 1920. Delegate to Fourth and Sixth World Congresses of the Communist International and also to a number of the Sessions of the enlarged Executive Committee of the Communist International. National Secretary of International Labor Defense from foundation, June 1925 to October 1928."

That's the first paragraph. [Laughter.] I ask you to be patient, as there is more to come. *The Militant* continues with its biography of James P. Cannon:

"Organizer in Akron Rubber Strike in 1913, Peoria Metal Workers Strike, Duluth and Superior Ore Dock Strike, and many others. Indicted for conspiracy in the Peoria metal workers strike in 1913 and also indicted by Federal Government for activity in strike of the Kansas Coal miners in 1919. No conviction in either case. Numerous arrests and short jail terms."

The date of that brief sketch of the life of James P. Cannon is of some pertinence—January 1, 1929. That was forty-one years ago. Jim was then thirty-nine years old.

It would seem obvious that it is

high time to bring this biographical note up-to-date. Here I find myself facing a difficulty. I really am not sure why I happened to be selected to do this.

Is it because I am among the younger members of the old guard [laughter] and can therefore be counted on to strike a certain youthful note? [Laughter.] Or is it because I am among the older members of the youth [laughter] and can therefore be trusted [laughter]—to a certain extent [laughter]—to give an impression of maturity? [Laughter.]

In any case I'll try to contribute a few more bits of information to help cover the period following 1929.

First of all, let's note the items known to most of those present here tonight; that's the books bearing the name of James P. Cannon as author. These include the following:

*The Struggle for a Proletarian Party*. This consists of documents contributed by James P. Cannon in a factional struggle in 1939-40, an important one led by Leon Trotsky.

*Socialism on Trial*. This is the official court record of James P. Cannon's testimony in the famous Minneapolis "sedition" trial at the beginning of World War II. This is probably the most widely circulated of Cannon's books and has been translated into several languages.

*The History of American Trotskyism*. This consists of lectures given in 1942 and published in 1944.

*Notebook of an Agitator*. This is a collection of articles mostly from *The Militant* that constitute models of revolutionary journalism in my opinion. This was published in 1958.

*The First Ten Years of American Communism*. This consists largely of letters to a historian, Theodore Draper, published in 1962.

Finally, *Letters from Prison*, published in 1968.

Besides this, Cannon has written any number of pamphlets, some of sub-

stantial size like *America's Road to Socialism*.

I think that these books, like *The Militant*, can be purchased at the rear of the hall, and perhaps at astonishingly low prices—while they last. [Laughter.]

The title of that last book *Letters from Prison* reminds me. The 1929 biographical sketch in *The Militant* ended with the following—what shall we call them?—exceptional accomplishments of James P. Cannon: "Indicted for conspiracy in the Peoria metal workers strike in 1913 and also indicted by Federal Government for activity in strike of the Kansas Coal miners in 1919. No conviction in either case. Numerous arrests and short jail terms."

James P. Cannon managed to add to these accolades in a rather spectacular way. In 1941 he, together with seventeen other leaders and members of the Socialist Workers party, was indicted, tried, found guilty, and sentenced to nothing less than a federal penitentiary.

What they were really guilty of was offering political opposition to U.S. imperialism in World War II. They were the first victims of the Smith "Gag" Act, or "Thought Control" Act, the first victims of the repressive legislation that expanded into McCarthyism.

And James P. Cannon had the honor of being sentenced to sixteen months in a federal penitentiary as one of the first victims of this repressive period.

He got some time off, but he served more than a year, which under U.S. law made him a felon. And a felon he remains to this day. Thus he could not take office, if for example he should choose to run for president of the United States and happened to win the election.

Sandstone Penitentiary must not be very effective as a corrective institution. [Laughter.] I recall the very first speech Jim gave after getting out of stir. [Laughter.] It was on May Day 1945 at Webster Hall in New York and the place was packed, since James P. Cannon was a very well-known figure in the radical movement and everybody that was anybody in New York wanted to hear what he would say and whether any behavior for the better was to be noted [laughter] after the training he had received in the penitentiary.

Well, after the chairman finished the introduction, Jim came to the rostrum to give his speech. His first words were: "As I was saying . . . [laughter] . . . before I was so rudely interrupted . . ." [Prolonged laughter.]

In the biographical sketch printed in the January 1, 1929, *Militant*, Jim's achievements can be placed under two headings:

First, organizational activities. Quite clearly he was an activist involved in struggles of the working class; and these activities had a certain direction, participation as a leader in strike struggles to participation as a leader in politics, but politics of a specific kind—communism, or, as we would say today, revolutionary socialism.

Secondly, editorial activities—and again, an editor of a specific kind, an editor of revolutionary journals.

In my own opinion, these two occupations are not widely separated. A good editor is primarily an organizer, an organizer of a staff that may be spread on a national or even international scale, an organizer of material that has a very definite focus and aim, particularly when it is a revolutionary paper or magazine associated with a revolutionary organization.

I would say that in the years following 1929, Jim in his work combined both fields. He continued to organize for the party and he continued to edit and to write for its press.

His chief function, however, was that of a political strategist, a political strategist within the framework of revolutionary socialism.

Viewed in this way, his achievements can be seen to have a certain logic.

The whole period up to 1928 was a preparatory period, in which he gained experience, gained knowledge, learned in the very hard school of the Wobblies and the early Communist movement. He learned in action the politics of the class struggle and the importance of principles, and the still more decisive importance of converting socialist principles into *correct* revolutionary practice.

It was this background that fitted him to become the founder of the American Trotskyist movement and to play a key role in close collaboration with Leon Trotsky in founding the Fourth International.

It was this background that enabled him to play the central role in guiding the American Trotskyist movement through some exceedingly difficult pe-

riods, when it was compelled to exist as a small persecuted group, vilely slandered and under constant attack by very powerful formations, ranging from the Stalinists to the fascists.

I should like to single out for special comment what I consider to be Jim's greatest single contribution. This was to maintain the continuity of the revolutionary-socialist movement in the United States.

Let me pause a moment here to indicate the importance of this question, which may not be fully appreciated by the new generation.

The rise of Stalinism in the Soviet Union did not at first cause revolutionary-minded workers to turn away. Instead, they tended to accept the new heads of the country as the continuators of the Russian revolution. They listened to what Stalin said. They accepted his advice.

In this way a new set of concepts began to replace what had been taught and practiced by Lenin and Trotsky. This included ultraleftist adventurism, but, much more prominently than that, "peaceful coexistence," meaning giving up the class struggle.

Worst of all, revolutionary-minded workers, through their faith that Stalin represented the revolutionary continuity, were betrayed into giving up their natural inclination to think for themselves. They were converted into mere pawns in the diplomatic deals of the Kremlin.

At the same time, the Trotskyists were framed up in the most monstrous campaign of lies ever conducted by any regime, so as to reduce them to the status of pariahs whom everyone shunned.

As the Communist parties in country after country succumbed to Stalinism, the revolutionary continuity was broken. In those years it was difficult to find your way through the barriers of Stalinism and of the Social Democracy to revolutionary truth.

Still another important link in the continuity was broken. This was the continuity of living experience, the experience that is handed down from one revolutionary generation to another through daily practice in infinitely varied situations that nevertheless tend to repeat certain patterns. These patterns can be learned.

How to maintain the continuity and to broaden it in the face of these circumstances constituted the central problem facing the small nucleus that ral-



lied to the banners of the Left Opposition headed by Leon Trotsky in the Soviet Union.

James P. Cannon was one of those who understood this problem and its extraordinary importance in reviving revolutionary Marxism.

It takes little reading in Jim's contributions to the literature of the world Trotskyist movement to see that ever since the October 1917 revolution in Russia he has been highly conscious of the merging in our movement of two currents.

The first is native American rebellion. If we list as the first pioneers of the socialist movement in the U. S. such figures as the Haymarket martyrs, Albert Parsons in particular, then it can be said that our movement includes a direct line of personal continuity with those figures.

The generation of rebel youth who were inspired by the example set in the eighties became the teachers of the generation represented by Jim. This was the generation of Vincent St. John, who probably had the greatest personal influence on Jim at that period; of Bill Haywood, whom Jim came to know intimately during Bill Haywood's exile in Moscow; the generation of the Debsian socialists, who came to the forefront in the great labor upsurge of the period leading up to 1912 and the eve of World War I.

Rose Karsner, Jim's companion, who died only two years ago—and of whom Walta spoke so movingly—became secretary of *The Masses* shortly after it was founded in 1911. Eugene Debs himself very much appreciated Rose Karsner.

The second component from the past in which a living personal continuity exists today in our movement stems from the Bolsheviks, who, of course, were trained by the generation that was directly tutored by Marx and Engels.

In the early twenties, Jim visited Russia four times and there he became personally acquainted with the top leaders of the Communist International. He already knew Trotsky before he decided in 1928 to take up the cause of the Left Opposition.

And up until Trotsky's death in 1940, Jim, like a few other leaders of the SWP, worked in close collaboration with Trotsky in forming and building the movement that became the Fourth International in 1938.



—Photo by John Gray

JOSEPH HANSEN reading a quotation from the *New York Daily News* at the celebration of James P. Cannon's eightieth birthday: "The New York Stock Exchange said

brokers would be hard hit if the [postal] strike continued into next week. There would be no means of distributing stock certificates and statements."

This living continuity of revolutionary experience from these two sources is one of the most valuable heritages of the Socialist Workers party. It is this living continuity that has given such stability to the American Trotskyist movement and that has enabled it to put up such strong resistance against repression, to stand up so well in adversity, and to take such quick advantage of the openings when they came.

It is a rather remarkable paradox, if you stop to think about it, that one of the strongest sectors of the world Trotskyist movement exists in the United States, the very heartland of world imperialism. This is ascribable primarily to the extraordinary combination of circumstances that enabled revolutionary Marxism to maintain a living continuity in the United States in contrast to the historic accidents that slashed across it or reduced it to the most fragile of threads in many other countries.

A consequence of this continuity is that the Socialist Workers party emerged from some exceedingly hard times with a relatively strong group of cadres. By the time the new wave of radicalization began in the United States a few years ago, first with the rise of the black liberation struggle, then the

radicalization of the youth and the rise of the antiwar movement, the Socialist Workers party was in position to begin recruiting, and at a rather rapid rate.

