

Cuban Poet's Arrest:

## A Blow to the Revolution

Ceylon:

## More Soviet Aid to Bandaranaike

Ernest Mandel:

## The Explosive Drive of U.S. Imperialism



MITCHELL: U.S. Attorney General spent busy week discovering antiwar "conspiracies" in Washington and federal prisons. See pages 443 and 453.

# Peking's Report

The communications media of the People's Republic of China gave considerable coverage to the April 24 antiwar mass demonstrations in the United States.

The April 24 issue of the *People's Daily* carried a long article about the actions of the Vietnam war veterans in throwing their medals and decorations back to the government, and reported the plans of the National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC) for the mass rallies in Washington, D. C., and San Francisco.

The April 27 *People's Daily* reported in considerable detail what occurred in both cities. According to the account, some 500,000 persons assembled in Washington April 24 and another 500,000 wanted to join but could not find transportation because of lack of facilities.

A caption on a photo of the San Francisco demonstration said that 500,000 participated there.

Both the headlines and the article itself stressed that the total far exceeded the number that had participated in previous actions. More than one-third of the participants had never joined in an antiwar action before, according to the Peking daily.

The broadness of the two demonstrations was also stressed—young and old, women and men, students, professionals, housewives, workers, GIs, Blacks as well as whites, Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, native Americans, religious leaders, etc.

The Chinese radio also carried extensive accounts of the two demonstrations, including broadcasts beamed to listeners abroad.

In all these accounts, the unity of the people in demanding that Nixon end the war NOW was emphasized. □

## Thought for Food

The Center for Agricultural Research in Maryland has managed to find a useful function for the capitalist press.

The organization discovered that eighty pages of newsprint daily, when mixed with molasses and vitamins, make a food that helps to put cows in prime condition. It was reported that cows are able to digest even glossy magazines.

## In This Issue

		<b>FEATURES</b>
Ernest Mandel	450	What Gives U.S. Imperialism Its Explosive Drive
		<b>ANTIWAR</b>
	442	Peking's Report on April 24 Rallies
	443	Nixon Pushes Attack on Antiwar Movement
	459	A Belgian View of April 24
	460	Juan Mari Bras's April 24 Speech
		<b>PAKISTAN</b>
	444	Resistance Continues in Bangla Desh
		<b>CUBA</b>
	445	Imprisonment of Poet a Blow to Cuban Revolution
		<b>CEYLON</b>
	447	More Soviet Aid to Bandaranaike
		<b>EAST GERMANY</b>
	449	Ulbricht Turns the Reins Over to Honecker
		<b>U.S.A.</b>
Allen Myers	453	Mitchell Orders New Indictments in Priests' "Plot"
		<b>MEXICO</b>
	454	Echeverria Exiles Student Leaders
Ricardo Ochoa	455	Echeverria's First One Hundred Days
		<b>SWITZERLAND</b>
	458	Revolutionary Marxist League Holds Congress
		<b>UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC</b>
	459	Sadat Kicks Out His Vice President
		<b>ECOLOGY</b>
	464	Government by Air Pollution
		<b>DOCUMENTS</b>
	446	Special Importance of Angela Davis Case
	448	Ceylon Union Calls for End to State of Emergency
	461	Harry Turner's Complaint to Gerry Healy
		<b>DRAWINGS</b>
Copain	441	John Mitchell; 443, Rennie Davis; 443, John Froines; 444, Tajuddin Ahmed; 447, Angela Davis; 449, Walter Ulbricht; 449, Erich Honecker; 453, Henry Kissinger

Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Village Post Office Station, New York, N.Y. 10014.

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

MANAGING EDITOR: Les Evans.  
EDITORIAL STAFF: Gerry Foley, Allen Myers, George Saunders.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.  
TECHNICAL STAFF: H. Massey, James M. Morgan, Ruth Schein, Steven Warshell, Jack Wood.

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, Black, and women's 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 116, Village Post Office Station, New York, N.Y. 10014. 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 116, Village Post Office Station, New York, N.Y. 10014. 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 © 1971 by Intercontinental Press.

# Nixon Pushes Attack on Antiwar Movement

In an attempt to distract attention from its indiscriminate arrest of more than 12,000 demonstrators in the three days beginning May 3, the Nixon administration has filed frame-up charges against three leaders of the Mayday Tribe, which organized the May 3-5 protests in Washington.

Attorney General John Mitchell appeared to be planning a repetition of the notorious "Chicago Seven" conspiracy trial that followed police assaults on demonstrators at the 1968 Democratic party convention.

The three facing charges were also defendants in the earlier trial. Rennie Davis and John Froines were arrested May 4 and accused of conspiring to deprive others of their rights and conspiring to interfere with federal workers. Abbie Hoffman was arrested in New York City May 5 and charged with assaulting a policeman, as well as with crossing state lines to incite a riot.

The only riot that occurred in Washington, however, was the one carried out by the cops on the instruction of Attorney General John Mitchell and his boss, Richard Nixon. The indiscriminate arrests were apparently decided on even before the May 3-5 demonstrations began. Sanford J. Un-

gar reported in the May 5 *Washington Post*:

"At an early stage . . . a decision was made by those coordinating strategy to insure public safety and protect 'the lives and property of law-abiding citizens' through mass arrests, even if the arrests were of questionable legality."

"Questionable legality" was a generous description. In fact, the mass roundups were so blatantly illegal that on the night of May 3 a superior court judge ordered the release of the 7,000 persons arrested that day unless the police could show 'true cause' for the arrests. The cops then released all prisoners who posted collateral of \$10.

Nixon's violent reaction to the Mayday Tribe demonstrators coincided with the publication of additional evidence of his isolation from the American people on the question of the war. A Louis Harris poll released May 3 showed, in Harris's words, that "The tide of American public opinion has now turned decisively against the war in Indochina."

Harris found that a 58 to 29 percent majority considers U.S. participation in the war "morally wrong." By an even larger majority, 60 percent to 26 percent, Americans favor withdrawing from Indochina "even if the government of South Vietnam collapsed" as a result.

The poll, it should be noted, was made in March, before the giant April 24 demonstrations and the veterans' protests that preceded them. Both these actions won even more support for the antiwar movement and provided a spur to further protests.

The May 5 moratorium called by the Student Mobilization Committee (SMC), the Association of Student Governments, and the National Student Association involved hundreds of actions across the country.

A mass rally in New York City drew 20,000; in addition, there were protests on campuses around the city. In Boston, the *New York Times* estimated the mass rally at 20,000 to 40,000. Large demonstrations also took place in San Francisco; Madi-



JOHN FROINES

son, Wisconsin; College Park, Maryland; Lincoln, Nebraska; Kent State University; and other cities.

The extent of Nixon's isolation on a world scale is becoming still more apparent as news of international protests on April 24 becomes available.

Reports from Québec describe demonstrations of 2,500 in Montréal and 800 in Québec City. The Vietnam News Agency (VNA) in Hanoi gave a detailed description of the April 24 actions in the U.S. and provided a roundup of demonstrations around the world.

In addition to the protests in Paris, London, Rome, Toronto, and Copenhagen reported in last week's *Intercontinental Press*, VNA listed demonstrations in Ottawa; Lusaka, Zambia; Beirut; and Krnov and Bruntal, Czechoslovakia.

With good reason, the North Vietnamese Communist party newspaper, *Nhan Dan*, entitled an April 26 editorial on the spring antiwar offensive "The days that shake the United States."

The antiwar upsurge has had the effect of securing a public hearing for members of Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVAW), who have been testifying about the criminal nature of the U.S. war against the Vietnamese.

Under the pressure of mass antiwar



RENNIE DAVIS

sentiment, in the days after April 24 eleven members of Congress established an unofficial committee to which the veterans presented their charges. These included such crimes as the deliberate shelling of a hospital and the massacre of at least thirty unarmed peasants in the hamlets of Truonle and Khanhgiang in August 1969.

Despite Nixon's defense of Calley, revelations like these have forced the Pentagon to go through the motions of investigating some crimes. In certain cases, the government has even had to bring charges against those immediately involved. William Greider reported in the May 3 *Washington*

*Post* that eight members of helicopter crews now face murder charges and that a total of thirty-two "allegations of battlefield crime" are under investigation.

The most significant sign of the pressure created by the veterans' testimony is the fact that a brigadier general is now among those under investigation on murder charges.

It is this growing isolation from the American people that Nixon and Mitchell hope to overcome by bringing criminal charges against members of the antiwar movement. The best defense of Hoffman, Froines, and Davis will be to continue exposing the criminals who run the government. □

[4.76 rupees equal US\$1] a day, an expenditure thought sufficient to exhaust the West Pakistani economy in four to six months.

Meanwhile, Tajuddin Ahmed, general secretary of the Awami League, is reported to have escaped capture and to be active in the resistance movement.

"The liberation forces," George reported, "have received a shot in the arm with the formal inauguration of the 'Mango grove cabinet' (in 'Mujibnagar', a village now teeming with government forces). With the surfacing of an experienced politician like Tajuddin Ahmed . . . the political vacuum at the top is now filled."

Ahmed's effect is likely to be double-edged. While he may be able to give some of the missing cohesion to the military forces of the Bengalis, he can also be expected to try to keep the struggle within the framework of the Awami League's bourgeois program.

However, if Ahmed is able to exercise even a partial control over any significant territory, the Indian government of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi will come under increasing pressure to extend diplomatic recognition and material aid to Bangla Desh. The disorganized state of the resistance has until now provided Gandhi with a pretext for refusing to yield to the popular demand—particularly from West Bengal—to send arms to the insurgents. A dispatch from New Delhi in the May 4 *Christian Science Monitor* reported:

"The word went around [in the Indian government] that the Awami League and its provisional government in East Pakistan exercised only a nominal control in the areas that had not been 'normalized' by the Pakistan Army. Worse still, the East Bengali independence movement was suddenly being criticized for its ineffective organization and administration. Indian officials went so far as to say that it bordered on chaos."

Indian Bengalis witnessing Yahya's crimes will hardly be satisfied by such excuses. □

#### Hoping for Invitations?

Since Mao Tsetung opened his ping pong diplomacy, the game has increased considerably in popularity with Australians. One playing center in Sydney reported a 50 percent increase in business.

## Mounting Pressure on India to Act

## Resistance Continues in Bangla Desh

Yahya Khan's genocidal war against Bangla Desh has driven an estimated 1,500,000 refugees into West Bengal, and millions more are expected.

The worldwide revulsion at the massacre is so strong that even members of the U. S. Congress have felt compelled to protest. On May 6, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee unanimously called for the suspension of U. S. arms sales to Pakistan.

It is quite likely, however, that the Pentagon will regard the committee's action as nothing but a pious statement for the record.

Despite the seeming success of the blitzkrieg, the prospects of Yahya's army are considered poor, particularly with the approach of the monsoon. T. J. S. George, writing in the May 1 Hong Kong weekly *Far Eastern Economic Review*, explained the military difficulties facing the dictatorship:

"The minimum requirements of government troops in Bengal, including supplies, ammunition and fuel, are believed to be around 120 tons a day. Eight C-130 transport planes have done twice their maximum permissible flying hours in the early weeks of the fighting and will now have to be grounded for servicing. Nine commercial Boeings have also been engaged in the airlift. . . .

"Distribution within Bengal of army supplies is equally difficult. A small



AHMED: Awami League general secretary reported with resistance forces.

fleet of Fokkers and helicopters have been bearing the brunt of this burden. This has been growing less and less reliable with fuel hard to come by and some air fields put out of commission by the liberation units. When the rains set in next month, the fleet may be as good as useless."

In addition, the cost of the offensive is 6,000,000 to 7,000,000 rupees

## Imprisonment of Poet a Blow to Cuban Revolution

An Agence France-Presse dispatch from Havana, published in the March 23 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde*, reported that it had been learned from reliable sources that the poet Heberto Padilla, whose book *Fuera del Juego* (Out of Bounds) won the 1968 national poetry prize in Cuba, had been arrested by the security police.

His companion, poetess Belkis Cuza Malé, had also been arrested, and their apartment had been sealed.

As for the reasons for the two arrests, the Cuban authorities had maintained complete silence.

The April 9 issue of *Le Monde* reported that Padilla had been held in prison since March 20. As yet no information was available on the charges. *Le Monde* said nothing about what had happened to Belkis Cuza Malé.

Fidel Castro had, nonetheless, acknowledged in an interview with some students at the University of Havana that the poet had been arrested.

Castro had told the audience that other intellectuals were implicated. According to *Le Monde*, Castro declared: "There is a series of facts which, when they are made public, will arouse indignation."

"He added," *Le Monde* continued, "that the intellectuals could expect no privileges granting them any immunity whatsoever for engaging in possibly counterrevolutionary activities. He let it be understood that the international reactions provoked by the Padilla affair would enable the Cuban revolution to establish a line of demarcation between its genuine friends and those who insist that conditions be met in return for their friendship."

In the same article, *Le Monde* published the text of a letter on the Padilla case addressed to Fidel Castro by a number of intellectuals of international renown.

The letter was translated by *The New York Review of Books*, appearing in the May 6 issue of that publication. This translation reads as follows:

"The undersigned, supporters of the principles and objectives of the Cuban Revolution, address you in order to express their disquiet as a result of

the imprisonment of the poet and writer Heberto [sic] Padilla and to ask you to re-examine the situation which this arrest has created.

"Since the Cuban government up to the present time has yet to supply any information about this arrest, we fear the re-emergence of a sectarian tendency stronger and more dangerous than that which you denounced in March, 1962, and to which Major Che Guevara alluded on several occasions when he denounced the suppression of the right of criticism within the ranks of the revolution.