What is to be especially noted about this recruiting is that the recruits find a cadre organization already at hand. Consequently, new recruits are converted into cadres themselves at a pace which, in my opinion, is new in the United States.

Let us consider the scene a bit more closely.

Where are the rivals that stood with such imposing force in 1929?

The smaller contending groups disintegrated. Beyond the historians, their names are hardly remembered.

The Social Democracy? Where does that once powerful organization stand today?

It is down to a sect, composed in part of former Trotskyists, who are still practicing a kind of "entryism." [Laughter.] With them the left-centrist mask became the person, and once that happened, it was easy for some to develop into right centrists and then into just run-of-the-mill, ordinary, garden variety, tired liberals. A few are caught up in odd-ball theories like the Soviet Union allegedly hav-

ing become an example of "state capitalism."

The Social Democracy in the United States thus no longer stands as a tremendous obstacle on the road to the socialist revolution.

What about Stalinism? It has its troubles. An uprising in East Germany in 1953. Uprisings in Poland and Hungary in 1956. A national rebellion in Czechoslovakia in 1968. A great rift between Moscow and Peking that seems unbridgeable, at least for the time being.

The Stalinist monolith has in fact been shattered. In its place now stand warring sects without a future.

In the United States, the Communist party has become reduced to a small, aging sect in irreversible decline.

In the Soviet Union there are more and more reports about a new opposition mood and even opposition formations.

In the November 25, 1968, *Intercontinental Press* we reported that 300 people had braved official disapproval in Moscow to pay a last tribute to the seventy-two-year-old Aleksei Kosterin, who had spent seventeen years in Stalin's concentration camps. The information at our disposal at the time was that the meeting was addressed by Major General Pyotr G. Grigorenko and that he made a stirring appeal over the body of his friend for a return to the democracy of Lenin's time.

More recent information puts the number in attendance at 700 to 800, and the number of speakers at five or six. Still more, these speakers voiced sentiments not heard openly in the Soviet Union since the days of the Trotskyist Left Opposition. The services for Kosterin became in fact a kind of political opposition meeting, the first public one since 1928.

On a world scale, a great revolutionary thrust forward has been occurring since the end of World War II. It has suffered defeats and setbacks, it is true—some of them of disastrous size and consequence as in Indonesia. But a great revolutionary thrust forward remains the principal feature of the past few decades, beginning in Indochina and China, extending to Cuba, and finally to France in 1968.

We are now witnessing an extraordinary radicalization of the youth on a world scale. In the smallest and most remote countries, students are in rebellion against the Establishment.

In our own country, everyone here is familiar with what is happening on the campus. Some of those present look suspiciously like participants. [Laughter.] New movements are erupting in our country, the struggle of the Blacks, of the Puerto Ricans, the Chicanos, and now Women's Liberation.

The difficulties faced by imperialism, including the most powerful of them all, are becoming more and more apparent. I will cite only a single example to illustrate the point.

Do you know that for the first time in the history of this country, right now you can't even mail a letter in New York City? [Laughter.] Not even an airmail letter with a ten-cent stamp on it. [Laughter.] Not even if you take it to the post office personally.

Reba and I walked to the post office last Wednesday before we knew about the strike. One of the clerks met us at the door with a little hand-lettered picket sign that spoke in about the softest way I have ever seen in a strike. The picket sign read: "No service today." [Laughter, applause.]

To appreciate the depth of the crisis precipitated for U. S. capitalism by the postal workers' strike, let me quote the following item from the *New York Daily News* [March 20]:

"The New York Stock Exchange said brokers [laughter] would be hard hit if the strike continued into next week. [Laughter.] There would be no means of distributing stock certificates and statements." [Laughter and cries of commiseration.]

No doubt that explains the big headline in the same *Daily News*: "MAY ASK ARMY TO MOVE MAIL." [Laughter and cries of "Let them try!"]

A more appropriate headline would be: "MAY ASK ARMY TO GET THE HELL OUT OF VIETNAM." [Applause.]

When the patient, underpaid, overloaded, long-suffering U. S. mailman finally rebels against being an animal of burden for transporting junk mail, I say that in honor of the event the government ought to issue a special commemorative stamp [laughter] . . . for the philatelists to mount in their stamp collections.

And perhaps we could speed up the mail by dropping the famous zipcode and substituting the date the strike began—3/18/70.

That might help jog Nixon's memory on his campaign promise to fix up the postal system and get packages

delivered on time by next Christmas—last Christmas, that is.

In the light of such developments both internationally and nationally, what bright prospects favor our movement! The movement founded in the United States by James P. Cannon and the small band of pioneers who joined him in carrying out this historic task.

The Socialist Workers party and the Young Socialist Alliance have openings now at hand that give every promise of making possible a qualitative breakthrough toward development of a mass party and a mass youth movement in this country.

In the United States today I hear repeated rumors about how easy it is to get credit cards from banks and similar institutions. I read the other day in the *New York Times* that special legislation is now being considered by Congress to put a stop to this easy flow of credit cards. Our lawmakers at least want to make it illegal to mail anyone a credit card unless he or she requests it.

I must admit that as yet I have not been faced by this particular problem [laughter]; and I daresay James P. Cannon has not found any bank messengers prowling around his door trying to foist any credit cards on him. No doubt if any of them tried it, he would give them a touch of his cane. [Laughter.]

But I do hope that on his eightieth birthday he will accept a bit of credit and recognition for the personal role he had played in maintaining the continuity of revolutionary Marxism, the continuity that has really made our movement possible.

So I'd like to say a few words on what I think makes a man like Jim the way he is.

I'll leave aside the individual quirks and eccentricities of which he has his share, as we all do [laughter], and merely note that his personality is a very complex one. What I want to call attention to is more important.

I think that if you had gone to Jim's hometown, Rosedale, Kansas, and asked about him when he was very young, people would have said he was as bright as they come. Who could tell what he might become? [Laughter.]

Whatever his own ambitions may have been, the circumstances of the times turned him into something rather

unique—a political strategist, or, if you wish, a political organizer.

The bourgeoisie has not a few of these, or it used to have some. In the capitalist world, they are called statesmen, or sometimes gray eminences. They are the figures who see the interests of the capitalists as a class very clearly and who have learned how to defend and advance these interests with the greatest skill.

During the rise of capitalism, such figures found their place as revolutionary leaders in the struggle against feudalism, or in the struggle for national independence.

But these types are quite rare among the workers, or in the radical movement. Up until recent times the reason for this was very simple; the capitalists were able to lure and corrupt them with careers and openings into their own class.

Let me narrow it down still more.

To build a revolutionary combat party is an extremely complex and difficult undertaking.

It requires people of the most varied talents and skills: administrators, artists, public speakers, writers, conversationalists, people with a special ability to make friends and gain recruits, technicians, craftsmen—all are needed. Of outstanding importance, whatever their other skills and abilities may be, are two broad general types: theoreticians and organizers.

In the radical movement we can find theoreticians of often exceptional quality. Their role is indispensable in building a revolutionary party.

But often they originate from the petty bourgeoisie or the bourgeoisie and it is difficult for them to surmount this background. They tend to become experts in the world of books and the world of ideas. This is excellent, but it takes more than that to make a revolution.

In the radical movement we also find excellent organizers, very often men and women of great experience in the field of trade unionism. They, too, are absolutely indispensable in the construction of a revolutionary party, particularly in the period of great battles in which the masses mobilize their strength and move toward power.

But there is still another type that should be noted. This is the revolutionary-socialist politician, who may indeed come from either a petty-bour-

geois or a working-class background, but who has an exceptional talent—this is the ability to see almost directly the relationship between the development of political issues, the movement of the masses, and the crystallization of these forces in the form of a combat party. Lenin represents the greatest example yet seen by the working class.

I do not maintain that James P. Cannon is another Lenin—he would never accept such a designation and would, in fact, take a hard look at anyone who tried that kind of flattery on him.

But Jim is a *Leninist*. He does have the talent of seeing politically. And we can add that he is a conscious Leninist in that he tried to learn from Lenin, particularly concerning party-building methods; and, I think, not unsuccessfully.

Jim didn't begin as a Leninist. He began as a rebel. He had a strong feeling of what an unbearable contradiction exists between the world as it is, and the world as it should be or could be.

He began as a youthful rebel, completely unable to accept a world in which poverty, oppression, drudgery, and misery is the lot of the masses; while an arrogant ruling class—a small minority—enjoys wealth and special privileges that most of them reached solely by an accident of birth.

And this in a world where it is easily apparent that poverty could be completely eliminated within a short span of time, provided a rational order could be established in the economy.

The hypocrisy of the ruling class, its basic irrationality, its active sponsorship of the most reactionary and

barbarous heritages of the past, sickened and revolted him.

This feeling of outrage, of fury, became coupled with the socialist vision of what is possible for mankind; and the combination of hate for what is and knowledge of what could be took the form of an overpowering urge to set things right.

What Jim went through, in short, was the rebellion of youth in the world of today.

In some people, Jim has seen this rebellion die out.

In some, he has seen the rebellion overwhelmed by personal difficulties or family responsibilities.

In some, he has seen the rebellion eroded as a consequence of errors, which maturing youth sometimes prove unable to recover from or to surmount.

Some he has seen worn down.

Some he has seen grow tired.

But Jim belongs to those in whom rebellion has never died.

Perhaps after the first flame, it never came to burn hotter or brighter, but it certainly burned steadily, never to flicker or to fade away.

Jim today at eighty is still a rebel youth.

This is his real secret.

He still remains a rebel youth with his eyes on what is coming, still fighting and contributing.

That is why the new generation of youth find that he speaks their language—that he is one of them.

And it will be that way until all of us together, in invincible numbers, sweep aside the resistance of the entire dead past and win the final battle in the coming American revolution. [Prolonged applause.]

## Portuguese Army Admits Losses in Angola

The Portuguese army command in Angola has announced that guerrillas of the "Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola" launched a major attack on Caripande in the southern part of the Cazombo district near the Zambian border, a special dispatch to the *New York Times* reported March 26.