"At this moment—when the installation of a socialist government in Chile and the new situation in Peru and Bolivia help make it possible to break the criminal blockade imposed on Cuba by North American imperialism—the use of repressive measures against intellectuals and writers who have exercised the right of criticism within the revolution can only have deeply negative repercussions among the anti-imperialist forces of the entire world, and most especially of Latin America, for which the Cuban Revolution is a symbol and a banner.

"In thanking you for the attention you may give to this request, we reaffirm our solidarity with the principles which guided the struggle in the Sierra Maestra and which the revolutionary government of Cuba has expressed so many times in the words and actions of its Prime Minister, of Major Che Guevara, and of so many other revolutionary leaders."

A partial list of the signers of this open letter included the following:

Simone de Beauvoir, Italo Calvino, José María Castellet, Julio Cortazar, Jean Daniel, Marguerite Duras, Hans Magnus Enzensberger, Carlos Franqui, Carlos Fuentes, Gabriel García Márquez, Juan Goytisolo, Luis Goytisolo, Alain Jouffroy, André Pieyre de Mandiargues, Dionys Mascolo, Alberto Moravia, Maurice Nadeau, Octavio Paz, Francisco Rosi, Rossana Rossanda, Claude Roy, Jean-Paul Sartre, Jorge Semprun, Mario Vargas Llosa.

According to an Agence France-Presse dispatch from Havana pub-

lished in the April 28 issue of *Le Monde*, the Cuban authorities announced that Heberto Padilla had written a self-criticism of about 4,000 words, which he had addressed to the government.

After accusing the French journalist K. S. Karol and the French agronomist René Dumont of being "agents of the CIA," Padilla accused himself of having "fed his egocentrism" by granting interviews to the British Broadcasting Corporation and a Canadian radio station, and by seeing himself characterized as a "poet and *enfant terrible* of politics" in a book by the American journalist Lee Lockwood on the Cuban revolution.

Then, citing his book *Fuera del Juego*, which had been awarded Cuba's 1968 national prize for poetry, Padilla called his collection of poems "insidious and provocative."

Padilla added: "In France, where they look for a scandal in no matter what book to arouse the interest of buyers, the Seuil publishing house translated the book in less than a month and launched it with the slogan, 'Can you be a poet in Cuba?'"

*Le Monde* added the following editorial note to the dispatch:

"The publication by the Cuban authorities of a self-criticism that the poet Heberto Padilla is said to have written in prison, suddenly gives the Havana regime a disagreeable coloration, which—up to now, at least—it appeared to have carefully sought to avoid. This self-abasement of a writer, who in 1968 had won Cuba's national prize for poetry despite the reservations of the Union of Artists and Writers, will not appease the sharp criticisms expressed in the intellectual circles of Europe and Latin America from the moment of Mr. Heberto Padilla's arrest. The Cuban authorities had already let it be understood that the French agronomist René Dumont had held interviews in Havana 'with an agent of the C. I. A.' The accusation directed this time in Mr. Heberto Padilla's self-criticism against Mr. René Dumont and Mr. K. S. Karol, accusing them of being

'agents of the C. I. A.,' threatens to set off a polemic from which the Cuban regime can gain no advantage."

In the April 29 issue of *Le Monde*, Marcel Niedergang reported that Padilla had been freed April 27 and had gone directly to his home.

Prensa Latina provided Niedergang with the text of the self-criticism written by Padilla.

"There is no doubt," said Niedergang, "concerning the desire of the Havana government to assure the widest possible distribution abroad of a document in which ridiculous accusations against foreign personalities alternate with the tearful repentance of a writer crowned with official laurels. To dispel any ambiguity, Fidel Castro himself has stated that he 'personally had ordered the arrest of Padilla,' and leading Cuban circles have recently been told that 'other intellectuals may be accused of counterrevolutionary activities and arrested.'"

In Niedergang's opinion, Heberto Padilla is not Cuba's greatest living writer. But he did win the 1968 prize for his poetry, although some of the leading figures in the army's top staff were of the opinion that certain allusions made by the poet were counterrevolutionary. The Union of Cuban Artists and Writers went along with the decision of the judges in the contest only to express reservations later. The army's weekly magazine, *Verde Olivo*, however, accused Padilla of being in reality an adversary of the revolution.

The poet's real crime, in Niedergang's opinion, was being naïve enough to believe that it was still possible "to juggle with nuances of thought while the entire country is, or ought to be, engaged in a very difficult combat on which the survival of the revolutionary experiment and the prestige of the regime depend. Does this 'weakness' merit a cell and opprobrium?"

Niedergang answered, "Obviously not. Thus one can understand the emotion of a great many European and Latin American intellectuals, who are nonetheless favorably disposed toward the Cuban revolution. Without singling anyone out, Mr. Fidel Castro responded to their reaction with irritation: 'Why are they mixing in? Now we will soon see who our genuine friends are. . . .'"

According to the April 30 *Le Monde*, Prensa Latina reported that on the

evening of April 27, the same day he was released from prison, the poet appeared at the headquarters of the Union of Artists and Writers to read the self-criticism he had written while he was held behind bars.

Accompanied by his wife and a group of friends, the account continued, he confessed his "counterrevolutionary errors" for an hour and a half before a hundred Cuban intellectuals and artists. "He exhorted certain of the writers present, MM. Pablo Armando Fernandez, Cesar Lopez, Manuel Diaz Martinez and Belkis Cuzza Malé, his wife, to 'overcome their weaknesses, which could lead them to political and moral degradation.'"

Referring to the declarations of support for him, which had been addressed to Havana during his detention, Padilla declared that the signers "had doubted a revolution that is greater than the man they defended."

According to Prensa Latina, as reported by *Le Monde*, "the writer appeared to be suffocating, because of the heat in the room." Prensa Latina added that each of the writers mentioned by Padilla arose in turn to voice their self-criticisms.

At the conclusion of the session, the poet declared: "We are living in a glorious trench of besieged Latin America, but that's the price of a revolution." He then lifted up his arms and shouted: "Patria o muerte. Venceremos!" (Victory or death. We will win!)

The latest development in this shift of the Cuban government on the question of freedom of expression by its poets was a speech made by Fidel Castro at the closing session of a national conference on education.

According to the May 4 issue of *Le Monde*, he assailed the "bourgeois liberals" and "shameless leftists" in the countries of the capitalist West who had taken up the defense of Cuban intellectuals hostile to the regime.

Without naming Heberto Padilla, Castro poured scorn on the "pseudo-leftist intellectuals" who "imagined that we were going to take up such an insignificant question" in the course of the conference on education.

"You, bourgeois intellectuals, agents of the C. I. A., we don't want you in Cuba," he was quoted as saying. "There's no room for you in Cuba, any more than there is for the U. P. I. and A. P. [the two American press agencies] . . . Cuba has no need for these shameless leftists, for these shameless Latin Americans who live in Paris, London, Rome, far from the battle."

Castro declared further: "The bourgeois liberals are at war with us. This is good news. They are going to be unmasked; they are going to be stripped naked."

He added: "We have the possibility of making an entire people creative and artistic."

He then stated: "From now on only genuine revolutionists will have the right to receive Cuban or international literary prizes and to sit on juries [that grant these awards]."

The same dispatch reported that the Cuban leader thanked the countries of the East for the aid they were sending to Cuba. He was especially appreciative of equipment sent by the Soviet Union that had enabled Cuba to increase the production of electricity by 50 percent.

[See next issue for more on the case of Heberto Padilla.]

## Special Importance of Angela Davis Case

[The following letter, dated April 27, was published in the May 5 *New York Times*. The paper reported that it was signed by sixty-one members of the faculty of Temple University in Philadelphia.]

\* \* \*

To the Editor:

We believe the case of Angela Davis has special importance to the academic community. The case started when she was fired by the University of California

Regents from her position as Assistant Professor of Philosophy at U. C. L. A. [University of California at Los Angeles] solely because of her membership in the Communist party. This firing was done despite the overwhelming opposition of her departmental colleagues, the faculty at large (who condemned the action by a 539-12 vote) and the students of U. C. L. A.

When the court overturned her firing, the Regents, acting in spite of her overwhelming faculty and student support, refused to rehire her because of political



statements she had made. This marked an acceleration of the major attack upon the integrity of the college and university system in California by the Reagan administration. Since then, several faculty members have been fired for their political beliefs, activities and associations.

Angela Davis now faces a possible death sentence on charges of murder, kidnapping and conspiracy in connection with the Marin County Courthouse "shoot-out" at which she was not present and with which she denies any connection. These charges are not separate from, but are a continuation of, her persecution for her political beliefs and associations. Thus, the indictment cites as overt acts such political activities and associations as her appearance at a Los Angeles ral-



ANGELA DAVIS

ly for the Soledad Brothers and visits to George Jackson in Soledad Prison.

Further indications of the political nature of this case are the attempts to create public hysteria against her and to deny her proper judicial procedures, such as her listing on the F. B. I.'s "most wanted" list as "armed and dangerous," exposing her to being shot on sight; the denial of bail, her imprisonment in solitary confinement and California's refusal to release the indictment to her attorneys (needed to fight extradition from New York).

The attack upon Angela Davis is part of an attempt by the repressive forces in the country to move it in a reactionary direction. The focus of the attack at this moment is someone they believe is most vulnerable—a black, Communist woman.

In making charges of this magnitude against her, these forces count upon the racism and anti-Communism of our society to inhibit people from coming to her defense, to deny her the presumption of innocence and to convict her before trial. It is of vital concern to us all that they fail. □

May 17, 1971

## LSSP Member Arrested

### More Soviet Aid to Bandaranaike

Ceylonese Prime Minister Sirimavo Bandaranaike used the May 9 Vesak festival, commemorating the birth of Buddha, to enlist religion in her "United Front" government's holy war against young socialist revolutionists.

Speaking in Colombo, Bandaranaike called on the rebels of the Janatha Vimukthi Permana (JVP) to "return to the pale of decent society" and accused the organization of "veering away from those qualities which have been enshrined in our civilization." Among these qualities, she said, were "a spirit of kindness, compassion and humanity."

The coalition government is continuing to demonstrate its own "kindness, compassion and humanity" by torture and summary execution of captured rebel youth. Eric Pace reported from Colombo in the May 8 *New York Times*:

"Only a few corpses have been seen floating in Ceylon's river waters in recent days; yet critics of the police, and they are many, say that police atrocities are continuing."

Pace took the trouble to investigate conditions outside Colombo and reported:

". . . everywhere a traveler is told grim tales. A prisoner is said to have been tortured with a lighted cigarette near the town of Kegalle, north of here. To the south, outside Galle, rebels are said to have shouted 'Hail Guevara!' as they were executed, without trial. There are stories of civilians being strafed from passing helicopters, more or less by mistake."

Despite the fact that the Ceylonese press did not report, prior to May 6, even the fact that accusations of police atrocities had been made, knowledge of the government's crimes is so widespread that the opposition, right-wing United National party (UNP) decided that political capital could be gained by criticism of the police actions.

UNP parliamentary leader J. R. Jayewardene raised charges of police atrocities in the House of Representatives on May 5.

The House had been the scene of another interesting disclosure the pre-

vious day. Pace reported in the May 5 *Times*:

"One Opposition member reported that a Trotskyite Representative, Vasudeva Nannayakara, had been taken into custody by the authorities at the height of the insurrection last month."

This fact would seem to indicate that there is significant dissatisfaction in the ranks of the ex-Trotskyist Lanka Sama Samaja party (LSSP) with the counterrevolutionary course of the coalition government, in which the party participates. The inability of the United Front to make good on its "socialist" campaign promises, which contributed to the rapid growth of the JVP, must also have raised questions among the LSSP rank and file. Now that the government has removed its mask, the party leadership will find it difficult to justify its class collaboration as a step toward socialism.

The continued resistance of the JVP can only increase the pressure on any developing left wing in the LSSP to break with the treacherous policies of its leadership. The May 1-4 amnesty period decreed by Bandaranaike in the hope of persuading the rebels to surrender appears to have fallen short of expectations.

At the end of the period on May 4, the government claimed that 1,700 persons had surrendered. The next day, this figure was inflated to nearly 4,000 without explanation.

Estimates of the original strength of the rebels range from 20,000 to 40,000. The government has reported killing 500 and about 2,500 persons are thought to have been arrested. Even if all the victims of the army's often indiscriminate attacks and arrests were JVP members, it is obvious that the organization is far from being wiped out.

In the middle of the amnesty period, in fact, the JVP was able to attack police forces in scattered areas from Galle in the south to Kekirawa in the north central part of the island.

In the May 1 issue of the Hong Kong weekly *Far Eastern Economic Review*, B. H. S. Jayewardene reported from Colombo on the military situ-

ation at the end of April:

". . . supporters of the Guevarist uprising remain in command of 12 areas and—even with military aid from abroad—the battle to crush them is likely to be bitter."

A significant portion of the military aid to the Ceylonese counterrevolution is being provided by the bureaucracies of the Soviet Union and the East European workers states.

President Tito of Yugoslavia has sent artillery. The Soviet Union has donated six MIG jets and at least sixty technicians and instructors.

Pace reported in the May 8 *New York Times* that additional assistance had arrived and that still more was expected.

"Well-placed unofficial sources," Pace wrote, "reported the arrival here today [May 7] of a Soviet military training mission and a shipment of East German police equipment."

Pace went on to note that delivery of twenty Soviet armored cars and two helicopters is awaited shortly.

The primary use of such weapons is to terrorize the rural population with a show of force, not to pursue the rebels of the JVP.

"So far," Pace wrote, "the armed forces have shown little inclination to hunt insurgents in the forest. Like the Pakistani Army in east Pakistan, they stick largely to the towns and roads. The expected arrival of a score of Soviet armored cars would not greatly change this state of affairs, although it would give the forces more mobility."

Bandaranaike and her allies of the LSSP and the pro-Moscow Communist party are increasingly at war with the entire population, a fact that helps explain the continued state of emergency despite the government's repeated claims that the insurgency is all but defeated.

Brigadier Douglas Ramanayake, commander of the military forces in the Galle area, expressed the United Front's position quite succinctly May 3 when he told Pace:

"We have to fight the terrorists inside and outside—that is why we feel we are on a tightrope; we don't know who is our enemy." □

### Health Care in Australia

The death rate of Aboriginal children is as much as seventeen times the Australian average, according to the director of the Queensland Maternal and Child Welfare Service.

## Ceylon

### Union Calls for End to State of Emergency

[The following letter, protesting the state of emergency in Ceylon, was sent April 30 by the Ceylon Mercantile Union (CMU) to Prime Minister Sirimavo Bandaranaike. The letter, copies of which went to all members of parliament, was signed by the CMU's general secretary, P. Bala Tampoe, who is also secretary of the Lanka Sama Samaja party (Revolutionary), the Ceylonese section of the Fourth International.]

\* \* \*

The General Council of our Union met on 24th April 1971 and considered the very grave situation that has arisen in this country under the State of Emergency and its implications for our Union. The statement made by you over the radio on the 24th morning, with regard to the armed uprising that has taken place in certain parts of the country since 5th April, was also considered.

Our General Council was of the view that those persons who have been engaged in the armed uprising cannot be properly regarded as "terrorists". It also took the view that it would be an act of inhumanity for you to order a concerted military offensive by the armed services against the insurgents, unless they surrender themselves, since such a military offensive would mean "that many young people on the threshold of their lives will be killed or maimed fighting for a cause that is already lost", as you have declared.

Our General Council also decided to convey to you its strong protest against the suppression of the fundamental democratic rights of the working class and the subjection of workers to arbitrary orders by employers, under "essential service" orders.

Further to the decisions of our General Council, our Executive Committee has decided to make the following submissions for your consideration:

The attacks on police stations and other acts of insurgency that have taken place since 5th April 1971 do not appear to have taken place "throughout the island", as you have stated in your broadcast talk to the nation on 24th April. All the information that has been published indicates that the armed uprising has been confined to certain parts of the country in which the rural masses predominate, and that it was primarily amongst the educated and unemployed youth of both sexes that the uprising took place in those areas.

The view taken by our General Council, that the young persons who have been involved in the uprising cannot be properly regarded as "terrorists", appears to have been endorsed by the Minister of Communications, Mr. Leslie Goonewardene, in an article published in the daily newspapers on 27th April. He has not once referred to the insurgents as "terror-

ists" in that article, but has described them either as "young rebels" or as "insurrectionists". He has also declared, with regard to the uprising, that "there is no doubt that the essence of the matter is that it was a revolt of the youth".

Mr. Leslie Goonewardene has attributed "the swift growth of the movement known as the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna after the popular electoral victory of May 1970", at least partly, "to the slowness of the United Front Government in proceeding with its programme of radical reforms". This, in his view, was "likely to have led to impatience and exasperation". It should not be forgotten, in addition, that the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna became subject to denunciation by the political parties associated with your Government, from the time it announced its intention to hold its very first public meeting, on 10th August 1970, and that the police subjected adherents and even suspected adherents of that organisation to continual arrests and interrogations from that time, even when they were putting up posters or having discussions in their homes.

Mr. Leslie Goonewardene himself seems to believe that "excesses" have been committed by the Armed Services since the uprising began. The Government should find out whether "excesses" were also committed by the police before the uprising began on 5th April, in the exercise or purported exercise of the special powers given to them under the State of Emergency that was declared on 16th March 1971. Otherwise, we think that a proper judgment cannot be made of the actions of the young people who are reported to have attacked police stations in large numbers, with no more than hand-bombs or shot-guns, in the face of death from the rifles and automatic weapons with which the police were armed.

Since you are now confident that your Government stands in no danger from the young rebels who have taken to the jungles, according to you, and that the overwhelming majority of the people took no part in the uprising, we would urge you to restore civil liberties and democratic conditions of life for all sections of our people, without delay. To keep all our people subject to the conditions imposed on them under the State of Emergency, with the continuing threat of arbitrary action by the police and the military against whomsoever they please, and by employers against workers, will only serve to strengthen the hand of reaction in this country. □

### The Laotians Did Even More

U. S. Vice President Spiro Agnew complained in an April 7 speech that the news media had done a "hatchet job" on the U. S.-Saigon invasion of Laos.



# Ulbricht Turns the Reins Over to Honecker

The most long-lived of the East European Stalinist dictators, Walter Ulbricht, surrendered his post as general secretary of the Communist party of East Germany May 3, twenty-five years after the Kremlin installed him as the absolute ruler of the country. He retains the largely honorary post of head of state.

In his speech of resignation, Ulbricht, who is seventy-seven years old, gave his age as the reason for retirement: ". . . unfortunately there is no medicine against advancing years. If I ask you therefore to free me from my post as First Secretary of the Central Committee, it is because of my profound feeling of responsibility toward the Central Committee, the entire party and also toward our people, toward whose welfare the whole policy of the party is directed."

Most of the press outside the Soviet bloc countries indicated skepticism about Ulbricht's stated reasons for resigning. In the history of the Stalinist system, the men holding absolute power have seldom, if ever, retired voluntarily. In the last three years in particular, two of Ulbricht's contemporaries, Wladyslaw Gomulka in Po-

land and Antonin Novotny in Czechoslovakia, have "resigned." Each, in fact, was toppled by pressure from below.

Ulbricht's resignation comes only five months after Gomulka was driven into retirement by a workers' uprising that threatened to grow into a full-scale political revolution against the bureaucratic system.

Although the Polish workers appear to be marking time after winning a series of unprecedented victories, the impact of their struggle went deep. It is impossible to predict what the final consequences of it will be, not only in Poland but throughout the East European countries.

To the East German bureaucracy, which has always been afraid of attempting any reforms to win the support of the workers, the victories of the Polish proletariat must seem especially threatening. Only a year and a half after it spearheaded the move to crush the liberalization in Czechoslovakia, the Berlin regime sees the Stalinist system shaken in another neighbor country.

Furthermore, the East German bureaucracy is caught between conflicting pressures. While some sections of the bureaucracy might want to crack down hard to prevent unrest developing among the workers, such a policy would embarrass the Soviet Union in its attempts to achieve a détente with Bonn. The problem was made more delicate by the fact that the Ulbricht regime, because of its character and because it is a focus of Western propaganda, became identified in West Germany and elsewhere with the worst period of Stalinism.

It was in the interest of the East German CP, it seems, to refurbish its image, an operation that apparently required dropping Ulbricht. As in Poland, however, the best that the bureaucracy could come up with in the way of a new face was a mediocre apparatus product—Erich Honecker.

"He [Honecker] is a good second man," a Communist party member told a *New York Times* correspondent May 3. "He has the apparatus



ERICH HONECKER

in hand. He is a natural except for one thing: He is not a fighter—he has no concept, no party line."

In an editorial May 5, the well-informed Paris daily *Le Monde* commented: "After the patriarchs of the world Communist movement, a generation of new men are coming to power in the people's democracies. These 'apparatchiki' have already spent the main part of their careers in ministerial offices and official palaces. Honecker is one of them, like the East German premier Willi Stoph."

Like Edward Gierak in Poland, Honecker has a history of opposing democratic concessions: "Honecker has always looked with suspicion on the renewal and reform experiments in certain countries like Hungary or Czechoslovakia," Manuel Lucbert wrote in the May 5 issue of *Le Monde*. "In fact, analyzing the situation in these countries, he wrote in the June 24, 1968, issue of *Pravda* that the 'hysterical screams about freedom of opinion and the press really only represent a eulogy of bourgeois democ-



WALTER ULBRICHT

racy.'"

Honecker's very mediocrity seems to be his main qualification. His purely Stalinist background is assurance to the Kremlin and the East German bureaucracy that he will do his best to

resist giving concessions to the masses. His lack of principle or personality seems likely to make him a more flexible instrument of bureaucratic policy than the "grand old man" of German Stalinism.

When powerful unrest does develop among the East German workers, however, these advantages of the new general secretary may turn into disastrous political weaknesses for the bureaucracy. □

## More Than the Military-Industrial Complex Is Involved

# What Gives U.S. Imperialism Its Explosive Drive

By Ernest Mandel

[The following article was published as an educational supplement to issue No. 2, 1971, of the Swedish revolutionary socialist monthly *Mullvaden* (Mole), from which we have translated it.]

\* \* \*

American imperialism began to show its face in Latin America early in the nineteenth century and later in the Pacific area (expansion into the Japanese sphere and the conquest of the Philippines). Since the opening of the first world war, American imperialism has spread out to encircle the entire world. In the competition among the imperialist powers, American imperialism emerged as the victor in the two imperialist world conflicts.

In fact, American imperialism was the only victor that was strengthened militarily and economically by these wars. All its most important competitors were weakened by one or both of these conflicts.

There is no need to go into detail on the causes of American imperialism's superiority over its competitors. The primary reasons are well known—enormous natural resources, a better balance between industry and agriculture, and a larger territorial and demographic base, which made it possible to take advantage of industrial mass production, wipe out all semifeudal vestiges, and permit the development of a purer form of capitalism than in the other imperialist states, and so forth.

It must be stressed, however, that American imperialism's rise to the place of leading power on the planet has been a dialectical process involving sharpening contradictions throughout the rest of the world as well as in American society itself. The American imperialist bourgeoisie has been unable to take part in the race for world domination without assuring its leadership of the capitalist world. In this it has been confronted with ever more powerful anticapitalist forces.

As a result, the decisions of American imperialism are often guided by the political necessity to defend the capitalist system on a worldwide scale. This need may conflict with its own particular interests. It is in this light that the Marshall Plan must be seen. Far from being an attempt to bring the European economy under Washington's control, it was, in historical perspective, the first phase in rebuilding West European imperialism as an independent force, more precisely a force with the capacity

to compete with the USA. This decision, however, was not an irrational one.

Washington was faced with a choice between two evils after the second world war. It had either to help bring about the collapse of West European capitalism or permit a powerful competitor to recover. American imperialism chose the lesser evil, from its standpoint.

These introductory remarks are essential to avoid falling into economism or making an oversimplified analysis of the economic roots of American imperialism.

American imperialism is still rooted primarily in the economic phenomenon which Lenin defined and which continues in force for the entire imperialist epoch—the existence of surplus capital in the imperialist countries spreading out over the globe in search of superprofits.

The only modification that need be made in Lenin's definition is that, since the second world war, this surplus capital is no longer solely, or even primarily, flowing toward the colonial or semicolonial "underdeveloped" countries, but also, to an increasing extent, toward other industrially developed imperialist countries.

This important difference with respect to the imperialism of Lenin's day can be explained by the following factors:

1. The important differentials in technology and labor productivity between American imperialism and the other imperialist powers.

2. The difference in military and political power between the USA and the other imperialist states, a difference more pronounced than that in the economic sphere.

3. The increasing insecurity of investments in the colonial and semicolonial countries, where the revolutionary liberation movements have been on the advance.

4. The reduced geographical area in which invested surplus capital can still produce profits, owing to the overthrow of capitalism in large sections of the world.<sup>1</sup>

The end result of these uneven tendencies is that the differences between the rate of profit in the USA and what American capital can get in other countries (by exploiting

1. A study by a Chicago consultants' firm in 1960 revealed that the thirty-five biggest American trusts had a net profit of 9.2 percent in the USA and 14.2 percent abroad (corporate profits after taxes). The January 1, 1962, issue of the *U.S. News and World Report* and the March 8, 1965, issue of *Newsweek* came to similar conclusions.

its technological advantages and thereby assuring important surplus profits) is sufficiently large to make exporting capital to other imperialist countries considerably more enticing than investing in underdeveloped countries, where the greater risks detract from the lure of higher rates of profit.

At the same time that American capital is gradually finding new outlets in the world,<sup>2</sup> the differences in labor productivity and technical development between the USA and the other imperialist countries are evening out. This process is reducing the profit-rate differentials between these countries and once again making the underdeveloped nations the only area that can absorb large surplus profits. A relaxation in the tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union may open up possibilities (however modest) for investment of American capital in countries with a socialist economic base, in the same way as FIAT and Renault have already done in the automotive industry.

But all the possibilities for investment cannot alter the basic fact that, for the past twenty-five years, the major part of American capital exports has been invested in other imperialist countries rather than in the rest of the world.

It must be remembered that these exports of capital correspond to an economic need inherent in the monopoly capitalist system. They are a response to a two-sided threat of a decline in the average rate of profit in the main fortresses of imperialism and a massive accumulation of capital that cannot be invested in these centers without threatening to bring about a grave new decline in the average rate of profit.

The accumulation of an increasing capital surplus that can no longer be invested profitably in any of the usual economic sectors promotes not only exports but also a rush for new areas of investment in sectors where the average rate of profit is comparable to that in monopolized sectors but where investment does not threaten the profit rate throughout the entire system. Arms production (and its carry-over into the space sector) offers an area for "substitute investment," to use Rosa Luxemburg's expression.