The guerrilla group referred to was apparently the MPLA [Movimento de Libertacao de Angola] of Agostino Neto. Another group, the FNLA [Frente Nacional de Libertacao de Angola—National Front for the Liberation of Angola] of Holden Roberto has also been active in the colonial territory.

The Portuguese army communique, issued in Luanda, said that the national liberation forces used mortars and auto-

matic weapons in their attack, inflicting "many" casualties on the defenders.

"No further details of the attack were given," the *New York Times* dispatch specified. "Nor was a precise number given on casualties. But it is only on rare occasions that Portugal admits 'many' casualties in fighting in Africa."

The Portuguese authorities complained that the attack was launched from across the Zambian border while the border guards of the small African state looked on passively.

Lisbon has claimed since the Angolan insurrection began in 1961 that its inability to stamp out the guerrillas was a result of their receiving sanctuary in the neighboring independent black African country.

## The Left in Ireland Today

[The following interview with Eamonn McCann, the Northern Ireland civil-rights leader, was obtained by Gerry Foley of *Intercontinental Press* in New York during the first week of March. McCann is chairman of the Derry branch of the Northern Ireland Labour party, and was one of the principal leaders of the youth in the Catholic ghetto of Bogside in the battles with police and right-wing Protestant extremists last August.

[The Northern Ireland Labour party, which has historically represented the Protestant working class in Northern Ireland and supports the partition into two states, voted 21,700 to 1,900 at a January 31 conference to affiliate to the British Labour party.

[A process of regroupment is presently taking place among radicals in Northern Ireland involving a number of groups and individuals, and it is still too early to make an assessment of particular organizations on the left. We are presenting this interview as one position in the discussion.]

\* \* \*

*Question: Mr. McCann, how would you describe the division in the Northern Ireland Labour party [NILP] over the question of affiliation with the British Labour party [BLP]?*

*Answer:* A majority of the NILP voted to affiliate with the BLP. However, we in Derry City opposed affiliation and we won the support of four branches — Derry, Falls, Newtownabbey, and Carrickfergus. Two other branches supported us but were bureaucratically excluded from the conference that voted on the merger.

We posed the alternative of calling a rank-and-file conference representative of all the Labour parties in Ireland, and all the tendencies within them, with a view to constructing a united socialist party for the thirty-two counties of Ireland. The kind of party we had in mind would be an anti-imperialist party which would reject coalitions with any Tory [bourgeois] force, Orange [Unionist] or Green [nationalist], North or South,



EAMONN McCANN

and which would be dedicated to building the Irish workers republic envisaged by Connolly.

We were not allowed to present our alternative at the conference but we did argue for it in our speeches and in some leaflets and propaganda we put out in the months just before the conference.

The situation at the moment is that the British Labour party may not accept the merger, which would leave the leadership of the NILP out on a limb and totally expose the absolute bankruptcy of this kind of political maneuvering.

*Q: Did the division in the NILP follow religious lines?*

*A:* It is true that a Catholic in Northern Ireland is more likely to be against the partition [i.e., for an independent united Ireland] than is a Protestant.

However, that is not the same thing as saying that the Catholic members were against the merger and the Protestant members were for it. I would

say that of the 2,000 votes against the merger about half were Protestants.

*Q: What steps have been taken toward forming an all-Ireland socialist organization?*

*A:* We have been engaged for the past few months in negotiations and meetings with various people active in socialist politics in the Republic of Ireland. What we are aiming at is a regroupment of the radical left that would encompass elements within the Northern Ireland Labour party, the Irish Labour party, the Republican movement, and the People's Democracy.

The fact is that the radical movement is extremely fragmented in Ireland. For example, in Northern Ireland in 1963 we had seven labour parties running in various constituencies, in an area which has a population of less than a million and a half, which is a rather confusing situation.

*Q: How would you describe the political character of the resistance to the Unionist regime and imperialist control in Ireland, both North and South?*

*A:* As was to be expected, the people who have actually been doing the fighting in the streets have been the Catholic workers, and the Catholic young workers in particular. In Derry we had some small support from the Protestant working class and from the Young Socialists, who were in the Bogside and fought with us.

We have had the appearance of an all-class bloc of Catholics. But what that really amounted to was that the Catholic workers fought and the Catholic middle classes came in later to head off the militancy of the Catholic working-class youth. They wanted to channel this militancy into reformist demands for a decent, civilized, normal bourgeois society modeled after Britain, after British democracy.

In some areas socialist elements and in other areas Republican elements have been representing and trying to lead the Catholic working class.

The role and relationship of the Re-

publican and socialist elements are complex questions. In Derry, for example, the Labour party and the Republican movement have worked very closely together. We formed a joint caucus in the Derry Citizens' Committee, the organization which ran the area behind the barricades in August, September, and October.

During that period we worked as if we were one socialist revolutionary organization, sharing the same printing facilities, putting out leaflets together, holding joint public meetings.

In other areas, you wouldn't find nearly as close a relationship between the Republican tendency and the Labour party tendency. The fact is that none of the political organizations are homogeneous. Some local groups of one organization will be totally opposed to other local groups of the same organization.

In the South of Ireland, the same sort of confusion exists. This was reflected in the crisis engendered by the events in the North.

I think that the main mistake made by almost everybody, whether they were radicals or revolutionaries, was that they tried to put pressure on the Fianna Fáil government to do something about what was going on in the North.

What the groups in the South should have done was use the mass emotion generated by the pogroms and counter-pogroms to expose the nature of Fianna Fáil. Instead of asking Fianna Fáil to move troops into the North, they should have said that Fianna Fáil will not move troops in because it is a puppet of British imperialism and puppets don't send troops to fight their masters.

The best hope for the future in the South may well lie within the Republican movement. But the Republican movement is not united. The instincts of its rank and file are toward revolutionary-socialist politics. But it is not clear what organizational forms and concrete political demands will grow out of that instinctive looking toward the left for solutions.

*Q: Do you feel that the struggle for national liberation in Ireland can be divided from the struggle for socialism?*

A: No. The fact is that at the moment the Green Tory class, that is, the Catholic bourgeois forces in Ire-

land, have sold out to British imperialism to such an extent that they operate almost as part of the British ruling class. They've integrated the economy of the Republic of Ireland back into the British market.

Instead of looking to any bourgeois nationalist elements we must realize one vital fact. The biggest single section of the population of Northern Ireland is the Protestant working class. I believe the Protestant workers are not *colons* but part of the Irish working class, who happen to live in the North, happen to be Protestant, and happen to support the Unionist party because they've been bought off by the very marginal privileges the discriminatory system in the North has managed to give them.

We certainly could not reach these Protestant workers simply by taking an anti-imperialist line. If you talk about national liberation without talking about a sweeping revolutionary reorganization of the whole economy, you suggest that we should divide the existing jobs and houses in Northern Ireland equally.

That in fact means that the Protestant working class would have less jobs and houses than they have at the moment.

We can't ask the Protestant workers to join the type of society that exists in the Republic of Ireland, which would give them worse social services, less houses, less jobs, poorer health service, a poorer educational system. That's not an enticing prospect for anybody.

The people who say that we will have to achieve national liberation first and decide about socialism later are in fact driving the Protestant working class toward fascism. And as a result they are leading the Catholic working class up a blind alley.

*Q: You feel, then, that the Catholic middle class and the Catholic petty bourgeoisie have no acute grievances against the Unionist regime that can be exploited for the benefit of the struggle?*

A: A lot of Catholic middle-class people are oppressed in the sense that they are not social equals of the Protestant middle class. If that's a grievance, yes, they have grievances.

But they approach the struggle from the point of view of their class inter-

est. They see the aim of the civil-rights struggle as the creation of a civilized, bourgeois society in Northern Ireland, in which there will be social justice—their favorite phrase. This means that all workers, be they Catholic or be they Protestant, will be exploited equally and no worker will be exploited more than any other worker because of his religion.

That's a very nice idea for the middle classes, but it's not so good for the workers. As socialists, our aim in participating in the struggle is not to equalize the exploitation of the working class but to end the exploitation of the working class.

The Catholic middle class have no role to play but a treacherous one, the role they have traditionally played in Irish politics—that is, to first lead and then sell out the working-class elements. They have been playing this role again at present, and, one would have to say, with a fair amount of success, because they have mobilized tens of thousands of people in Ireland to struggle against the Unionist party.

But once the Catholic middle class have achieved British democracy, that is, normal bourgeois democracy, they will try to stop the whole thing.

What has happened in the past is simply that they have channeled the frustration of the young Catholic workers in a religious direction. It has been vented against the Protestant areas and Protestant people.

I think that socialists in the North of Ireland must make it quite clear that they are totally opposed to the aims of the Catholic middle class, that they are not united with them, that they are not attempting to build any all-class Catholic alliance within the civil-rights movement. When one does this in Northern Ireland, one is accused of being a splitter and a wreck-er. And I certainly do think that we ought to split from the middle-class elements and wreck any movement that they are going to dominate ideologically. In that sense we're splitters and wreckers and unrepentant about it.

*Q: Do you feel that anything resembling normal bourgeois democracy is possible, either in the North or South?*

A: It's theoretically possible. In fact, it is directly in the interests of imperialism at this time. And the Brit-

ish troops are there precisely to impose it. However, in half a century the British have created a political machine to rule Northern Ireland based on religious prejudice.

A changed economic situation in Northern Ireland demands normal bourgeois democracy. However, this change cannot be reflected immediately in the political form of bourgeois rule. What is really happening in Northern Ireland is that imperialism has been trying to dismantle the old political superstructure that it created.

Whether British imperialism can achieve this aim depends primarily on their ability to improve the economic situation, unemployment and housing, for example, which are chronic issues.

My judgment is that a normal bourgeois system cannot be achieved, although I wouldn't be dogmatic about it and say that it definitely couldn't happen.

*Q: Why has the civil-rights movement developed precisely at this point in history and taken a much wider scope than previous resistance to the Unionist regime?*

A: Because of a number of factors. One is the rising expectations among the Catholic working class produced by social changes such as the development of a welfare state in Britain and the institution of free postprimary education. The improvement in public education created for the first time an educated element among the Catholic working class.