The advantages that flow from investments in the arms industry are obvious. They do not reduce the volume of capital already invested in other sectors of industry. To the contrary, they stimulate heavy industrial production and the supply of certain raw materials. Nor do they compete with existing commodity production but create products whose only buyer is the state and whose only "consumption" value is to strengthen U.S. imperialism internationally. Such investments also offer other marginal advantages which cannot be overlooked. They make it possible to put a damper on cyclical fluctuations by stabilizing an important part of investment volume. In this way, the American economy is protected against a crisis like that of 1929 (although the development of periodic recessions cannot be prevented, which in the last analysis are no less serious than the crises capitalism has experienced throughout its entire history). These investments guarantee automatic profits for the monopolies in an increasing number of sectors, all linked to defense.

2. Direct American corporate investments rose from \$7.2 billion in 1946 to \$40.6 billion in 1963 and \$54.4 billion in 1966.

The increasing importance of the war industry in the American economy can be seen first of all in its growing influence in sectors like the electronic, airplane, and chemical industries. This results in a twofold interrelationship that stimulates the expansion of American imperialist capital.

1. The linking up of certain monopolies with war matériel production makes military industry and its extension into other fields a vital matter.

2. The link between certain high posts in the armed forces and the government apparatus creates a vital interest in maintaining the defense budget at an astronomical level and raising it still higher.

This twofold symbiosis is all the more dangerous in that it has a tendency to reproduce itself in foreign countries as a result of the construction of American bases abroad and the sending of military "aid" and advisers to "friendly" governments threatened by "subversion from within" or "Communist aggression from without."

Even former President Eisenhower, conservative as he was, expressed concern at the end of his term over the enormous growth of the industrial, military, and political establishment. This establishment lives and flourishes essentially from increasing defense expenditures, and needs international conflicts to justify this growth to the American taxpayers.

It would be no less stupid to see the important role that the arms industry plays in the American economy as the sole result of maneuvers by this Mafia within the American bourgeoisie. The entire capitalist class is compelled to carry on a permanent arms policy, since it is confronted by the permanent revolution on a world scale and by the industrial and military development of countries that have already abolished capitalism. The aim of the arms reduction conference is not disarmament but an attempt to rationalize the arms race so that it can be supported by the U.S. and Soviet defense budgets, which, despite everything, are not unlimited.

In a world divided into two hostile camps, real disarmament is completely utopian. Still more utopian is the idea that monopoly capitalism can reallocate the sixteen to seventeen billion dollars it spends annually on arms to the public sectors of education, health, and aid to the underdeveloped countries. Such a reallocation would require that the bourgeoisie change from a class driven by the profit motive to a class working for the good of humanity. Any great spread of capital outside the arms sector would quickly threaten "civilian" capital investments and thus the rate of profit. No such thing will ever happen.

In contrast to most of its competitors, American imperialism was characterized by the fact that it had access within its borders to the basic raw materials that are necessary for modern industry. Even in the years immediately following the first world war, raw material imports were of secondary importance and could easily be replaced with synthetics.

The enormous expansion of American industrial production at the end of the second world war changed this situation, however. Today the USA must import ever increasing quantities of raw materials, including such basic items as oil, iron ore, bauxite, copper, magnesium, and nickel. What is more, the available sources of such materials in the U.S.'s own borders are rapidly decreasing. With regard to oil, reserves will be exhausted at the

end of the century. The USA depends entirely on imports for chromium, cobalt, and columbium, which are essential to steel production.

In other words, now, seventy-five years later than its most important competitors, the USA must go out into the world to look for new sources of raw materials—oil in Latin America, the Near East, and West Africa; other minerals in Canada, Australia, Africa, and elsewhere. In this search it is colliding not only with the liberation movements in various colonial and semicolonial countries, but must also compete with other imperialist nations such as England, Japan, France, West Germany, and in fact even Spain.

To seize and control these resources has often involved political conflicts, with resulting coups d'etat and local wars (especially in West Africa over the last five years). This can lead to sending military advisers and to *de facto* development of American bases. The need for new sources of raw materials explains the vigor with which American imperialism clings to countries like Venezuela and Brazil. They have been indispensable suppliers of raw materials for the big American financial interests.<sup>3</sup>

Despite the fact that American capital exports to the underdeveloped countries have been less extensive than its exports to other imperialist countries, they have not been insignificant. In the cases of important countries like Indonesia and Brazil or other countries with great, almost untouched resources like the Congo, American capital exports have resulted in increasing interference by American imperialism in the affairs of these semicolonial countries. Conflicts have arisen with other imperialist powers, especially the old colonial powers that American imperialism is gradually displacing.

The most typical examples of the way American capital has taken over in the past twenty years from earlier colonial capital are to be seen in Indonesia (where it took the place of Dutch capital), Morocco (French capital), and Iran (English capital).

In the Congo we can clearly see the beginning of a similar change, in this case involving Belgian capital, even if for the moment this is better reflected in the re-orientation of foreign trade than in capital investments.

This whole imperialist changing of the guard has not been achieved simply by behind-the-scenes maneuvers but has led to acute national and international conflicts, most often accompanied by bloodbaths. From the overthrow of Mossadegh up to the murder of Ben Barka and the imposition of Mobutu by a coup d'etat, the roadway has been lined with murders, conspiracies, and repression costing hundreds of thousands of lives.

To climax everything, American imperialism has not achieved world domination. The dream of an "American century" lasted only five years—from 1945 to 1950. It

3. According to Harry Magdoff, American imports of certain raw materials have been increasing to the following extent, calculated as a percentage of U. S. production.

	% in 1937	% in 1966
Iron Ore	3	43
Copper	-13	18
Lead	0	131
Zinc	7	140
Bauxite	113	638
Oil	-4	—

was shattered not only by the increasing strength of the anticapitalist forces on the international scale, but also by the law of uneven development which the capitalist world center has inexorably had to bow to, since that permits no new position to be held forever. In comparison with the period 1945-50, the positions of American imperialism's most important competitors (with the exception of England) have grown stronger, not weaker, vis-à-vis the USA.

The competition among the imperialist countries is more acute than previously. We have not seen any superimperialism develop, but rather a continuing struggle among the imperialist countries, each trying to shift the balance of power in its favor. This competition among the imperialist powers is taking place, however, within the framework of the new worldwide relationship of forces. Capital has lost a third of the world, and the continual expansion of new revolutionary movements threatens to release new countries from its grip.

Under these conditions, interimperialist competition has come to be replaced by interimperialist solidarity in confronting the mortal threat that hangs over the entire system. Stalin's hope for a new interimperialist war has come to nought, if you disregard local conflicts between imperialist puppets in Africa, Cyprus, and elsewhere.

One of the economic bases of American imperialism is defense of the conditions for the reproduction of invested U. S. capital when these seem to deteriorate or be threatened. This precisely was the meaning of the coup d'etat in Guatemala, which defended United Fruit's investments. It was Creole Petroleum's investments that were protected by military men sent to Venezuela; and the CIA was involved in the military coup in Brazil to safeguard the United States Steel Corporation's investments. The same sort of intervention in Greece enabled America's Litton Industries to make big capital investments under extremely favorable conditions.

It is wrong, however, to look at the imperialist interventions in too narrow a focus, that is, only as defending invested capital.

It is also a question of safeguarding future possibilities and averting the danger of a chain reaction, with an "unstable situation" in one country spreading to the surrounding states. Thus, for example, direct American capital investment in South Vietnam is very modest. The investments in Thailand are, however, more significant; and those in Malaysia, Indonesia, and India are considerably greater.

By intervening with a counterrevolutionary aggression in the civil war in Vietnam, American imperialism is protecting the capitalist strongholds in the neighboring countries and trying to safeguard its future possibilities in Southeast Asia. Today the American strategy must inevitably be a global one. The fight in defense of capital is not necessarily waged where this capital is invested. The battle may be fought in other countries where the loss of imperialism's advanced positions could represent a dangerous threat to the areas further back.

An analysis of the economic forces that have determined the development of American imperialism can lead only to a conclusion that, in order to be effective, the anticapitalist forces must meet the international counterrevolutionary strategy of big capital with a corresponding worldwide strategy. □

# Mitchell Orders New Indictment in Priests' 'Plot'

By Allen Myers

On April 30, a federal grand jury in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, handed down new indictments in the case of the clerical "kidnappers." The new indictment, which added two new defendants to the original "Harrisburg Six," only made more obvious the trumped-up nature of the entire case.

The charges stem from careless statements made by FBI chieftain J. Edgar Hoover in testimony before a congressional subcommittee last November. Hoover asserted that a defunct organization called "East Coast Conspiracy to Save Lives" was planning to kidnap an unnamed government official.

When Hoover's remarks, which had apparently been intended only to obtain extra appropriations for his agency, were made public, he was faced with the demand to prove his accusations or retract them. Attorney General John Mitchell then rallied to Hoover's defense by having the Justice Department indict the "Harrisburg Six." (See *Intercontinental Press*, January 25, page 52.)

The original indictment, handed down January 12, charged the defendants with conspiring to kidnap presidential adviser Henry A. Kissinger and to blow up the heating system of federal buildings in Washington, D. C., as an antiwar protest.

The six alleged conspirators were the Rev. Philip F. Berrigan, a pacifist priest serving a three-and-a-half-year sentence for destroying draft files in 1968; two Baltimore priests, Neil R. McLaughlin and Joseph R. Wenderoth; Sister Elizabeth McAlister, a New York City nun; Anthony Scoblick, a former priest; and Eqbal Ahmad, a fellow of the Adlai Stevenson Institute for International Affairs at the University of Chicago.

The indictment of committed pacifists on such charges was greeted with no less skepticism than Hoover's original accusations. The *New York Times*, for example, called the charges "almost a conspiracy against sober reason."

The April 30 indictment only rein-



KISSINGER: "Brains" of Nixon team still held to be target of "kidnap plot."

forces that evaluation. Like the original six, the two new defendants are pacifists. Mary C. Scoblick is a former nun. John T. Glick is serving a prison term in Kentucky for having destroyed draft records.

The new indictment is both a transparent attempt to patch up the defects of the original and a retreat from it. Bill Kovach explained in the May 1 *New York Times*:

"The new indictments appear to soften a kidnapping-bombing charge by changing the wording from the original indictment in a way that reduces the penalty for conviction from life imprisonment to five years in prison. This was accomplished by charging that the kidnapping-bombing plot was part of a larger conspiracy that includes other acts. . . .

"It also appears to make possible a conviction on the conspiracy charge *without specifically proving the original plot* if the other overt acts can be proved." (Emphasis added.)

In other words, the government can now try the defendants on a charge of conspiring to kidnap Kissinger *and* commit some other act, such as destroying draft files. The accused could

then be convicted if the government convinced a jury *only* that one of the defendants had tried to destroy draft records.

The prosecution attempted to conceal this sleight of hand by attaching to the indictment copies of letters allegedly exchanged between Philip Berrigan and Elizabeth McAlister in which the two discuss kidnapping Kissinger. Such publication is almost unheard-of, but it was no more peculiar than the documents themselves.

The letter, purportedly written by McAlister, declares that its subject "should not be committed to paper," and then commits to paper an incredible scheme for kidnapping not only Kissinger but also "big wigs of the liberal ilk," holding all these people "for about a week," conducting "a trial or grand jury affair" to indict the captives, and filming the entire proceedings.

The letter attributed to Berrigan replies that the plan is "brilliant" although a bit "grandiose"—certainly one of the larger understatements of current history. Neither the prosecution nor the alleged letters provide any explanation of how eight "conspirators," two of them in jail, were to carry out a scheme that would have required dozens if not hundreds of participants, plus a film crew (and perhaps an orchestra for background music?).

The authenticity of the letters is suspect on the basis of more than their content. The press has already pointed to a government provocateur as the real source of the letters. Betty Medsger put this as gently as possible in the May 1 *Washington Post*:

"It was not clear whether the handwriting was that of the letters' alleged authors or that of Bucknell University students who transcribed letters known to have been taken in and out of the prison for the two defendants by Boyd Douglas, a former convict at Lewisburg [prison] who is believed to be the government's chief witness in the case."

The Justice Department's decision to

publish the alleged letters was an obvious attempt to try the case in the press, pious disclaimers to the contrary. The action was so unprecedented that on May 4 defense attorneys moved that the officials responsible be held in contempt of court.

A Justice Department spokesman replied that "It is not an uncommon practice for such information to be attached to an indictment." But Robert M. Smith reported in the May 6 *New York Times*:

"John Wilson, a spokesman for the department, was asked today [May 5] when and in what cases the Government had released letters like those in the Berrigan case. He said the department did not know. . . .

"Asked if the department could name a single case in the last year or two in which the procedure of releasing such letters is followed, he said, 'No.'"

In fact, Mitchell's employees included the alleged letters with the indictment *only after they had failed in attempts to persuade several magazines to publish them*. Medsger reported in the article quoted above:

"For more than a month, a few publications, including *Time* magazine, have been in possession of copies of these letters and others allegedly written by the same persons. But none of the letters had been published before yesterday's [April 30] indictments."

The magazines appear to have refused to publish the letters because they suspected they were phony. Bill Kovach wrote in the May 5 *New York Times*:

"A spokesman for *Time* magazine confirmed that the magazine had seen excerpts from the alleged letters and tried to establish their authenticity. . . ."