Secondly, the Unionist leadership began to promise the Catholic people that things were going to improve. This new turn developed in 1963 when Terence O'Neill became prime minister in succession to Lord Brookeborough. He initiated the new "civilized" form of Unionism. He said that discrimination was out of date and would have nothing to do with the old rag-bag of religious slogans that had constituted the Unionist ideology since the party's inception.

The Unionist turn occurred because there was a convergence of economic interest between the Orange Tories in Northern Ireland and the Green Tories in the South.

As O'Neill promised more and more to the Catholics, an Orange backlash developed among the more backward and fanatical elements of the Unionist party. So O'Neill was caught between two opposing forces.

These things came to a head in 1968 and the bubble burst in Derry on October 5, 1968. Unlike all the previous clashes, there was a relatively capable and young radical leadership.

*Q: How would you compare the youth movement in Northern Ireland with those in other parts of the world?*

A: There are obvious similarities. The May events in France had a tremendous effect on the development of the People's Democracy, its use of mass meetings rather than small committees.

A number of French and German young people took part in the fighting in the Bogside, and that's always been a pretty parochial place, Derry. But the fact was, they were welcomed by everyone, especially by the young people, and very much integrated into what was going on there.

I think that illustrated the fact that the young people who were fighting did see themselves as being part of a general movement of youth throughout the world. For example, there's quite a discernible feeling of solidarity with the Black liberation movement in the United States, with the students in Prague, and so on.

*Q: How would you describe the enduring effects of the fighting in August? Did it change the political lineup, did the mass mobilizations change the consciousness of the people?*

A: The most significant thing that it did was increase the self-reliance of the people. The very fact that they did defeat the police force in the course of physical struggle; the fact that they held the area for two and a half months, has shown people that if they stand together, there's very little that they can't do. And for a people who were entirely apathetic and ground down for decades, that is quite a startling and exciting advance.

The idea of revolutionary socialism, the mere mention of anything red in that claustrophobic Catholic community up to a very short time ago would have been sufficient to discredit one. But the red smear suddenly and dramatically is no longer a useful weapon for the right wing.

This new openness to ideas creates new openings in which revolutionary socialists can get through to these people who would have been turned off

completely by the idea of left-wing politics just a short time ago.

*Q: How powerful do you think the Catholic hierarchy is in Northern Ireland?*

A: It's still very powerful, there's no doubt about that. But not nearly as powerful as it was. It's powerful among older people. The bishop in Belfast, who is a hard-necked, McCarthyite reactionary demagogue, was able to walk into the Free Belfast area and walk all over the local defense committee and have the barricades taken down. And he marched in at the head of the British army, moreover.

This is an illustration of the role that the Catholic hierarchy plays, but the fact is that he got away with it.

But equally significant was the fact that he was opposed, that he didn't do it without some people objecting.

It is possible now to argue with the hierarchy and to get the support of the young people. The Catholic hierarchy never again in Ireland will be able to do the type of things it did in decades past.

*Q: What kind of a socialist organization are you trying to build?*

A: What we need ideally is a Bolshevik party to lead the Irish working class. In general, I favor building such a party.

At present we in Derry are exchanging position-perspective papers with some other people: in the South with the League for a Workers Republic, with elements within the Large element movement, and with fairly large elements within the People's Democracy who are somewhat dissatisfied with one or two aspects of the way PD is going.

At least at present the effort is being made, which was not true even a year ago when people were so caught up in ongoing political activity that the necessity for building a hard Marxist party was just dropped.

I think all the people who call themselves Marxists on the left in Ireland have to take a lot of responsibility for that.

The necessity to have that crucial weapon at the disposal of the working class was never more clearly illustrated than in the situation last August where we had a tremendous working-class ferment throughout Ireland, and nobody, but nobody, be they Republicans, Labour party, PD, or anybody

else—or any tendency within any of those things—was able successfully to be integrated into the movement, to give it leadership and to pose slogans and solutions that meant something to the people who are participating in the activities that would have led on

## Denmark

# Students Oppose Reactionary Legislation

By Peder Jensen

### Copenhagen

A march of 8,000 students culminated in a temporary occupation of the University of Copenhagen by several thousand demonstrators March 9. This was the opening salvo by the students against a new administrative law now before the Danish parliament.

For the past two years the student governments of the various campuses of the University of Copenhagen have been trying to win democratization of the school administration and get student representation in all the university's decision-making bodies. Through their minister of education, Helge Larsen, the coalition of three bourgeois parties which form the government at present have now proposed a new "administrative law" for the university system. This law would make the present undemocratic character of the university governing bodies official; it would legalize the direct ties between business and the universities, and, in addition, would increase the pressure to depoliticize the present student governments. The sole "concession" to the students would be one-third representation on the governing bodies.

The law proposes to replace the present student governments with councils in the separate disciplines. These bodies would then deal only with questions of curriculum, quality of instruction, etc. Just to make sure that these organs have no powers to speak for the students as a whole or to deal with political questions, the bill provides that all their decisions have to be approved by the minister of education. The proposed law makes explicit the cozy relationship between capital and higher education by providing for yearly meetings between

towards the socialist revolution.

That was a real tragedy and unless the lack of the party is redressed, in the coming crisis the same thing could happen again and another chance might not appear for a long time to come.

representatives of the universities and of business to discuss the character of instruction and research on the campuses. A recent study has indicated that business already has a stranglehold on all the committees that appropriate money for research. Representatives of capital occupy 56 percent of the seats on these committees.

The students have actively opposed this proposed legislation and the continued subordination of the universities to the interests of capitalism. The demonstration March 9 inaugurated their campaign. The march wound through Copenhagen, stopping at several places to hear speakers denounce the bill and the influence of business on campus.

One of the stops was at the Sociological Institute, which students had already occupied. The action, the occupiers said, was primarily to "express our opinion of the research conducted at this institute." The institute is largely financed by the Rockefeller Foundation.

At the central campus a rally was held. Then approximately 3,000 of the demonstrators proceeded to occupy the administrative center and several other buildings. They stayed there until early next morning, holding discussions and mass meetings on the subject of capitalist domination of the universities. Proposals for future action were considered.

The largest mass meeting (more than 1,000) passed a resolution raising three central demands: (1) Research and education for the benefit of the people—not the leaders of industry. (2) Unrestricted freedom of organization. (3) 50 percent student representation in all university decision-making bodies.

The resolution also stated: "It is the

declared goal of the government to increase the influence of business on research and education. Since the goals of the students and business are different, the government will only give the students a symbolic voice in decision making. This is clear from the proposed law. The students will be only a minority in all the basic governing bodies. They will not be allowed to organize freely."

The students explicitly identify their struggles with those of the workers. In the past two months a series of "illegal strikes" in many of the largest factories have pressed demands for more pay as well as directly attacking the government's economic policy. A leaflet issued by the students and distributed at many key factories stated: "The dissatisfied students and the dissatisfied workers are in almost the same situation. The university is the students' place of employment—and we are dissatisfied with the management. Shouldn't the workers be the ones to make the decisions in the factories? Shouldn't the students be the ones to make the decisions in the universities? . . . They [the government] would have us believe that the growth of industry is in everyone's interest. That is a lie. We 'participate,' they make the profits."

While occupying the administration building, the students discovered that the university was still receiving reports on all students arrested, a practice the university president publicly stated had stopped in 1967. In addition, the files indicated that a popular professor who had been actively supporting the student struggles was in danger of being fired.

The struggle around the proposed administrative law is sure to continue. Already demonstrations are planned throughout the country. The scope of the struggle is continually broadening, taking in the whole question of the role of higher education in a capitalist society and the controlling influence of industrialists in university affairs.

The government's reaction so far has been patterned after that of its idol in the White House, Richard Nixon. When he heard about the demonstration, Premier Baunsgaard said: "The actions around the occupation of the University of Copenhagen cannot influence government policy."

## 'Red Mole' Explains Split with 'Black Dwarf'

[Many of our readers may be familiar with the left-wing London *Black Dwarf* edited by Tariq Ali, a well-known figure in the British antiwar movement and one of the leaders of the International Marxist Group (IMG), the British section of the Fourth International. The *Black Dwarf*, named after a radical Chartist paper of the early nineteenth century, began publication in June 1968.

[Differences in the staff of the *Black Dwarf* have now led to a split, and the appearance of a new publication, the *Red Mole*, the first issue of which is dated March 17.

[The February 20 issue of *Black Dwarf*, the last before the split, listed the staff as follows: Editor: Tariq Ali; editorial board: Anthony Barnett, Robin Blackburn, Vinay Chand, Clive Goodwin, Fred Halliday, John Hoyal, Sheila Rowbotham, John Weal; designer: Mike Newton; circulation and advertising: Dave Kendall; distribution: Peter Gowan; and secretary: Marie-Therese Ligougne.

[The first issue of *Red Mole* lists its staff as follows: Editorial board: Tariq Ali, Chenhamo Chimutengwende, Peter Gowan, Teresa Hayter, Dave Kendall, Marie-Therese Ligougne, Neil Middleton, Felicity Trodd, John Weal; design: David Wills.

[Below, we are reprinting the lead editorial in the first issue of *Red Mole*, explaining the issues in dispute. It is entitled "Where to Begin."

[The name of the new paper is taken from a comment by Marx: "We recognize our old friend, our old mole, who knows so well how to work underground, suddenly to appear: the revolution."]