Leonard Boudin, one of the defense attorneys, charged in an affidavit that both *Time* and *Life* had been offered the letters but had refused them because they were not considered authentic. Boudin pointed out that "the Government could have been the only source of that offer."

It is readily apparent that the prosecuting attorneys would not have been likely to engage in these various maneuvers on their own authority. Defense attorneys have asked the judge to inquire just who in the Justice Department made the decision to offer "evidence" to the press and to attach the supposed letters to the indictment.

If the judge actually makes such an inquiry, it might well prove to be embarrassing to John Mitchell, who

appears to have gone out on a limb in order to protect J. Edgar Hoover. □

## Mexico

### Echeverria Exiles Student Leaders

#### Mexico City

Less than six months after imposing savage prison sentences of eight to fifteen years in prison on the main leaders of the 1968 student movement, the government of President Luis Echeverría has sent them into enforced exile.

On April 27, the following were put on a plane and flown to Peru, where they were granted political asylum: Raúl Álvarez Garín, Luis Oscar González de Alba, Gilberto Ramón Guevara Niebla, Federico Emeri Ulloa, Saúl Álvarez, and Eduardo de la Vega de Avila.

This group was the core of the imprisoned leadership of the Consejo Nacional de Huelga [National Strike Council, the body that led the 1968 protests]. However, by its arbitrary action in selecting these prominent figures for release just months after completing a prolonged frame-up trial against them, the government only made more scandalous the fact that it continues to hold fifty political prisoners arrested this year, to say nothing of those jailed prior to 1968. (The latter group includes the journalists Adolfo Gilly, an Argentinian; and Víctor Rico Galán, a Mexican.)

At present there are about eighty political prisoners in Lecumberri prison in Mexico City, including those recently arrested in the case of an alleged Kremlin-sponsored insurrectionary plot—the "guerrillas" of MAR [Movimiento de Acción Revolucionaria — Revolutionary Action Movement].\*

When former president Díaz Ordaz complained about the release of this latest group of students, a government jokester is supposed to have said: "We are taking some out to make room in the cells for others."

At least the second part of this state-

ment, about jailing more students, is true.

Besides the groups arrested in March in the Federal District and in Sonora in connection with the MAR case, thirty students were jailed early this year in Guadalajara, the country's third most important city.

The question remains, however, why President Echeverría released the group of prominent student leaders, as well as another three political prisoners a few days afterward, who were also sent into exile. No doubt the main reason for these releases is the pressure built up by the student movement, together with broad sectors of public opinion here and internationally.

Echeverría faces severe problems, and it is possible that by this sleight of hand he hopes to divert public attention from the political prisoners.

The student movement, however, is determined to block the government's tactic and keep the pressure up for release of all persons jailed because of their political beliefs or activity.

On April 28, the day after the student leaders were sent into exile, the Comité Coordinador de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México [Coordinating Committee of the Autonomous National University of Mexico] held a mass meeting on campus to expose the president's maneuvers.

In order to maintain the pressure on the government, it is important that international protests continue and that they be increased, if possible.

Letters and telegrams demanding the release of all the political prisoners can be sent to President Luis Echeverría, Palacio Nacional, Mexico, D. F., Mexico. □

#### Giving Themselves a Second Chance?

The Indonesian parliament in March passed a bill increasing the penalties for governmental corruption. The measure was not made retroactive.

\* On this case, see "Echeverría Discovers Another 'Communist Plot,'" in *Intercontinental Press*, April 19, 1971, page 360. — IP



# Echeverría's First 100 Days

By Ricardo Ochoa

Mexico City

With President Luis Echeverría's "first hundred days" in office, signs have appeared pointing to a dramatic new deepening of the crisis that has been latent in the country since 1968. Beginning as acute political contradictions in top bourgeois circles, this crisis has spread slowly and inexorably to other sectors, thereby threatening to broaden into a social confrontation.

In the wake of the 1968 student movement and the slaughter and jailings of student activists, Echeverría has tried to restabilize the political situation by combining both left-sounding and rightist demagogy.

But as his ambiguous hints of reforms and a lessening in the repression have failed to reduce student opposition to the regime, and as popular unrest has continued to spread and mount with explosive potentialities, the new president seems now to be moving even further to the right than his predecessor, mass murderer Díaz Ordaz.

The anti-Communist campaign launched in mid-March over the case of alleged Soviet-sponsored guerrillas signaled the sharpening stresses in the country, and the approaching storms. Up until then, Echeverría had hinted at a liberalization of the regime.

The journalists who feed at the government's trough have run out of adjectives to describe Echeverría's "dynamic and bold steps to get the country moving again." The tongue-lashings the new president likes to give the vested interests have naturally pleased all the circles these scribblers represent — the union bureaucracies, the politicians of the PRI [Partido Revolucionario Institucional — Institutional Revolutionary party, the government party], the broad gamut of official intellectual spokesmen and functionaries, many old "progressives," and similar sectors.

Giving almost a speech a day, improvised and all, Echeverría has been barnstorming the country from one end to the other, talking about "the country's failings." A lot of Mexicans

who believed the government propaganda and thought they were living in "the model country of Latin America" must have been surprised by the very different tone adopted by the country's highest leader in his speeches in the last few months.

All the reformists and liberals in the PRI and the different government sectors could not hide their joy when Echeverría denounced some sections of private enterprise in January and February. The main targets of a series of presidential excoriations were the Banco Internacional and the Unión de Productores de Azúcar [Sugar Producers Association].

In these speeches Echeverría said that the current situation is similar to that which preceded the revolution of 1910, above all in regard to the agrarian question.

Attacks on the evils of union bossism also won applause from many reformists, who failed to notice, however, that in making these appeals for clean unionism, Echeverría shared the platform with big labor fakers like Fidel Valázquez and others.

But to climax his "hundred days," the Mexican president decided to "balance" the scales by launching an attack on the "left," thus reminding everyone of the bonapartist element in his regime.

In the previous phase he had won applause only from the inveterate reformists, who control an important but far from decisive sector of the press (*Siempre, El Día*). His move against the "left" now became the occasion for an immense campaign of chauvinist demagogy, unprecedented except for Díaz Ordaz's "outstretched hand" campaign in 1968.

The pretext for this onslaught was of the flimsiest kind. Since 1966 the government has had a habit of arresting "foquista" groups every once in a while. To judge from the press, none of these groups has ever been able to actually set up its "foco" [guerrilla nucleus]. Thanks to informers, they have always been captured, the government said, in the stage just pre-

paratory to beginning guerrilla warfare.

In mid-March, the state prosecutor's office presented another such group to the press. It was called the MAR [Movimiento de Acción Revolucionaria — Revolutionary Action Movement]. The scenario was one now familiar to every Mexican.

In the newspaper pictures, portraits of Lenin and books by Che were mixed with machine guns, walkie-talkies, and other such equipment. A couple of dozen revolutionists were captured. They were supposed to have been given away by an informer encountered by the police accidentally in the state of Tamaulipas, from which the majority of the group came.

The complex situation in mid-March took a bad turn when the president made the invidious statement that "Mexico respected the sovereignty of other countries and demanded that they respect its sovereignty by not meddling in its internal affairs." These words touched off a wave of hysteria in all of the country's news media.

Millions of pesos were squandered on pages and pages of supporting statements by every element in the political establishment. The president in turn made his accusation concrete by expelling five Soviet diplomats considered *persona non grata*.

Why did Echeverría choose to attack the Soviet Union? The pretext for blaming the USSR was that some of the MAR members arrested were former students at the Lumumba University in Moscow. But the amalgam was extraordinarily gross. According to the statements of the persons arrested (or the statements attributed to them), they were trained in the People's Democratic Republic of Korea. Thus, the Echeverría government was indicting the Soviets for a matter involving the country run by Leader Kim Il Sung.

But even this can only be assumed. The Mexican government has never given a definite reason for expelling the Soviet diplomats. Responding to the special tom-tom music of Mexican politics, however, the governors, deputies, senators, labor fakers, and the whole political and social establishment that constitutes the Mexican bourgeois system, flocked to "demonstrate their solidarity" with President Echeverría "in these moments of danger for the fatherland."

The campaign was so perfectly orchestrated that one could not help rec-

ognizing the familiar hand behind it all, the hand of the government directing a chorus of self-praise to demonstrate its stability.

The consequences of this operation became clear immediately, being felt first in the student sector, which remains—especially in the universities—the center of national opposition to the government. Bands of "cop-students" called *porros*—i.e., members of *porras* [clubs], or gangs of hoodlums paid by school and government authorities to intimidate the student population—took advantage of the anti-Soviet climate whipped up by the press.

Armed with machine guns, although they did not use them, the *porros* distributed rabid anti-Communist leaflets on campus.

This attack came at a time when the student movement, especially at the UNAM [Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México—Autonomous National University of Mexico] was in a stage of recovery. Its leadership had received vitalizing new blood when some of the student leaders imprisoned in 1968 were released.

Displaying a courageous attitude, these leaders no sooner got out of jail than they began to organize a series of demonstrations culminating in a mass meeting March 17, which came in the midst of the all-out anti-Communist hysteria. This was the day the MAR "guerrillas" were formally charged.

Between 7,000 and 8,000 persons attended the rally, which was tense and thoughtful rather than agitational. It was really an occasion for taking stock of the movement's gains and losses. There were some attempts to break up the meeting by provocations (the Posadistas\* took part in one of these). But they failed.

The government provocation of sending armed gangs onto the campus was particularly brazen. Even in 1968 the police did not dare give guns to the *porros*. The student reaction was immediate and powerful.

Rallies and petitions to the authorities put the question on the front pages of the daily press, neutralizing the

\* The followers of Juan Posadas, an Argentinian ultraleftist who spilt from the international Trotskyist movement but who still claims to adhere to Trotskyism and, in fact, to be the only Trotskyist leader, if not the sole genuine Trotskyist, in the world.—IP

anti-Communist campaign to a large extent and at the same time showing the decisive importance that the student sector continues to hold in the political life of the country.

The virulent anti-Communist climate whipped up by Echeverría's statements apparently did prevent the release of student political prisoners who were scheduled to be freed, according to the press, following the release of those previously mentioned. Carlos Sevilla and Martín Dozal were to be among this group.

But the students' counterattack forced even the rector of the university to make an ambiguous statement in support of their protests. The result of all this was that the government had to think twice before daring to make a frontal attack on the students in Mexico City, as it has done in Guadalajara and is preparing to do now in Monterrey.

It is an open secret that the government wants to smash the student movement, especially in the universities, which is the sole stronghold of opposition to the regime.

The *porros* are being used for this purpose. But—for the moment—these gangs have gotten fouled up by their own primitivism. Caught up short by the intelligent counterattack of the students, the government left the *porros* to their own devices, without political counselors. As a result, they said things that made them a public laughingstock. For example, one of their leaders, "El Lallo," the son of the chief of the Mexico City secret police (not a trace of subtlety here!), declared he was a "moderate rightist like President Echeverría" and that his aspiration was to follow in his "papa's" footsteps.

It is easy to understand some of the underlying causes that led the new regime to try this anti-Communist style demagogy, unattempted even by Díaz Ordaz. (It should be noted that this president of infamous memory never felt obliged to make any special statements about the innumerable apprentice *foquistas* arrested by his government after it jailed Victor Rico Galán in 1966. Only the student movement was able to arouse him to wage an anti-Communist campaign such as Echeverría has mounted today over the capture of these MAR novice guerrillas.)

The primary reason for the course Echeverría has taken is that the Díaz Ordaz regime left him facing a politi-

cal opposition, represented by the student movement, which not even terrible blows such as the massacre of Tlatelolco have been able to subdue. The student milieu continues to offer an inexhaustible source of revolutionary cadres.

At times these cadres have incautiously thrown themselves into adventures. It is quite possible that in the case of the MAR there was a lot of the dilettantism and superficiality of the earlier *foquista*, or primitive guerrillist groups, like the many captured over the last six years. But how different the context is now!

MAR is both a symptom and a demonstration of the fact that such guerrillist tendencies are no longer concentrated in Mexico City but have spread virtually throughout the country. Moreover, Echeverría has to deal with these groups in the framework of a very difficult political situation. By its actions in 1968 the regime revealed how extremely inflexible its structure is and how it loses its ability to rule by any means except the harshest repression the moment it is faced with a challenge from masses acting in independence of its control.

The unrest in some sectors of the masses, especially in the provinces, filters into the daily papers only diffusely, but it is real. In Chihuahua, in Nuevo León, in Tabasco, and in other states, spontaneous demonstrations have taken place against the rise in prices of consumer goods (sugar, carbonated drinks, green vegetables, soap, etc.). The pressure has been so great that the labor fakers have been forced to take the lead in these protests.

The student vanguard presents a very different kind of problem for Echeverría than it did for Díaz Ordaz. Accordingly, his determination to go all out to suppress the student movement is of a firmer sort.

The fact is that the student vanguard has not let itself be lulled by Echeverría's pseudoreformist propaganda. The students want, they demand, action to prove that Echeverría really wants to change things. An example of this attitude is the question raised at the March 17 meeting: "How can they talk about the right to 'dissent' when our compañeros are still in jail?"

Thus, the fact that many students have openly avowed their determination to turn toward conspiratorial activity poses a problem with many dif-

ficult facets, for Echeverría.

First of all, Echeverría knows that the students represent a potential danger that cannot be overlooked. In 1968 a much smaller vanguard than exists today was able to consolidate a mass movement politically. Its accumulated experience now enables this vanguard to take advantage of any spontaneous mobilization that arises among the masses. Such mobilizations have developed frequently and will not fail to arise again in the future and even the near future.