\* \* \*

The political split on the *Dwarf* editorial board took place because it was impossible to achieve unity in action. Those of us (six in all) from the old *Dwarf* who have come together to form the new *Red Mole* board don't view this split as an end in itself. It will be both a beginning and a continuation. *The Red Mole* will continue to reflect all that was best in the old

*Dwarf* but it will be a much more politically consistent and coherent paper than its predecessor. Most of the members of the *Dwarf* board realized that the time had come for a long hard look at the *Dwarf's* politics. It was essential to hammer out a long-term political strategy for the *Dwarf* if it was to survive as a permanent and serious feature of the revolutionary left and not to disappear with the first temporary down turn in activity. We could not live for ever on the wave of revolutionary euphoria that accompanied the May events and the October '68 Demo in England. Without a perspective, without a strong link to revolutionary action, indeed without being an organizer ourselves, we would have become staid and superfluous. We had to make up our minds who we were talking to and what we wanted to say to them, most important of all what we wanted them to do. A political debate took place on the *Dwarf* board and papers and counterpapers (some of which we hope to reproduce in later issues to give our readers a clearer idea of the background to the split) were produced and read. Those papers did not provide a basis for unity in action—rather they served to do the opposite—they demonstrated the gaping difference that existed on the board about the future of the paper. Those of us who left wanted the *Dwarf* to take very clear political stands on the issues which it was confronted with. We argued that it was not sectarian to do this—in fact it would be sectarian to do the opposite and attempt to avoid making a decision on these issues, even if at times it did make us unpopular with some sections of the Left. Within the framework of the present *Dwarf* we couldn't put those ideas into practice, however. This was best illustrated by the Africa debate. A debate was begun on the role of the ANC [African National Congress] in South Africa; what we felt was an extremely important and educative debate for the British Left. However, it had to end prematurely. The *Dwarf* took up an issue, created a furor and then abruptly dropped the issue as

suddenly as it took it up. The reason was that the article created serious tensions on the editorial board, leading to one resignation, and a temporary and unsatisfactory compromise was reached to enable the paper to continue appearing. We felt that it was not fruitful for us to work in that climate any longer. It would be better to produce separate newspapers since the political differences had become so great. We want to be able to produce a committed newspaper, which is able to attempt to give a lead to militants, to open discussions on vital issues and which is not content to trail behind the movement or to shrink from taking sides for fear of offending personal friends or members of the board.

A second profound difference concerned the existence of a revolutionary paper in capitalist society. Some of the board thought that a newspaper had to be viewed in a completely different light from an organization. We would agree that this is the case for the general run of newspapers in capitalist society but we would argue that it's impossible for a revolutionary newspaper to run on the same basis (indeed it's hard anywhere in the world to find one that does). *The Red Mole* will be as professional a paper as our limited resources allow. It will take every opportunity as *The Black Dwarf* did of being distributed through bourgeois outlets but it will not rely on these means of distribution and it will try and build a revolutionary alternative. It will be above all an organizing paper, which uses its contacts to create real political links between militants, to create the basis for an organization, which both supports and is supported by the paper. The *Dwarf* always ran into problems because it had no organization behind it. It did not integrate people just coming into revolutionary politics into political life because it did not give any perspective beyond reading and selling the paper. This is where *The Red Mole* will be an important step forward from *The Black Dwarf* for it will be an organizing paper, dedicated to intervening in the class struggle. It will cease to be a spectator or a commentator and



become a living part of that struggle.

When it first appeared in June 1968 the *Dwarf* represented the revolutionary militants who identified with the anti-capitalist struggle in France in May 1968. Gradually the *Dwarf* became the voice of the extra-parliamentary opposition in this country and reflected the spontaneism which could be seen in the Grosvenor Square demonstrations. With many of the militants involved in these struggles either dropping out or joining organizations, the *Dwarf* seemed to be left in a void. *The Red Mole* we hope will be able to fill that void and offer some organizational perspectives to the hundreds of militants who have identified with the *Dwarf* in the past. At the same time we will continue to act as a mouthpiece for the revolutionary left in general without closing our pages to all those involved in struggle.

*The Red Mole* will support the struggles for national liberation and socialism throughout the world. Internationalism will be an important plank of our work and we will give support to the Chinese, Vietnamese and Cuban revolutions, to the anti-bureaucratic struggles in Eastern Europe and to struggle for workers' control and socialism in the advanced capitalist countries. We will not be a sectarian paper and will leave the task of theoretical debates and abstract polemics to the different journals of the revolutionary groupings in this country. What we will aim to do is to present a fusion of the accumulated experience of the working class in past struggles, the revolutionary tradition, with the experience being gained in struggles throughout the world now and with the day-to-day lessons and requirements of agitation in Britain. Most of all we think that it is not an abstract programme which is most important but the effects that the journal can have and the use to which it can be put in revolutionary activity. To make a turn to revolutionary activity requires unity in action, however, and that was impossible to achieve with the old *Dwarf*. Our new board will be a working collective with a broad agreement on revolutionary strategy.

We think that it is no longer sufficient to provide an abstract revolutionary culture as the *Dwarf* has sometimes done in the past. The crying need of the Left is to get organized. We have seen in the student field an

upsurge in 1968 which halted in its tracks after the LSE [London School of Economics] occupation and the October demo and left people wondering where to go next. Admittedly it produced the RSSF [Revolutionary Socialist Student Federation] but sad to say no organization with even the limited staying power of the SDS in West Germany or the USA. It is time to begin asking ourselves why this has happened and how we can amend our practice to begin to build more enduring organizations capable of resisting the counter-attacks of authority. In the last two or three issues of the *Dwarf* we have been tentatively opening the debate particularly with an article by [Daniel] Bensaïd in the last old *Dwarf* on students. That debate will be continued in the pages of *The Red Mole*. We are now seeing what promises to be the beginning of a new upsurge of the students. We would like to see the student left imbued with a far greater self-consciousness and idea of where it is going than in the past. The need *above all* is for organization, an enduring framework within which militants from different institutions can regularly meet to discuss their problems, to learn from each other and to hammer out a common strategy. This last is the most important because for an organization to survive it must find its *raison d'etre* in revolutionary action. It must not just be—it must act, and act in coordination so that students can face the centralized power of the state with a little more confidence than they have been able to over the last few gloomy months where the student movement has been able to do little to protect individual militants from repression. It is particularly essential for students to have an enduring organization that can prevent them from becoming isolated, demoralized and eventually absorbed when they leave their college and start work. We have seen too many revolutionaries and potential revolutionaries go to waste because of this lack. The long-term aim should not be a student organization, however, but a revolutionary youth organization taking its own political initiatives, and training people to accept the ideal of being a life-long revolutionary, a bolshevik. We say youth organization because this is the sector at present where the ruling ideology is weakest, which has little faith in the stagnant organization of

social democracy and reformism and which has not suffered the debilitating experience of Stalinism and the ultimate debacle of the 20th Congress and Budapest. Through youth as a whole lies the way into the working class for revolutionaries. The first base of a paper like the *Dwarf* and now *The Red Mole* may be among students but as it builds an organization and becomes an activist group so will it recruit comrades from the schools, apprentices and young workers.

Already in the latter part of the *Dwarf's* existence, *Dwarf* circles had been created in response to local political needs. We want to direct *The Red Mole* to help develop these organizations and coordinate their activities. On the basis of the perspective outlined in the preceding paragraphs our message to comrades reading this manifesto is quite simple. It is to build Red Circles. If one exists in your locality, join it, for in isolation a revolutionary can do nothing and revolutionary politics must be much more than a fortnightly read. If no Red Circle exists then join the struggle to build them. We will help you in whatever way we can with advice, speakers, advertising space in *The Red Mole*, etc. We will publish lists of Red Circles and Red Mole contacts in each edition of the paper. We believe this is where to begin—to attempt to construct one of the fragments that will one day join together to form the revolutionary party to make the revolution in Britain.

*Venceremos.*

## The American Way of Life

William Raspberry reports in the March 20 *Washington Post* that dum dum bullets are used by the White House police, the U. S. Secret Service, the U. S. Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, "and 300 other police departments across the United States."

A standard bullet causes a very small entry wound and a slightly jagged exit wound. A dum dum bullet expands upon impact with the flesh and generally tears out great gaping holes, not to mention tearing internal organs as it perforates them.

For this reason, dum dum bullets have long been banned by international law. But international law does not apply domestically—particularly in the United States, it seems.

An effort is being made to change the gun-control act so as to ban use of the dum dum. The Secret Service objects, favoring the expanding-point bullet for "humanitarian reasons."

## Opening for the Left in the Syndicate-Indicate Split

[The following editorial appeared in the February issue of *Marxist Outlook* under the title, "Tasks Before Revolutionary Left." *Marxist Outlook* is the monthly journal of the Socialist Workers party of India, the Indian section of the Fourth International.]

\* \* \*

The split in the Congress party, the traditional party of the Indian bourgeoisie, is indeed a reflection of the deep-rooted political crisis experienced by the capitalist class in India as a whole. Open factional squabbles and slander campaigns between the so-called Syndicate [the right-wing "old guard" leadership of the Congress party] and the Indicate [supporters of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi] have only accentuated the political instability that emerged after the general elections of 1967 with the eclipse of the Congress party as the sole monopolizer of political power in several states and with reduced strength at the Centre.

The split in the Congress, as the ruling party, has all the outward manifestations of a "new" process of polarization in the political life of the country. For one thing the split seems to have found its echo in almost all the traditional parties—both of the right and the left—all of which are called upon to define their attitude to it. Besides, the Syndicate is seeking a *modus vivendi* with the rightist capitalist parties—the Jan Sangh and the Swatantra—in the name of toppling the government at the Centre. The Indicate leadership is trying to woo the left parties including the two CPs, PSP [Praja Socialist party], the SSP [Samyukta Socialist party], as well as the various regional bourgeois parties like the DMK [Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam] in Tamil Nadu, Bharatiya Kranti Dal, the Akali Dal in Punjab, the Bangla Congress and the Muslim League (Kerala).

But this polarization, if at all it can be called a process of polarization, is taking place within the "safe" framework of the present capitalist parliamentary institutions. In reality lead-

ers of the two broad spectrums of capitalist politicians are seeking a way out of the crisis threatening their class rule. The Syndicate and its allies have perhaps realized that the ability of the capitalist state to give a better deal to the masses is limited. The Indicate leadership, on the other hand, is trying to foster a new illusion that the masses can expect a change for the better by introducing minor reforms within the existing property relations.

The slogan of democratic socialism, in the wake of bank nationalization, has become a convenient slogan to hoodwink the masses. While the capitalist politicians are clear about their class objectives, the tragedy lies with the traditional left parties. They have degenerated into mere appendages of capitalist parties. In the name of supporting a "more progressive wing"—"lesser of two evils"—of the capitalist politicians, these self-styled left parties are trying to sidetrack the attention of the masses from the path of struggle against the outdated system of capitalism.

All the left parties, including the two CPIs, PSP, and the SSP, not to speak of the smaller parties like the RSP [Revolutionary Socialist party], are directly or indirectly helping to create the illusion that a social transformation can be brought about through the existing parliamentary institutions without the direct political intervention of the working class and the exploited masses and liquidation of the capitalist system. The confusion generated by the left parties can be clearly discerned from the opportunist practices of the CPI [Communist party of India—the pro-Moscow CP] and the CPM [Communist party of India (Marxist)—the erstwhile pro-Peking split from the CPI, which heads the so-called United Front government in West Bengal] in many states. Their "conditional" support to the Indira Gandhi government is essentially an outcome of their position of forging a four-class bloc—of an alliance with the national bourgeoisie—in the name of building the so-called "na-

tional democratic front" (as in the case of the CPM).

Differences between the CPI and the CPM exist on the question of tactics, the extent to which they as "working class" parties can ally with the parties of the national bourgeoisie (i.e., Mrs. Gandhi) in the "national democratic front"; whereas the CPM insists, theoretically at least, on the proletarian hegemony (its own domination) of a "people's democratic front" envisaged by it. But both these parties in practice have got themselves bogged down in the quagmire of capitalist parliamentarism to such an extent that they cannot extricate themselves from a crisis of their own making. From what is happening in Kerala and West Bengal, their degeneration seems to have become complete.

The CPI has come out of the United Front with the CPM in Kerala to lead a "Mini-Front" ministry with the Muslim League and the reactionary Kerala Congress as its partners. In Bengal the UF government is being tossed from one crisis to another—the Indicate tribe playing the tune every time.

Both CPs reject the perspective of a socialist revolution for India; they reject the need for independent political intervention of the working class in alliance with the rural poor.

As for the reformist socialist parties, the PSP and the SSP, both of them are wedded to achieve the "ultimate goal of socialism" by parliamentary means, eschewing the methods of class struggle. Their methods are in no way different from those advocated by the Congress. Both these parties have lost their traditional following to the Congress over a period. A section of the SSP leadership indeed talks of toppling the Indira government—not by independent mass action but by aligning itself with the capitalist parties like the Syndicate, Jan Sangh, Swatantra, etc. This sounds more like a price it is paying for the support it seeks in Bihar and the UP [Uttar Pradesh] to form coalitions with these parties. The basic tactics of both pro-

Indira or anti-Indira sections of the SSP—now sharply divided—are that of tailing behind a capitalist party to share the "bounties of office."

Twenty-two years of capitalist rule in India have demonstrated clearly that the masses cannot expect solution of any of their basic problems—food, housing, employment—within the capitalist framework which has proved its total bankruptcy. No miracle is going to be achieved by the "new" Congress party led by Mrs. Gandhi; it will only prolong the agony of the masses. What is needed is a revolutionary transformation of the existing property relations and not minor reforms. Such a transformation can be brought about by revolutionary intervention of the masses led by the proletariat which must establish its own class rule in place of the rule of the capitalist class. Since the traditional left parties have abdicated their role as leadership of the working class, a new revolutionary leadership has to be created—a leadership capable of coordinating the emerging struggles of the masses of workers and the rural poor and lead them towards a socialist revolution.

The question confronting the revolutionary Marxists is how to build such a leadership. Revolutionary Marxists function today as scattered groups. They have to combat the opportunist parliamentary practices of the traditional left parties which behave no better than the capitalist parties in their mad race for the spoils of office. This struggle against "left opportunism" manifests itself in ultraleft adventurism in some parts of the country as demonstrated by the various Naxalite (Maoist) groups. The tasks are seemingly difficult. But the objective conditions in the context of the growing crisis of the capitalist system in the country and radicalization of the mass movements on a global scale—both in the advanced and underdeveloped countries—make these tasks less formidable. There is no other way, no short cut to a revolution other than the construction of a revolutionary leadership from the available manpower and resources.

Already different sections of the working class in the country are being drawn into the vortex of the struggles against the capitalist employers and the capitalist state. The working class of Bengal, especially in engineering,

jute, tea plantations, and textiles, have shown the way with their successful strike struggles in recent months. The engineering workers of Jamshedpur waged a united strike action against the powerful house of Tatas. In several other states also the working class is taking the path of direct mass action. Indeed these struggles are taking place for the present purely on an economic or trade-union plane but if they are coordinated on a regional and national basis they can assume the character of a serious challenge to the bourgeois state. Unfortunately the two CPIs are carrying their factional struggles to the extent of splitting the AITUC [All-India Trade Union Congress], one of the few militant trade-union fronts of the working class. But the working class should find ways of overcoming attempts at disrupting their ranks with artificial divisions foisted from above—through united action on common class demands as shown by the Jamshedpur workers. New struggles of white-collared employees, government servants, bank employees, teachers, etc., are also emerging in different states.

Along with a new wave of strike struggles of the urban working class a new consciousness is fast developing among the agricultural workers and the rural poor in the villages. In some states like Andhra the struggles of the rural poor have assumed the form of armed conflicts with the state apparatus. Hitherto, agricultural workers and the rural poor have been kept deliberately unorganized even by the left parties because of their fear of antagonizing the rich peasants and other exploiting strata in the villages.

## New Zealand

### Demonstrators Win Bail for John Bower

Some 200 students marched on Mt. Eden Prison in Auckland, New Zealand, March 12 to demand bail for John Bower, an antiwar activist who has been held since March 6 on frame-up charges of attempting to blow up military installations. Bower was released on \$500 bail March 13 despite a prosecution motion to hold him until his trial opens in April.

In the context of the emerging struggles of the agricultural workers as in parts of West Bengal (organized mainly by the SWP), the task of building up their independent class organizations has become easier. The struggles of the rural poor must be linked with the struggles of the urban working class if they are to achieve positive results. Otherwise, isolated struggles of the rural poor can be easily crushed by the capitalist state as has been the case in Srikakulam (Andhra).

The concept of building united class struggle of the working class—both urban and rural—may sound elementary to armchair revolutionaries who have romantic ideas of a revolutionary mass movement. But such a step is the essential basis of building a revolutionary struggle—against the bourgeois state. The major left parties have forgotten the need for building independent class movements of workers because of their preoccupation with opportunist electoral politics, of placating different regional, caste or communal groups to win votes.

The class movements have been betrayed or are being sabotaged by left parties which have become a part of the capitalist establishment. The present confusion caused by the opportunist practices of left parties can be combated only by the united struggles of the working class and other sections of the exploited masses at the grass-root level. The slogan of opportunist multiclass coalitions should be countered with the slogan of *independent intervention of workers and the rural poor* in the political struggles against the capitalist state and its policies. Only thus can we build a new proletarian leadership.

Bower, a twenty-one-year-old engineering student, was arrested in January on the relatively minor charge of disorderly conduct arising from an incident shortly before the demonstrations against the visit of U.S. Vice-president Spiro Agnew.

When Bower made a routine court appearance in this case on March 6, a surety of \$500 was demanded and

he was taken to jail. His friends quickly raised the money, but then found that Bower had "disappeared." After several hours it was discovered that he had been taken for questioning by the Criminal Investigation Branch (CIB). His lawyer was finally informed that Bower was being charged with arson in relation to an explosion at the Royal New Zealand Air Force depot in Fox Street, Parnell. A fact sheet on the case distributed by Bower's supporters describes what happened during the March 6 interrogation:

"It was not until 6:30 p.m. that John was able to see his lawyer. At this stage, after five and a half hours interrogation by the CIB, John had made no statements to the police and he

told his lawyer that he had no intention of making any in the absence of his lawyer. The following morning, his lawyer informed us that Bower had alleged that the police had presented him with the note left at the scene of the explosion. He had taken it in his hands, read it, and denied that it belonged to him. The police took the note away, and a short while later returned with the information that the note had John's fingerprints on it."

Bower denied all charges against him when he appeared in court March 13, the day following the student march in his behalf. He was released on bail on the condition that he report daily to the central police station until his trial.

to be the inheritor of October should stoop to propagating the philosophy of the Black Hundreds through a state-sponsored hack novel.

The revival of anti-Semitic propaganda in the Soviet Union fits in with the recent exploitation of this ancient prejudice to justify purges of reformers and dissidents in the Czechoslovak and Polish Communist parties.

In the Soviet Union the bureaucracy undoubtedly also has foreign policy objectives in mind in fanning anti-Semitism. Shevtsov's novel clearly represents a crude attempt to capitalize on revulsion against the aggressive plans of the Israeli leaders and the increasingly obvious racist character of the Zionist state.

Shevtsov and his mentors in the Kremlin seem to have a twofold purpose: (1) to divert the Palestinian and Arab freedom fighters from their anti-imperialist struggle, which has a revolutionary dynamic threatening "peaceful coexistence"; (2) to blacken Trotskyism in the eyes of the young Arab fighters, who are looking for allies in their revolutionary struggle, on the ground that it is a "Jewish ideology."

A similar approach has been followed by the Arab reactionaries, who have tried to channel the resentment of the Arab masses against Zionist aggression into an essentially verbal holy war. This tactic has tended to demobilize the Arab resistance by re-integrating it into the feudalistic and colonialist structures in the Near East, which are dominated by imperialism. The most advanced Arab fighters have realized this danger and are combating anti-Semitism.

Moreover, the notion of an international conspiracy has an added usefulness today. The Kremlin's diplomatic belly-crawling in Washington makes it inconvenient to ascribe all opposition in the Soviet Union to the subversive activities of the CIA. Overdoing this might be taken amiss by the Nixon administration.

In fact, Shevtsov seems even to use the "Jewish plot" idea to downgrade the capacities of American imperialism. His hero says: "You think no doubt that international Zionism is in the service of American imperialism. For my part, I am convinced that it is the other way around. American imperialism constitutes the economic and military base of Zionism. It serves the aims of Zion."