Because of this threat, Echeverría is determined to make a deliberate, premeditated turn toward anti-Communism, and not aimed just against the Castroists, Maoists, Trotskyists and other far left groups. For the majority of the Mexican masses, Communism is still identified with "Russia." For this reason Echeverría had to attack the USSR, even though by doing this he ran the risk of being looked on as a vulgar McCarthyite demagogue of the type common in the 1950s. In any case, he is no political scholar, or anything of the sort, but a professional cop, as his career shows.

By accusing the Soviets of wanting to "promote guerrilla warfare," Echeverría is making a fool of himself in the eyes of informed opinion here and abroad. But his objective is not to cater to this kind of opinion but to make an impact on the broadest layers of the Mexican people, most of all in the provinces. And for the broad population a communism that does not come from "Russia" does not sound real.

However, Díaz Ordaz also tried to use anti-Communism to discredit the student movement. His equally gross accusations fell flat. Like his predecessor, Echeverría also has little room for maneuver, in fact still less. The question of unprepared *foquista* groups is not so important in itself. The significance of these groups depends on the possibility of their linking up with the local guerrilla struggles that are already beginning to take root.

The guerrilla struggle started in 1968 by Vázquez Rojas, a mass leader in the south, has not been crushed. It has even—because of splits in its leading nucleus—given birth to new guerrilla movements. And these groups do have a *base of social support*, as demonstrated by many spectacular kidnappings and expropria-

tions in Acapulco and other places on the coast.

It has been claimed, although it is impossible to verify this, that similar groups have appeared in other states such as Jalisco, Chihuahua, Oaxaca, and Veracruz. But it is clear that the government knows that the history of the Mexican revolutions has always begun with groups such as the one led by Vázquez Rojas. Morelos, Hidalgo, and Guerrero in the struggle for independence, Alvarez in the fight against Santa Ana in the reform period, and Zapata in 1910 were local leaders who operated primarily in the south, where the oligarchy's tradition of oppression and despotism prevented all but armed opposition.

The present regime itself was born in armed struggle. It knows how explosively the Mexican masses can react, unaccustomed as they are to the subtleties of "democracy," which they have never really experienced. I am convinced that these spontaneously developing experiments in self-defense by small but already firmly rooted groups present an especially important element confronting Echeverría, which he is trying to meet with a counterstrategy.

According to *El cívico*, a small mimeographed publication that circulates widely in student circles, the torch of armed rebellion continues to burn in the south. By his anti-Communist campaign, Echeverría is trying to prevent this spontaneous opposition among the most exploited masses in the south from spreading and linking up with the political capacities of the student opposition in the central and northern parts of the country. He knows that such a development would mean the beginning of the end for him, and this explains the virulence of his anti-Communism and his anti-Soviet campaign.

In the student milieu itself, this reactionary campaign may lead to very violent confrontations. The students will be the first to face its consequences. In fact, they already have. I mentioned the brazen provocation by the *porros* on the UNAM campus.

At the University of Guadalajara, moreover, an actual armed struggle has been going on for a year between the students and the gangsters of the FEG [Federación de Estudiantes de Guadalajara—Guadalajara Student Federation], the organization that is supposed to represent the student "leadership." The revolutionary stu-

dent group in this city, the FER [Federación de Estudiantes Revolucionarios—Revolutionary Student Federation], has been forced to resort to armed self-defense by the attempts of armed FEG goons to break up and terrorize student meetings and demonstrations. There have been several armed clashes.

Close collaboration between the police and the university authorities has enabled the FEG to dominate the student scene in this city. Many "teachers" (placed in their posts by the FEG) put a machine gun on their desks before starting their classes.

The authorities want to impose this Dantesque situation on all the universities. And in this regard the struggle being waged today by the students of the University of Nuevo León in Monterrey has a decisive importance.

In Monterrey the students have succeeded in forcing the administration to accept student control. An important experiment in self-management and advanced education has been in progress (Marxism has been made compulsory for all majors).

But today the state government, obviously in complicity with Echeverría, has ringed the campus with troops, and proposed to call a "people's assembly" next week to take charge of the university.

This body will be composed of delegates from the reactionary union bureaucracies and the worker, peasant, and "people's" federations that make up the PRI.

Moreover, the climate of repression pervading the country has led to incredible excesses. The common-law prisoners in Lecumberri prison promised to kill members of the MAR if others still at large carried out threats to kidnap diplomats.

The pernicious effects of this wave of chauvinism are not yet exhausted. But it remains to be seen if Echeverría will achieve his objectives. □

## Antiwar Antiquarians?

As if he didn't have enough troubles, Richard Nixon was rejected for membership in the American Antiquarian Society on April 22. He was one of ten candidates for the honor—and the only one to be rejected.

The society, which in the past has had thirteen different U. S. presidents as members, gave no reason for the rejection. The White House later announced that Nixon didn't know his name was under consideration by the group.

# Revolutionary Marxist League Holds Congress

The Swiss LMR [Ligue Marxiste Révolutionnaire—Revolutionary Marxist League] held its first national congress in early April. The group originated in a split of the "Tendance de Gauche" [Left Tendency] from the Vaud cantonal Communist party in 1969. Since then it has organized mainly in the French-speaking part of Switzerland. Recently it has gained influence in the German-speaking areas.

About 150 delegates attended the congress, representing Lausanne, Vevey, Nyon, Neuchâtel, and Bern-Jura, according to the LMR's biweekly organ, *La Brèche*. At the congress the *Rouge* group joined the organization, constituting a Geneva section. In addition, there were about twenty observers from Zurich and Fribourg.

In a country characterized by great local autonomy, the move toward a centralized national organization represents a specially important and difficult step.

"Although most of the speeches centered around a critical examination of the organization's work in various arenas (students, high-school youth, and workers), the theme of centralization dominated the discussion at the congress," *La Brèche* noted.

"The participants were not concerned with discussing program but with the twofold problem of evaluating the LMR's activity, and the need to 're-structure'—to centralize—the organization, in order to achieve the concrete political and organizational conditions necessary for creating a real nationwide organization."

The statutes adopted at the congress stressed that the organizational gains of the LMR reflected its political development: "The question of centralizing the LMR organizationally is only a consequence of the need for centralizing it politically. This political need is rooted in a basic understanding of the function of the revolutionary party. Logically, then, we must try to get the *nucleus* of the future revolutionary party (which will be forged in struggles and undergo profound changes in the process) to set its sights, even at this stage, in the direc-

tion of centralization."

The organization had been able to develop a coherent political approach, according to *La Brèche*, because it had "aligned itself unequivocally with the revolutionary-Marxist movement."

In defining the political situation in Switzerland, the introductory report pointed to a general tendency toward the establishment of a "strong state" and selective repression against the far left. It set out the organization's main tasks as (1) confronting the spontanéist tendencies favored by the political conditions that exist now; (2) gaining a base in the working class.

Under the report on industrial work, three main questions were taken up. The first was the problem of "the type of demands to be advanced in this period when 'labor peace' is beginning to break down." Several speeches stressed the need for raising unifying demands and for integrating them into the framework of the sharpening social crisis.

"Next a series of contributions by comrades took up the question of organizing plant work in relation to the organizational forms (strike committees, workers' assemblies) which begin to arise from struggles. The question to be solved here is important because we must determine how to make the connections between advanced demands and the organizational forms needed to achieve them."

The results of a long discussion on the problem of the Swiss trade unions are scheduled to be published in coming issues of *La Brèche*.

The congress concluded that the organization's current main area of work in building the revolutionary party is the university and high-school arena. To guide this activity, it set a line of "struggle against the class university."

"The revolutionary-Marxist militants must counter bourgeois policy in the universities on two levels—by struggling against all forms of class oppression on the campus (restrictive admissions, bourgeois ideological indoctrination, and the material underdevelopment of the universities) and

by responding correctly to multiple attempts at 'university reform,' advanced either by enlightened bourgeois circles or by the UNES [Union des Etudiants Suisses—Swiss Student Union] in its 'Modèle de Lausanne' [Lausanne Model]."

The congress also took note of new ferment among high-school youth: "The discussion on working among 'high-school youth' was distinguished primarily by the contribution of the Zurich comrades on the strategy that needs to be developed for the trade-school arena and a debate over the need to create a revolutionary youth organization, and ways of doing it.

"Several contributions also stressed the conditions at the root of the 'high-school student' movement now developing in Switzerland."

The congress opened a period of discussion preliminary to a founding congress of a centralized revolutionary organization.

"All the speeches after the three introductory ones on 'industrial work,' 'work among the high-school youth,' and 'in the student milieu,' highlighted the key problem today for the LMR—more complete and clearer programmatic definition, *the working out of a transitional program capable of offering real perspectives to the revolutionary vanguard*. This is the task the entire organization must devote itself to, so that as a result of broad discussion, the LMR can hold a congress this September that will provide the programmatic basis necessary for building a revolutionary organization on the national level." □

## What Does It Do to the Fish?

A survey published by the Belgian Consumers' Association discloses that vacationers might do better to spend their time at home than go swimming in the polluted waters on European beaches.

The association questioned 9,000 tourists who had visited seaside resorts, and found that a large number of them had contracted such diseases as typhoid, paratyphoid, hepatitis, conjunctivitis, and otitis. In Italy, 18 percent of the swimmers caught these diseases.

# Sadat Kicks Out His Vice President

Egypt's Vice President Aly Sabry was removed from his post May 2 by President Anwar el-Sadat. No official reason was given for the action.

Since the ouster coincided with the visit to the Near East of U.S. Secretary of State William Rogers, most commentators speculated that Sabry was removed to facilitate a sellout to Israel on U.S. terms.

A May 2 dispatch from Cairo in the *New York Times* pointed out: "Some of the harshest criticism of the Rogers trip—in which the Secretary of State is seeking agreement on Mr. Sadat's proposal for an Israeli pullback to enable a reopening of the Suez Canal—has been printed in *Al Gomhuriya*, the newspaper of the Arab Socialist Union, which has been considered the stronghold of Mr. Sabry's influence."

*New York Times* correspondent Raymond H. Anderson cabled from Cairo May 3: "Mr. Sabry's supporters in the Arab Socialist Union, Egypt's sole official political organization, have been among the most vehement critics of Cairo's endeavors to reach a political settlement with Israel through the United States. . . .

"There were comments here today that Mr. Sabry's removal might be beneficial to the Rogers mission, since the former Vice President has a reputation for hostility and suspicion toward Washington."

Sabry tended to represent the demagogic, left-sounding side of the official political party. "Mr. Sabry has long been a controversial figure, with many enemies, and his advancement to the leadership would have been certain to provoke protests and disorder at a time when stability was needed in Egypt," Anderson continued.

"Mr. Sabry, a former Secretary General of the Arab Socialist Union, has long striven to enliven the organization and to transform it into an active force for political, ideological and social change in Egypt."

Although Sabry has been considered a strong ally of the Soviet Union, Anderson wrote: ". . . there have been indications that the Soviet leadership has regarded him with wariness."

Most observers saw the immediate cause of Sabry's dismissal in a dispute within the Egyptian government over the proposed federation of Egypt, Libya, and the Sudan.

"Now it seems, we have proof of the rumor that has been going around in recent days," Roland Delcour wrote from Cairo in the May 4 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde*. "Aly Sabry waged an attack inside the Arab Socialist Union against Sadat and his proposed union of the Arab republics. He succeeded April 21 in winning a majority against the president in the supreme executive committee of the party."

"Seen from this angle, the operation looks like a personal quarrel. A former secretary of the Arab Socialist Union, Aly Sabry remained a member of its supreme executive committee. Thus, it was quite natural for him to embrace the cause of a large section of the ASU activists, angered by Sadat's failure to consult them over the proposed federation."

It is not yet clear whether this dis-

pute was only a bureaucratic wrangle or had deeper political meaning.

In the April 30 issue of *Le Monde*, the Egyptian journalist Lotfallah Soliman, who has a reputation for being well informed on the ins and outs of Egyptian politics, took a position opposite to the one presumably held by Sabry. Soliman described the opposition to the new federation as "reactionary subversion."

According to Soliman, the failure of the other Arab states to give full support to Egypt during the Six-Day war promoted a tendency favoring a turn away from the idea of Arab unity and toward concentrating on Egyptian interests alone. This tendency, in Soliman's opinion, was at least objectively a reactionary one.

"Every means was used . . . to commit Egypt to abandon any idea of an Arab policy, which was the best way to complete the isolation of the country, that is, to realize the strategic objective of the United States and Israel."

"The proclamation of the federation of Arab republics halted this reactionary subversion."

Thus, in Soliman's opinion, the new federation represented an advance for the Arab revolution.

Whether Soliman's view is accurate remains to be seen. Certainly the issues involved in the firing of Sabry are far from clear. □

## A Belgian View of April 24

# Solidarity With the Vietnamese Revolution!

[We have translated the following editorial from the April 30 issue of the Belgian revolutionary-socialist weekly *La Gauche*.]

\* \* \*

The success of the mass anti-Vietnam-war demonstrations on April 24 surpassed all hopes. A half million demonstrators in Washington, a quarter million in San Francisco—all those who proclaimed the death of the antiwar movement in the United States look pretty silly now.

Thus, the correct political line of our comrades in the Young Socialist Alliance, who have been the principal promoters of the idea of mass united-front demonstrations against the war, has once again been confirmed by events. Their influence as the main left youth organization in

the United States will be increased by this success.