## REVIEWS

### Moscow Novel Attacks Trotsky as 'Zionist'

By Gerry Foley

A new Soviet novel has reportedly revived the Moscow-trial, frame-up charges against Leon Trotsky. The novel also includes the thinly veiled anti-Semitic slurs Stalin resorted to in attacking the founder of the Red Army.

Ivan Shevtsov's novel, *In the Name of the Father and the Son*, according to a March 23 UPI dispatch from Moscow, contains some choice morsels of old-fashioned Stalinist prose. The following is an example: "Trotsky was a Zionist and his so-called party was only an offshoot of Zionism." Shevtsov put these words into the mouth of his hero Aaron Hertsovich.

Hertsovich also speaks as follows: "Like the fascists, the Zionists are ferocious enemies of Marxism-Leninism. With this difference, that the Zionists introduce their agents into the international Communist movement. Sometimes they succeed in infiltrating into the Communist party leadership . . . This was the case of the Judas Trotsky, alias Bronstein, a typical agent of Zionism, international provocateur No. 1."

In this context, Stalin's favorite epithet, "Judas," has a distinctly ecclesiastical flavor, reminiscent of the Ortho-

dox Church's portrayal of the Jews as "Christ killers."

It is evident that Shevtsov's message is anti-Semitic, there being nothing to link Trotsky to Zionism except birth in a Jewish family.

There is no doubt either that Shevtsov's novel represents the views of at least an important sector of the Soviet bureaucracy, otherwise it could not have been published. The recent expulsion of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn and the apparently forced resignation of the mildly independent Aleksandr Tvardovsky from the editorship of *Novy Mir* show the role the Kremlin has assigned to official "literature."

The real literature of the Russian people has been driven underground; it circulates in the hand-copied manuscripts. The main tradition in Russian literature has been that of Pushkin, Tolstoy, and Chekhov, who defended progressive and enlightened ideas as well as artistic integrity against the obscurantist despotism of the Czars. This tradition of courage and honesty was taken over by the generation that made the October revolution. Its continuers are Solzhenitsyn and the anonymous writers of the underground publications.

It is ironic that a regime claiming

## The 'Red Power' Movement

By Dick Fidler

[This article and the one that follows were taken from the February 23 issue of *Labor Challenge*, a revolutionary-socialist biweekly published in Toronto.]

\* \* \*

Indians in Quebec recently reminded the provincial government that it had failed to sign treaties with them for all of northern Quebec, and that the time had come for a settlement. They claim 85 percent of the province's territory, and have put a price tag of \$5 billion on it.

Mohawk Indians from the St. Regis reservation near Cornwall, Ontario, recently sat-in to block the U. S.-Canadian border crossing. They demanded that the Canadian government recognize the Jay Treaty, signed in the late 18th century between Britain and the United States, which gave Indians the right as sovereign peoples to transport goods across the border free of duty.

The leaders of the 9,000 Indians in the Six Nations Confederacy at Brantford, Ontario, have petitioned the United Nations in support of their claim that the Confederacy is a sovereign state, and suggested that Ottawa begin paying rent—including back rent—for its use of land guaranteed to the Indians by treaty with the British crown and never formally revoked. An adequate settlement, they say, might be in the neighborhood of \$2 billion.

In Saskatchewan, the Native Action Committee, which seeks local control of government in Metis and Indian communities, ran an independent Red Power candidate, 23-year-old Carole Lavalley in Meadow Lake constituency in the 1968 federal election.

U. S. Sioux leader Vine Deloria, Jr., in a speech in Montreal this month, called for a "mutual defense pact between U. S. and Canadian Indians against the white man."

The ideas and tactics of the Red Power movement are inspired in part by the developing movements of op-

pressed peoples around the world—and in particular the Vietnamese, the U. S. Blacks, and the Quebecois. But its roots are to be found in the terribly exploited and oppressed conditions of the Native people right here in Canada, and the growing determination of these half-million original inhabitants of this continent, nearly crushed by literally centuries of colonization, degradation, and white "civilization's" attempts to destroy them, to resist the cultural genocide which is staring them in the face. It is these "New Indians"—led by articulate, militant young spokesmen like Harold Cardinal, an Alberta Cree—who are opening up a new, inspiring and revolutionary chapter in Indian history.

Cardinal's book, *The Unjust Society*,\* has received attention because it is the most detailed presentation yet published of the Indian side of the story and because it is an eloquent, damning and comprehensive indictment of the Trudeau government's new Indian policy.

That policy was expressed in a "white paper" released by Indian Affairs Minister Jean Chretien last June, which projected phasing out the Indian Affairs department over the next five years, thereby leaving Canada's quarter-million treaty Indians presently covered by federal services at the mercy of the provinces, many of which do not provide such services.

Harold Cardinal and other Indian spokesmen—who have unanimously condemned the plan—describe it as a blueprint for cultural genocide. They are not exaggerating. It is difficult to imagine any other motivation behind the white paper's proposals than the complete destruction of the Indians as a people.

The white paper's starting point is a complete dismissal of the treaties which have been the formal basis of

relations between half the Indian population and the government for well over half a century. Trudeau brushed the treaties aside as an "anomaly" not to be tolerated in the Just Society. "It is inconceivable," he said, "that one section of a society should have a treaty with another section of a society . . ." They should become Canadians as all other Canadians.

But for the Indians, the treaties are the means by which the whites legitimized in the eyes of the world their presence in the Indians' country. They were negotiated between sovereign peoples, and have great symbolic importance to the Indians. The Indians have never denied that the written terms of the treaties are often misleading; verbal promises (and there were no doubt many on the part of the crafty whites) are omitted; "they carry key phrases that are not precise"; "they state that certain things were ceded that, in actual fact, were never considered so granted by the Indians who signed the treaties." (Cardinal)

But many treaties did make wide-ranging promises which, if interpreted in the light of present-day needs and the Indians' understanding when they were signed, would encompass a vast expansion in government services and the economic status of the Indian people. These include full protection of hunting, trapping and fishing rights, the right of education (while free, it is of such abysmal quality and so unrelated to the cultural traditions and needs of Indians that only 200 Indian youth go to university each year), provision for full medical services (a reference to the government's duty to provide a medicine chest could, Indians justly argue, be interpreted today to mean free comprehensive medicare), and protection of the Indians' land and encouragement of their future economic development on the reserves.

The government, of course, has instead chosen to give the treaties the narrowest possible interpretation, holding the Indians to the strict letter

\* *The Unjust Society, the Tragedy of Canada's Indians*, by Harold Cardinal. M. G. Hurtig Ltd., Edmonton, 1969. 171 pages. \$2.75.

of their written terms, and wherever there is doubt, unilaterally and arbitrarily deciding in the interests of the white capitalist system. An example is mineral rights, where Indians whose ancestors thought they were surrendering surface rights only, have been deprived in many instances of rich royalties from new subsurface mineral finds under their lands, while the giant oil and mining monopolies reap huge profits and the white man's government rakes in the taxes.

But the legal documentation that really governs the Indian fate today is not the treaties, which the government considers irrelevant, but the Indian Act as it has developed this century, an act which once and for all legalized the colonial-like subordination of the Indians to the federal rule. For example, it gives the Minister of Indian Affairs the sole discretionary power to authorize the use of reserve land for schools, hospitals and other projects, and to disallow any bylaws enacted by the band; it places the finances of the reserves almost exclusively under the control of the Department and provides the Indians with no protection against laws enacted by the federal parliament.

The act is the legal foundation for the huge bureaucratic apparatus that has grown up to maintain the Indians in a primitive state of abject dependency on the federal government. This bureaucracy is huge, and incredibly inefficient—for example, by 1967, department spending averaged out to \$3,180 a year for a family of six, but the average *income* of Indian families across Canada was only half that amount.

What have the Indians received in return?

A glance at the conditions listed in the article following this one gives some idea.

But worse even than the physical poverty, terrible as that is, is the complete denial of the Indians' most precious asset—their self-identity as Indians—by the Ottawa mandarins and their patronizing local agents. Even the *legal* definition of an Indian is up for grabs, thanks to the government's cynical distinction between legal and non-legal Indians. A treaty or "registered" (legal) Indian can enfranchise, thereby getting citizenship, the vote, liquor, but he loses his treaty or aboriginal rights, his right to share in the reserve's communal lands—in

short, the one thing that above all defines him as an Indian.

The purely arbitrary, even cruel implications of this distinction reveal just how clearly it is designed to frustrate Indian self-definition and cultural identity. To cite only one example: If an Indian woman marries a non-Indian, she automatically forfeits her claim to be an Indian. But, if a non-Indian woman marries a treaty or registered Indian, she becomes a legal Indian, regardless of her color (although her children will not necessarily be Indians—a further complication).

The constant humiliation of the Indian, designed to make him ashamed of his origins, his culture, language, and history, of course is particularly blatant in the educational system and is eloquently documented by Harold Cardinal from his bitter personal experience.

Even the narrowest provisions of the treaties have been violated continually by the government. The courts have overruled longstanding exemptions of Indians from white men's laws restricting hunting, fishing, and international customs duties. Treaty promises by the white conquerors to encourage economic development of Indian lands have been entirely ignored.

And thus the Indian people find themselves confined in a deepening vicious circle of poverty, unemployment, and welfare payments. Forced by an expanding birth rate and declining economic perspectives on the reserves to emigrate to the cities, they form there a growing subproletariat, more or less permanently unemployed, or grossly underpaid, totally unaccepted by white society.

The consistently high rate of unemployment among the Indians—about one-third of the total number of those listed as looking for work in Canada—is shocking evidence of how totally unable capitalism is to absorb this "reserve army of labor" into its economic structures.

But white capitalist society's rejection of the Indian is no less equaled by the Indian's rejection of all the attempts of the system to smash his identity. Today, it is precisely those young Indians who have been most subjected to the influences of the white world—its cities, its educational system, its culture—who are moving out in the vanguard of the struggles to organize their people. And the developing spirit of militancy is strongest among those Indians who have managed to some small degree to move in the white man's world, without giving up their sense of identity as Indians: the high steelworkers of Caughnawaga, Quebec, the industrial workers of Brantford, the farmers and reserve ranchers of Alberta. These "New Indians" are the front line soldiers in the growing battle by Indians to determine their own future.

"The work of creating stable and representative organizations has been one of the most difficult challenges faced by our people," writes Harold Cardinal. He relates how the government attempted to bar every step of the way, provoking and exploiting differences between treaty and non-treaty Indians, preventing use of band council moneys for organizing efforts, creating its own organizations dominated by "good" (pro-government) Indians (Uncle Tomahawks), pumping funds into white dominated groups, even trying to co-opt the developing leadership through establishment of its own "community development" programs (which are quickly dropped whenever the Indians show any inclination to use them). But a major breakthrough occurred in July of last year, when the National Indian Brotherhood was founded, the first such representative body controlled by Indians for Indians.

The NIB is now drafting its counter-Indian Act, based on the principle of self-determination, for the Native people, which it will present to Ottawa sometime this year.

## Some Facts and Figures on Indian Poverty

Canada's native Indian population numbers around 500,000—about half of them (237,490 in 1968) living on more than 2,000 reserves, and the remainder outside direct federal gov-

ernment jurisdiction and the provisions of the Indian Act. In addition, there are 350,000 mixed-blood Metis. The total Indian population in the United States is roughly similar, a

little more than half a million, with an additional several hundred thousand Indians out on their own, more or less assimilated. Thus Canada's Indian population is nearly ten times greater than the American as a percentage of total population.

The vast majority of native Indian people suffer incredible, soul-breaking poverty. The government's Hawthorn-Tremblay study, published in 1967, found that of a sample survey of over 22,000 families in Indian communities across Canada, 74 percent made less than \$2,000 in 1964; 47 percent made less than \$1,000 a year. (Remember, those are *family* incomes.) Over half the Indian population is chronically unemployed: the survey reported that 61 percent of the workers held jobs less than 6 months per year; 23.6 percent for less than two months. The Indian unemployment rate is 10 times the national average.

As a result, more than one-third of the households in the Hawthorn-Tremblay survey depended for their livelihood on meager welfare grants from the Indian Affairs Branch—and this figure doesn't account for the large number of bands providing their own welfare funds. The federal government allots about 25 percent of its Indian

affairs budget to welfare payments, as against the 10 percent it devotes to "economic development" on the reserves.

Most government services are either nonexistent or of scandalously poor quality. Total spending of the Indian Affairs Branch averages out to \$530 per treaty Indian a year (1967); whereas the federal government spends \$740 a year on the average non-Indian Canadian, not to speak of the provincial and municipal government services (e.g., education, health, agriculture, roads, etc.) which our quarter-million treaty Indians do not have access to.

Nine out of 10 Indian homes on reserves have no indoor toilets; barely half have electricity; nearly 60 percent live in houses of three rooms or less.

It is estimated that more than 30 percent of the inmates in Canada's jails and training schools are Indian, although Indians account for less than 3 percent of the total population. The number of Indians in federal penitentiaries has increased five-fold since 1950 to more than 2,500.

While the average Canadian can expect to live to the age of 62, the Indians' life expectancy is only 33 for

men, 34 for women. The mortality rate among Indians increased by 8 percent between 1965 and 1968 alone. The mortality rate among Indian preschool children is eight times the national average.

Yet Indians are the fastest growing ethnic group in Canada, with an annual population increase of 5 percent. Half the Indian population is under the age of 16, close to twice the proportion among non-Indians.

This phenomenal population increase, combined with rapidly declining job opportunities for Indian workers—half of whom are engaged in relatively traditional and marginal economic activities like fishing, trapping, hunting, and agriculture—means a tremendous pressure on the Indians to leave the reserves and head for the cities in search of work.

In Manitoba, for example, about half of the province's 80,000 Indians and 30,000 Metis are now subsisting in substandard conditions in Winnipeg; 10,000 have migrated to the city during the last 10 years, most of them in the last three years. But in the cities, the employment prospect is scarcely better than on the reserves. Only 3 percent of Winnipeg's inhabitants, the Indians and Metis, account for 12 percent of its welfare cases.

## Documents

# Fourth International Calls for Antiwar Actions

[The following appeal was issued March 9 by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, the World Party of Socialist Revolution founded by Leon Trotsky.]

\* \* \*

It has been five years since U.S. imperialism massively escalated its military intervention in Vietnam to save its tottering client regime in Saigon from the revolutionary wave about to engulf it. The purpose of Washington's aggression has been and remains to crush the national liberation struggle in South Vietnam and Southeast Asia as a whole, preserving an enclave there for world imperialism; to weaken the workers state in North Vietnam in preparation for roll-

ing back the revolution there if possible; to contain and threaten the Chinese revolution; and to set an "example" to demoralize revolutionary forces everywhere. The war is part and parcel of imperialism's overall counterrevolutionary drive to contain the world revolution and reverse it if that should appear feasible.

But imperialism didn't reckon with the power of resistance of the Vietnamese people, who have prevented the victory of the most powerful military machine on earth through tremendous sacrifice and heroic effort. The revelations concerning the massacre at Songmy only lifted the corner on the horror of the war that Washington has unleashed on the Vietnamese. Only the rich and corrupt support and are supported by the im-

perialists, with the result that the war is necessarily aimed at the vast majority of Vietnamese—the workers, peasants, and the poor. It is a war against a whole people, with women and babies being machine-gunned, old men being thrown into wells with grenades tossed in after them—not to mention the regular, mechanized terror of the systematic bombings, the uprooting of hundreds of thousands of people, the mass destruction of crops and forests to such an extent that scientists speculate that the very ecology of Vietnam has been seriously damaged for a long time to come. The resistance of the Vietnamese people can only be called heroic. Their struggle has provided a revolutionary counterthrust against imperialism's offensive on an international scale, giving inspiration

to a new generation of revolutionary youth throughout the world and — most important — for the development of a massive antiwar movement inside the USA itself.

The power of the resistance put up by the Vietnamese, coupled with the development of a growing antiwar movement in the United States, forced Washington to make a tactical shift. Johnson abdicated, the bombing of North Vietnam was halted, the Paris talks began, and token withdrawals of U. S. forces were made. Nixon made hints that he had a "plan" to end the war. All this was intended to lull antiwar forces inside the United States and around the world with the idea that the war was soon coming to an end, while Washington used the time so gained to continue and even escalate the war.

The planes formerly used in the bombing of North Vietnam are now used in stepped-up bombing of the South. Nixon revealed that his "plan" was for the "Vietnamization" of the war, a semantic hoax designed to cover up his real strategy of a prolonged war. Washington hopes this will eventually force the Vietnamese to accept a Korean-type "settlement." And, far from beginning the process of withdrawal, U. S. imperialism has widened the scope of the war internationally, first to Thailand and Laos, and possibly soon to Cambodia.

The level of bombing in Laos, now admittedly much more extensive than bombing of supply lines, has reached 20,000 sorties a month, the level of the previous bombing of North Vietnam. The U. S. has trained a "loyal" army in Laos under General Vang Pao, which early this year forcibly evacuated most of the 150,000 civilians living on the Plaine des Jarres. When revolutionary forces smashed these puppet troops and drove them off the Plaine on February 21, the U. S. sent in all seventy-five of the B-52 bombers belonging to the Strategic Air Command in a futile attempt to aid the Vang Pao forces.

The American antiwar movement has been in the forefront in exposing Nixon's phony "peace" maneuvers and in remobilizing masses in action against the war. Last October 15 saw demonstrations in every city and many towns across the United States. And on November 15 there was a militant demonstration of 800,000 in Washing-

ton and 250,000 in San Francisco, the greatest demonstration in the history of the United States. The Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam and other antiwar groups have called for new actions against the war April 15-18 in the United States.

The Fourth International appeals to all revolutionary working-class and youth militants not to be taken in by the imperialists' smoke screen, to understand that the counterrevolutionary

aggression continues and that the Vietnam war remains a key pivot of the international class struggle. The Fourth International calls on all workers organizations, the students and youth, all who support the right of Vietnamese self-determination and all who are fighting for the victory of the Vietnamese revolution to demonstrate their solidarity with the Vietnamese people and with the antiwar movement in the U. S. in massive struggles this spring.

## Documents

### Polish Coal Used Against Asturias Strike

[The United Secretariat of the Fourth International issued the following statement March 8.]

\* \* \*

The Fourth International denounces the shipment of Polish coal to Spain in January and February 1970 during the courageous strike of the Asturian miners. In this way, the nationalistic and myopic Polish bureaucracy, with the complicity of the Kremlin, sabotaged the struggle of these workers.

While it is true that workers states living in a capitalist environment cannot avoid trading with states of a different social nature, it is no less true that such trade must be strictly subordinated, as was the case for the Soviet Union in Lenin and Trotsky's time, to the interests of the international class struggle and the world socialist revolution.

The fact that the governments currently in power in Warsaw and Moscow are expanding their trade with the capitalist countries, without regard for the disastrous effects this trade can have at specific times and in specific forms for the struggle of the workers in countries like Spain, reveals the full extent of the bureaucratic degeneration these countries have undergone.

This fact also undercuts the most elementary kind of trade-union solidarity. What sort of authority can Communist party members have for calling on miners and transport workers in the capitalist countries not to

deliver coal to Spain, at the same time that a workers state is doing this?

While the Asturian miners' strike was going on, the Limbourg miners in Belgium were also on strike. Revolutionary activists alerted Belgian and German working-class public opinion against the danger of German coal coming into Belgium to break the strike. Among other things, the revolutionists got a majority of the Liège steelworkers to refuse to handle German coal.

Thus, while the Belgian miners were receiving demonstrations of international solidarity, the Spanish worker militants were thrown off balance by the arrival of coal from a country calling itself "socialist." They did not know how to react to this strike-breaking action.

The Fourth International calls on the Spanish Communist party activists, who condemned this shipment of Polish coal to Spain during the Asturias strike, to view this development in its full context. It appeals to them to make the connection between this strike-breaking action and the Kremlin's military intervention in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, as well as the policy followed by Stalin and the Spanish Communist party leadership during the civil war, when they strangled a promising socialist revolution for the sake of an agreement with segments of the bourgeoisie. All of these cases show the counterrevolutionary nature of Stalinism. In opposition to this, they will find their way back to Leninism.