Two features distinguished the April 24 antiwar demonstrations from those in previous years. First, there was impressive working-class participation in San Francisco, where for the first time a considerable part of the trade-union movement supported the demonstration. This was the result both of increased pressure from the rank and file and the growing discontent of the American workers in the face of the continual rise in the cost of living, record unemployment, and Nixon's antilabor policy.

Secondly, the role of Vietnam war veterans and soldiers still serving in Vietnam is becoming more and more prominent within the antiwar movement. Thus, a dynamic has been revealed that seriously threatens American imperialism. The U.S. imperialists can no longer fulfill their

function of policing the world for capitalism if they do not have an army ready to march into all these dirty wars.

The onset of the moral and political disintegration of the U. S. army in Vietnam is an event of great importance. We must commend the reaction of the South Vietnamese revolutionists of the National Liberation Front and the Provisional Revolutionary Government, who, in the best internationalist tradition, are now trying to accelerate this disintegration by practicing a deliberate policy of fraternization with the GIs. This is how Duong Dinh Thao's April 26 Paris statement—that the South Vietnamese fighters would refrain from attacking any contingent of American soldiers demonstrating its opposition to continuing the war—must be interpreted.

Is this the last quarter-hour of American imperialism in Indochina? Before drawing this conclusion, we must weigh two factors working to limit the extent of the victory of the Indochinese revolution, which is now possible in the near future.

The first danger comes from the pressure of the Democratic party in the U. S., aided by all those elements of both the old left (primarily the Communist party) and the new which refuse to break with the policy of supporting one of the two established bourgeois parties. The threat is that the Democrats will succeed in coopting the antiwar movement and getting it to subordinate everything to the 1972 elections, thereby prolonging again the duration of the war and the weight of the privations, exactions, and sacrifices imposed on the heroic Vietnamese masses.

During this new respite, Nixon would

have no lack of opportunities for stepping up and extending his aggressions.

The second danger is that the Peking bureaucracy will now join with the Moscow bureaucracy to put heavy pressure on Hanoi and the NLF to get them to accept an "honorable compromise" with Nixon.

Of course, we are not opposed to establishment of diplomatic and trade relations between the People's Republic of China and the imperialist powers, including the United States. But just as we deny the Kremlin the right to subordinate the interests of the revolution in any foreign country to its own diplomatic needs, so we must deny this same right to Mao. His behavior toward the Indonesian revolution, the revolution in East Bengal, and the Ceylonese revolution is anything but reassuring. It is not excluded that as a *quid pro quo* for Nixon's establishing good relations with Peking, Mao will bring strong pressure to bear on the Vietnamese revolution. But after the experience of the Geneva agreement, after the experience of a long and victorious revolutionary war, will the NLF let the fruits of its victory be stolen from it? That is something else again.

More than ever the duty of revolutionists, of workers, and of progressives throughout the world is to demonstrate the greatest possible active solidarity with the heroic Vietnamese revolution. And one of the reasons for this solidarity is to protect it during this apparent "last quarter-hour" of struggle, not only against its enemies but also against its "friends," who are ready to sacrifice it on the altar of "peaceful coexistence." □

advantage of actions like the one last Saturday to speak from the platform.

We had the opportunity to deliver a brief message to the huge crowd gathered there, and to millions of other North Americans who were listening and watching from coast to coast on radio and television. Here is what we said:

"People of the United States, I bring a message from one of the most significant frontiers of the third world: the Island of Puerto Rico. I represent the movement for national liberation of my country.

"The freedom-seeking people of Puerto Rico have always been in active solidarity with the heroic Vietnamese people in their struggle to drive the foreign invaders out of their country; and the people of Puerto Rico take the same stand today in solidarity with the peoples of Indochina who are struggling for the same objective. More than conventional solidarity, for us the cause of Indochina is our own cause. Its victories are ours, because we are struggling for the same aim and against the same enemy.

"We too have suffered North American intervention in our country. The right of our people to self-determination is being denied and we are forcefully subjected to the dictates of imperialism.

"As for Vietnam and Indochina in general, we believe that the issue should not be posed in terms of saying that the imperialist troops ought to get out, because the Indochinese are already undertaking to drive them out by blood and fire. They have no other recourse but to leave Indochina, defeated.

"Thus they will have to leave all parts of the world, defeated—wherever they have put their snouts in, including my Puerto Rican country.

"The peoples of the third world, those of Latin America, of which Puerto Rico forms a part, and humanity in general want to live in peace with the people of the United States. In you lies the hope of realizing this peaceful living together.

"In order to achieve this, you must unite, organize yourselves, and overcome imperialism from within. Otherwise, we people of the world will have to unite to destroy the United States. A monster lives here, conspiring against humanity and bringing war, slaughter, and crime to various areas of our planet. The world cannot permit this monster to succeed in enslaving everyone. You here within, and we in all parts of the globe, have the joint responsibility of destroying the monster—Yankee imperialism.

"In Puerto Rico we are struggling to free our soil from the North American invaders. If they don't go and leave us free and tranquil, they will get the same treatment there that they have got in Vietnam. And the same fate. In view of this, upon assembling at your call for an end now to the war in Indochina, we likewise say, Independence for Puerto Rico, Now!"

### Throw Away Your Glasses

"Chairman Mao's brilliant philosophic concepts guide me forward," writes Chinese eye doctor." — Hsinhua, April 22.

## Documents

### Juan Mari Bras's April 24 Speech

[The following is a translation by *Intercontinental Press* of the column by the Puerto Rican leader Juan Mari Bras in the May 2 issue of *Claridad*, the weekly publication of the Movimiento Pro Independencia (MPI).]

\* \* \*

Last Saturday [April 24] we participated in the action in Washington against the United States intervention in Indochina. It was certainly the biggest assembly the North American capital has ever seen. The chief of police of the District of Columbia himself testified to that.

We marched together with a half million persons along Pennsylvania Avenue to the capitol building. There, from the platform, could be seen the immense throng that covered the foreground and the entire avenue as far as the eye could reach.

Various sectors of the antiwar movement in the eastern part of the United States had converged on Washington. The

majority consisted of young people, but there was an impressive number of contingents of middle-aged workers, both men and women, as well as Vietnam war veterans. Flags of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam waved everywhere, and the mass mood was clearly radical, of unreserved solidarity with the peoples of Indochina and stubborn opposition to imperialism.

But it was not like that on the speakers' platform, where more than fifty orators were heard. The majority of them did not measure up to the level of consciousness and combativity of the masses. This was perhaps the negative note in the action. It reflected an anomaly in the North American left. Its leadership has not been able to put together an organizational structure embracing the enormous number of persons who are moving at an increasing rate toward radical positions. The organizational atomization of the left, in conjunction with the opportunism of the liberals, made it possible for even dirty politicians like Herman Badillo to take



# Harry Turner's Complaint to Gerry Healy

[One of the duties of the staff of *Intercontinental Press* is to keep up to date, insofar as it is possible, with happenings among the so-called splinter groups in the left. Politically these formations range from devout followers of Mao Tsetung, Enver Hoxha, and Kim Il Sung to self-proclaimed "Trotskyists." They are generally—but not always—ultraleft sectarians. In size the groups range from half a dozen persons or less to organizations of some pretensions.

[We faithfully read their publications—that is, all those we receive. (Some groups consider it unprincipled to put us on their mailing list.) We follow their disputations with interest—after all, they want to be revolutionists—and we acknowledge a certain enlightenment that would otherwise not have been ours on many a fine hairline in doctrine and dogma. Occasionally we run across an item that strikes us as deserving the attention of a broader audience than the narrow one aimed at by the author. The letter reprinted below is an example.

[The letter appeared in the March issue of the *Vanguard Newsletter*, a well-mimeographed fourteen- to sixteen-page monthly published in New York. Signed by one of the editors, Harry Turner, it is addressed to Gerry Healy, the national secretary of the Socialist Labour League.

[Healy has as yet not publicly acknowledged the letter. Rather than accuse him of not deigning to reply, we leave open the possibility that he never received it. If that happens to be the case, he will no doubt appreciate our making it available to him through the columns of *Intercontinental Press*.

[A few words on the political background so as to make some of the references in the letter more comprehensible: The world Trotskyist movement underwent a split in 1953-54, two factions being formed—one under the leadership of the International Secretariat, headed at the time by Michel Pablo, and the other under the International Committee, which, in the United States, was supported by the Socialist Workers party.

[By 1963 it became possible to reunite the movement on a principled basis, and this was achieved at a Reunification Congress. In token of the healing of the old rupture, the top executive body of the Fourth International was named the "United Secretariat." (For the text of the document stating the principles on which the two sides agreed, see *Intercontinental Press*, May 11, 1970, pp. 442-45.)

[A minority faction in the International Secretariat refused to participate in the reunification. This faction, headed by Juan Posadas, held that a worldwide nuclear war is inevitable; and, since it is inevitable, the sooner the better. Today the Posadist group is considerably reduced in size but still has some forces, principally in Uruguay, where they are currently practicing class-collaborationism as one of the sponsors of the recently formed popular front. Posadas claims to have "reorganized" the Fourth International and to be its true and only leader.

[A minority of the International Committee likewise refused to participate in the reunification. This group was

headed by Gerry Healy in Britain and by Pierre Lambert in France. Their principal point of difference was over the Cuban revolution, which they held had not been victorious. Healy in particular maintained that Fidel Castro was just another "Batista," a view he still insists on. Healy and Lambert continued to use the name "International Committee," although they and their followers constituted only a rump of that formation. Their goal, they have repeatedly proclaimed for the past eight years, is to "reconstruct" the Fourth International.

[Within the Socialist Workers party, which was barred by reactionary legislation in the United States from maintaining its affiliation with the Fourth International, the world party of socialist revolution founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938, a small tendency joined Healy in opposing the 1963 reunification. This tendency was headed by James Robertson and Tim Wohlforth, both of whom were originally followers of Max Shachtman, one of the leaders of a split from the Fourth International in 1939-40.

[Robertson and Wohlforth later parted company. Robertson wound up as the leader of the "Spartacist League" and Wohlforth as leader of the competing "Workers League."

[Harry Turner was aligned with Robertson, but eventually moved into an orbit of his own. The group he belongs to at present apparently calls itself only by the name of its monthly publication.

[We have tried to reproduce the text of Turner's letter exactly as it appeared in the *Vanguard Newsletter*, but have taken the liberty of adding three footnotes.]

\* \* \*

March 12, 1971

Dear Comrade Healy,

You will, of course, wish to be informed about a meeting on January 20, 1971, in which Hugh Fredricks, Harold Robins, Mark Berns and I met as delegates of VANGUARD NEWSLETTER with Tim Wohlforth, Fred Mueller, Pat Connolly and Denis O'Casey of the Workers League.

We considered that a discussion with the WL was again in order upon noting its partial return to Trotsky's and our own position on the Negro question, e.g., the recognition that the Blacks are, "the most dynamic section of the working class", who, therefore, "can and will play an important role...in the construction of a vanguard leadership for the class as a whole", that the real "content" of the Black movement, is one of militant struggle against all oppression, which tends to break through the Black nationalist "form" in which it is often initially expressed.

In arranging with Wohlforth for the meeting at the WL's headquarters, I made clear our reason for requesting it, namely, to explore the implications of the shift in the WL's line on the Negro question, to determine whether a sufficient basis now existed for a cooperative working relationship in which differences would be nar-

rowed, and which, therefore, might lead to an eventual unity.

Wohlforth agreed to the meeting, while also stating his belief that the "real" difference was not on the Negro question, but rather on "internationalism". Despite our feeling that this response was not too promising, we decided to follow through on our overture.

I opened the meeting with a twenty minute presentation of our positions. We welcomed the WL's return to some of Trotsky's positions on the Negro question, and then presented our arguments. We re-stated our belief that our disagreement on this question was the essential barrier to our unity. We requested information as to whether the WL had also reconsidered its position denying that the Black and Spanish-speaking minorities were subject to a special oppression, manifested in the workplace as super-exploitation. We again informed them that we believed the recognition of this condition to be a potentially powerful lever with which to raise the political class consciousness of Black and white workers in the process of uniting them in a struggle for their immediate and fundamental interests. We contrasted our approach, in which the struggle against special oppression was united to the transitional program, to theirs, in which a *concrete* program of struggle against racism was absent.

We also posed our positions for a united front approach to existing Black caucuses, support to the *right* of the Black masses to a section of the US for a separate state, should they wish it, and to the *right* of the Quebecois to independence, as rooted in the Leninist position of the right of nations to self-determination, which seeks to *unite* the workers of oppressor and oppressed nations for the socialist revolution.

We praised their work in publishing a regular weekly paper, and their concentration in the trade union movement, and concluded with the hope that the discussion would prove fruitful in further narrowing existing political differences.

Wohlforth responded by informing us that, in his opinion, the fundamental question was our recognition that the International Committee's struggle against Pabloism<sup>1</sup> represented the continuity of the struggle for the Fourth International, and that the Negro question was subordinate to the "program of the WL and IC". According to Wohlforth, our decision not to join their organization was "historically wrong". Their shift of position on the Negro question proved that we could have in-

1. In January 1964, Michel Pablo launched a personal magazine called *Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme*. In the May 1965 issue, he published a statement indicating that he would not abide by the decisions of the projected world congress of the Fourth International. For a translation of this statement and a declaration of the United Secretariat on it, "Pablo Announces His Break with the Fourth International," see *World Outlook* (the former name of *Intercontinental Press*), May 28, 1965, pages 31-40. Pablo is at present the leader of Tendance Marxiste Revolutionnaire, which continues to publish *Sous le Drapeau du Socialisme* as its "central organ." Aside from this quarterly, which is printed in Paris, we do not know of any other publication put out by this grouping.

The Healyites dismissed Pablo's departure from the Fourth International as meaningless. Of the various currents that pay homage to either Healy or Lambert, not one has ever analyzed the political significance of the split led by Pablo in 1965. To do so would bring into question their first article of faith, namely, the dire menace of "Pabloism." — IP

fluenced the course of the WL from within, instead of opposing it from without.

Even had they arrived at full agreement with us on the Negro question, they "could not care less", as they were not interested in "episodic agreements". It was a question of "Marxist method". Until we reconsidered our attitude toward the "fundamental question" of "internationalism", on which they had become "even more fanatical", acknowledged that we had adopted "Robertson's position" toward the IC, and repudiated our incorrect course, there was "nothing to discuss". This accusation and demand for our recantation were echoed by Pat Connolly.

Furthermore, said Wohlforth, they were still in basic disagreement with Trotsky's position on the Negro question, although they now "understood more clearly" those "parts" concerning the "relationship of the Black vanguard to the working class as a whole". They still held to their criticism of Trotsky, made in the pamphlet on Black nationalism and in Lucy St. John's articles.<sup>2</sup>

In an attempt at provoking a discussion, Cde. Fredricks questioned Wohlforth as to the motivation for the changes which the WL had made on this question. However, Wohlforth's reply was evasive. Throughout the meeting, he refused to argue the merits of their position on this question, but simply made assertions. He insisted that they "were not blind followers of Trotsky", that he had made a number of mistakes, that he was "wrong", not only on this question, but also on the Jewish question. He had referred to the "Jewish nation". "Wrong!"

Wohlforth also falsely charged Cde. Robins with being a "Zionist", and informed him that he would not be permitted in their organization under any circumstances. It was, however, his reaction to Cde. Robins' contribution to the discussion, which completely revealed Wohlforth's real political "method".

Cde. Robins criticized the account of the politics in the "International Report" by Wohlforth to the WL's convention which had appeared in the Jan. 11, 1971 "Bulletin", as lacking in the most fundamental premises and methodology which one would expect from a Trotskyist. It did not contain an analysis of the international and domestic economic situation, the spiraling inflation throughout the world, or conclusions as to its effect on the working class movement in the US. It said nothing about the US imperialist war in Indochina, the present split in the ruling class, the role of Stalinism and petty-bourgeois pacifism, and the morale of the army, and presented no comprehensive military policy toward the war. The report also reflected the WL's abandonment of the Trotskyist policy of uniting the Black and white workers in struggle against job and other forms of racial discrimination. For a period of developing crisis, Wohlforth simply dwelt on the need to study philosophy. "What kind of Trotskyism is that", asked Cde. Robins?

At this point, Wohlforth interrupted, refused to allow him to finish his remarks, and then justified this conduct

2. The Healyites believe that Trotsky was ignorant on the question of the Black liberation struggle in the United States. Because of this presumed ignorance, Trotsky was led, they believe, into a "revisionist" position—that is, supporting Black nationalism a number of decades before it appeared. For an analysis of the Healyite position referred to in the letter above, see "The Healyites Begin to Unravel Their 'Trotskyism'" by Joseph Hansen, in *Intercontinental Press*, February 24, 1969, pages 190-95. — IP

on the basis that at *their* headquarters, *they* made the rules governing discussion!

He then broke up the meeting by demanding that Cde. Robins immediately vacate their premises, by calling him a "deserter from Trotskyism", and by threatening, at some distance and in the language of the gutter, that he would have his nose broken if he ever returned there. This, to a man who is more than twenty years his senior, was a founding member of the Trotskyist movement and an active Trotskyist for more than forty years, and who continues to function prominently and openly as a Trotskyist in his trade union and as a member of our organization!

Assuming that Wohlforth's behavior has a rational explanation, what could he have hoped to gain by so gross a rejection of our well-intentioned overture? Fear that a cooperative relationship might expose his members to our ideas, might cause his "flock" to stray? Perhaps. He may have felt that our small numbers permitted him to act in so arrogant a fashion. If so, his miscalculation was as gross as his behavior.

We do not bluff about our size, as do some other radical groups. Our newsletter, however, is read by most political tendencies on the "left" in this country, as well as by a number of organizations abroad. His "method" in "discussions" with other tendencies will, unfortunately, discredit, not only the WL but also, the other organizations of the IC with which it is in solidarity. Wohlforth's conduct will, undoubtedly, provide grist to the mills of the Pabloist United Secretariat, who may even use it to justify their rejection of your own recent proposals for discussion with them.

As to the criticism by Wohlforth which alone deserves a response—that we have not "broken" from Robertson's "method", in rejecting "internationalism" for such "subordinate" considerations as the Negro question—we welcome the opportunity of again making our position clear.

Hugh Fredricks and I informed the WL, in refusing Wohlforth's invitation to join it, of our belief that a section of an international Leninist and Trotskyist working class vanguard party *could not be built* in the racially divided US on the basis of its program of passive adaptation to white chauvinism, and that it would have been an abrogation of principle unworthy of Trotskyists to have joined an organization whose program, we believed, *insured* the failure of our common perspective.

In addition, and as I stated in my letter to Robert Sherwood, at the time, in informing him of the events which had transpired at the last WL meeting which we attended:

"... the forms of membership would be emptied of content, under the circumstances, in that we would have to either mutely radiate our differences on a question touching almost every aspect of practical activity, or would, by constantly raising our differences, constantly disrupt the work of the organization . . . the relationship of the individual to the collective could not be maintained, where programmatic differences were so serious, without doing violence to one, the other or both . . ."

"Until we can reach sufficient programmatic agreement with the WL, it is as wrong for it to pose membership to us, as it would be wrong for us to accept it. What kind of members could we be under circumstances where we were, in effect, debarred from making *political* contributions on basic questions? It was not our subordina-

tion to the WL that was posed, but, in reality, our political obliteration."

The WL responded, as you know, by passing Wohlforth's motion that, "the Turner group" is an "alien petty-bourgeois tendency", and "breaking off all political relations with it". We believe, however, that our position was and is principled and in excellent agreement with Trotsky's conception, as stated in his article on the centrism of the ILP, "In the Middle of the Road", that:

"The International is first of all a program, and a system of *strategic, tactical and organizational* methods that flow from it." (Trotsky's emphasis)

We are small, but, in our modest way, we are also trying to build the Fourth International. We do this, however, not by subordinating program to the *fetish* of "internationalism", as does Wohlforth, but by fighting for a program which we believe can build a real, living section of such an international in the US, the heartland of world capitalism and imperialism. We believe this to be the greatest service we can provide an international.

Robertson's split from the IC in 1962 and 1966,<sup>3</sup> was motivated, as we have shown, by petty egotistical considerations. Programmatic disagreements were *entirely subordinate*. By lumping our serious political differences with Robertson's unprincipled behavior, Wohlforth only reveals his own unprincipled attitude toward program. Having rejected Trotsky's position on the Negro question, the heart of the American question, he really demands that we behave as Robertson did, to ignore our program, to discard it to worship, along with Wohlforth and company, at the empty shrine of an abstract "internationalism" without program.

Under the fetish of "internationalism", Wohlforth is, obviously, building a *personal* organization, and not the "Fourth International", as he claims. We believe that he cannot tolerate an organization which unites "under its banner the most audacious iconoclasts, fighters and insurgents . . .", in Trotsky's choice descriptive phrase of Lenin's Bolshevik Party in *The Revolution Betrayed*. We had noted two years ago, and had so informed the WL's members at the last meeting which we attended, that their meetings resembled a "chicken-pecking order", and not a real collective. Wohlforth "pecks" all others, but no one dares reply to the criticism or to criticize him. The other "leaders", in their turn, criticize lesser "lights", also without fear of a rejoinder. The same technique is utilized by Robertson, who was also trained in these methods in the same Shachtmanite school.

It is possible that Wohlforth believes that this sort of "leadership" can produce a mass party. We do not agree. He is able to draw together a few dependent souls by utilizing the banners of the IC in a mystical fashion. We have noted not a few individuals in the WL's ranks whose approach to the organization resembled that of "true believers". As you well know, utilizing the banners of October, the Stalinized Communist parties were able to recruit and even retain thousands of very devoted and subjectively revolutionary members, not only in the ul-

3. At an international conference of the Healyites held in April 1966, Robertson, as well as others who had been invited to attend, was thrown out. For documents and comments on the fiasco of this conference, see the pamphlet *Healy "Reconstructs" the Fourth International*. Available for \$35 from Pathfinder Press, 873 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 10003. — IP

tra-left period, but also in the overtly counter-revolutionary "popular front" period, i.e., regardless of program. We do not believe that the IC's banners can be utilized in this manner to build a mass party. Even if such a fantasy could be realized, such a party would be entirely incapable of leading the working class to power.

We have never denied that the IC, in fighting Pabloist revisionism, was conducting a struggle for the continuity of revolutionary Marxism, for the Fourth International. It is because of that struggle and because of our own struggle along the same lines, that our tendency stands politically closest to you. We share a common heritage, outlook and goal. However, we do not have sufficient programmatic agreement to enable us to join you in one organization.

Our differences on China seem to have vanished along with your critical support to Mao Tse Tung and his "Cultural Revolution". However, we still differ on Cuba. We do not see it as capitalist, but rather, as a deformed workers' state, not qualitatively differing from those in Eastern Europe, China or the Soviet Union. We cannot see the "Arab Revolution" in the peasant-guerrilla struggles of the fedayeen as you do. You share this position with the Pabloists, the Stalinists and a number of other opportunist organizations. We consider your long diplomatic silence on the Stalinist *program* of betrayal of the Indo-chinese struggle, which you have covered over with the slogan of "Victory to the NLF", to be a serious disservice to the "struggle for the Fourth International". Finally and decisively, we believe that your co-thinkers in the WL are still following policies which make impossible the construction of a viable section of the Fourth International in the US.

We do not believe that the WL's present eclectic political patchwork, which it presents as having been derived by Marxist "METHOD", can produce anything but what it already has produced, confusion. Nor do we believe that personal vituperation, slander, spite and willfulness have anything in common with Leninist hardness. The hardness of the Bolsheviks was founded in theoretical clarity, in a clear understanding of the road which the working class must take to the socialist revolution.

Wohlforth seems eager to call attention to the "number", usually unspecified, of Trotsky's "mistakes" to justify the WL's faulty politics, and to present himself as the superior "theoretician". And what was Trotsky's "mistake" on the Jewish question? Trotsky was incapable of conceptualizing eternal, immutable categories, and saw every phenomenon, *including the national*, in motion, in development, in the process of becoming or disappearing, unlike the master of "METHOD", Wohlforth. Trotsky had pointed out, early in 1937, that the anti-semitic policies of "decaying capitalism" was helping keep alive Yiddish culture in Europe, and bringing into being a "Jewish nation", which would "maintain itself for an entire epoch to come", and which would, therefore, seek a "common territory". While Zionism was "incapable of resolving the Jewish question", socialism would enable "the dispersed Jews", other "scattered nations" such as the Arabs and "parts of nationalities" to be "reassembled" in a community of their own choice.

We believe that the process of building the Fourth International will eventually bring us together in one organization. We look forward to the narrowing of our political differences. We believe that this unity can only

come about as a result of our contending ideas, acted on and tested in the crucible of the objective process. To the extent that our political differences diminish, we will seek to further the process of unity. We do not allow personality to outweigh program.

We are confident that you will find objectionable Wohlforth's assertion that his petty-bourgeois property rights determine the norms for discussion or the rules of conduct for meetings of socialists or for any civilized group, for that matter. The WL's adoption of neo-Stalinist methods should be a matter of concern to revolutionary socialists, and certainly to his co-thinkers abroad.

Fraternally,  
Harry Turner

## Explanation of Nixon's Behavior?

## Government by Air Pollution

Australians will no doubt be proud to learn that their country has surpassed the United States in one of the important measures of capitalist industrial development. Robert Trumbull reported in the April 25 *New York Times* that Sydney, Australia's largest city, has a higher level of carbon monoxide pollution in the air than any city in the United States.

A study conducted by the New South Wales state government found concentrations of carbon monoxide as high as 40 parts per million in Sydney. The best that U. S. cities could do was 39 parts per million in Chicago, 37 in Denver, and 32 in Los Angeles.

The chief source of carbon monoxide pollution is automobile exhausts. This may explain why New York City registered only 15 parts carbon monoxide per million parts air: In New York, the streets are so congested and automobile thefts so frequent that most people have stopped trying to drive.

The U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) recently established air pollution standards that it hopes might be achieved by 1975. These would limit carbon monoxide to nine parts per million.

E. W. Kenworthy wrote in the May 1 *New York Times* that carbon monoxide "... in accumulations found in many cities today, can impair mental processes."

This fact may provide an explanation of the way governments deal—or fail to deal—with environmental contamination. One suspects that the city government of Sydney, for example, must be addicted to sniffing automobile exhausts to permit the dumping of 200,000,000 gallons of sewage a day off the city's beaches.

We have not seen any figures on carbon monoxide levels in the capital city of the United States, but we do recall that during antiwar demonstrations, such as the one on November 15, 1969, it has been the custom of the government to surround the White House with a wall of buses. It may well be that the carbon monoxide produced when those buses started up would have been sufficient to cause permanent brain damage to anyone who happened to be in the neighborhood. □