



What Were the Secret Commitments?

# Behind Nixon's Trip to Peking

KISSINGER: Found trip to Peking perfect cure for stomach trouble. See p. 699.

Ernest Mandel:

## *Great Britain's Entry Into the Common Market*

# Rising Pollution

## Copenhagen

Air pollution in Danish cities and industrial areas has already reached the point where it may cause death, according to a report by the Danske Forureningsrad [Danish Council on Pollution]. In concise language the report documented the extent of air pollution and its deleterious effect on the health of the people.

The report noted that air pollution is responsible for many deaths attributed in the papers to heart failure, circulatory ailments, etc. It has also been ascertained that certain levels of sulfur dioxide contamination in the air cause chronic respiratory disturbances in children. Such levels have already been recorded in some winter months in Copenhagen.

Air pollution is also a contributing factor in adult ailments. "Dangerous changes in the lining of the bronchial tubes and even in lung tissue result from constant exposure to minimal levels of sulfur dioxide contamination in which the particles filter into the bronchi and lessen resistance to infections," the report noted.

"These changes in the lung tissue," the report continued, "put a burden on the left side of the heart, which becomes enlarged and thus weakened. In particular, when air pollution increases, interference with blood circulation in the lungs can place an acute strain on the heart, producing heart failure. Such heart failure leads to death in many cases, and not only in smog emergencies but also under conditions that normally prevail during the winter months."

At the same time, Swedish researchers have shown that the concentration of DDT and PCB in the Baltic is ten times higher than it is off the Dutch and British coasts, and that if this pollution is not halted, there is danger that entire species of birds and fish will become extinct.

A sonar study of fish resources has also shown that in many parts of the Baltic, considered the world's most polluted sea, all life has perished above 100 meters from the bottom. □

## In This Issue

		<b>FEATURES</b>
Ernest Mandel	703	Great Britain's Entry Into the Common Market
		<b>ECOLOGY</b>
	698	Rising Pollution in Denmark
		<b>CHINA</b>
Joseph Hansen	699	Behind Nixon's Projected Trip to Peking
		<b>NEW ZEALAND</b>
	702	Holyoake Raises a Reasonable Objection
		<b>FRANCE</b>
Jon Rothschild	705	Broad Campaign Against Repression
	712	Bretons Stage Language Demonstration
		<b>IRAN</b>
Javad Sadeeg	706	Stalinists Back Mao's Betrayal
		<b>U. S. A.</b>
Dianne Feeley	707	Women Launch Abortion Repeal Campaign
	711	Seek Indictment of "N.Y. Times" Reporter
		<b>IRELAND</b>
Gerry Foley	708	Nationalists in Derry City Battle British Tanks
	718	Nationalist Acquitted of Frame-Up Charge
		<b>DOMINICAN REPUBLIC</b>
	709	Political Prisoners Jailed Illegally
		<b>MOROCCO</b>
	710	Coup Aimed at Corrupt Officials
		<b>ANTIWAR</b>
	711	Antiwar Officer Convicted
		<b>INDOCHINA WAR</b>
	712	How Nixon Handles Vietnam Refugees
	717	Napalm Sticks to Kids
		<b>PAKISTAN</b>
	713	Bengali Resistance Reported Growing
		<b>CANADA</b>
Art Young	714	Why Trudeau Lost in Quebec
		<b>PHILIPPINES</b>
Francisco Blandino	716	Convention Plans Reactionary Constitution
		<b>REVIEWS</b>
	718	A Guaranteed Best-Seller
		<b>DOCUMENTS</b>
Joseph Hansen	719	The Opening Move in Mao's Bid to Nixon
		<b>DRAWINGS</b>
Copain	697	Henry Kissinger; 700, Chiang Ching-kuo; 701, Hugh Scott; 708, Jack Lynch; 715, Pierre Elliott Trudeau

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: Allen Myers.

EDITORIAL STAFF: Gerry Foley, George Saunders.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.

TECHNICAL STAFF: H. Massey, James M. Morgan, Jon Rothschild.

Published in New York each Monday except last in December and first in January; 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, 10 Impasse Guemenee, Paris 4, 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.

# Behind Nixon's Projected Trip to Peking

By Joseph Hansen

*"Premier Chou En-lai and Dr. Henry Kissinger, President Nixon's Assistant for National Security Affairs, held talks in Peking from July 9 to 11, 1971. Knowing of President Nixon's expressed desire to visit the People's Republic of China, Premier Chou En-lai on behalf of the Government of the People's Republic of China, has extended an invitation to President Nixon to visit China at an appropriate date before May, 1972.*

*"President Nixon has accepted the invitation with pleasure.*

*"The meeting between the leaders of China and the United States is to seek the normalization of relations between the two countries and also to exchange views on questions of concern to the two sides."*

Peking radio broadcast the text of the above announcement without comment. Simultaneously in Los Angeles, Nixon, obviously elated, read the statement personally on a special nationwide television and radio hookup July 15, adding some comments:

"... a major development in our efforts to build a lasting peace in the world... will not be at the expense of our old friends... not directed against any other nation."

The announcement climaxed secret diplomatic moves involving Rumanian President Nicolae Ceausescu, the French Foreign Ministry, and the Yahya Khan dictatorship in Pakistan.

The final move was Kissinger's eleven-day "fact-finding" tour around the world, which, it is now obvious, was camouflage for his real objective.

Arriving in Rawalpindi, Kissinger vanished from sight, "indisposed with a stomach ailment." As has now been announced, a Pakistan International Airways plane flew him to Peking where he spent forty-nine hours, twenty of them in conferences with Chou En-lai.

The most vital topics discussed with the Chinese premier by Nixon's envoy will probably remain closely guarded state secrets. However, the implications of Mao's invitation to Nixon

and Nixon's acceptance are fairly obvious.

First of all, it can be taken for granted that the Nixon administration will no longer oppose the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations.

Secondly, at a point when he judges it will do the most good for his campaign for reelection in 1972, Nixon can be expected to announce formal U. S. recognition of the Mao government. His acceptance of an invitation to visit Peking constitutes informal recognition. He could hardly visit hosts that do not exist.

For U. S. imperialism these are not so much concessions as gains. The policy of blockading China became counterproductive long ago, and Wall Street has had many reasons for wanting to shift to a more flexible approach. In fact the change has been advocated for years by a sector of the American ruling class.

For China, U. S. recognition constitutes a substantial advantage. In the arena of world diplomacy it means enhanced prestige and greater weight. The economic gains will be considerable, the most immediate being widened access to the world market and enhanced possibilities of obtaining badly needed materials.

Already the Nixon administration has listed a series of commodities that can now be shipped to China and has likewise approved entry into the U. S. of previously banned Chinese goods. Tourism could prove to be a considerable source of foreign exchange if Peking cares to develop it.

## Dismay in Taiwan

Among the immediate reactions to Nixon's announcement, some were to be anticipated. In Taiwan, the Chiang Kai-shek puppet regime lodged a "strong protest," following an emergency meeting of top officials. Premier C. K. Yen said, "This could lead to a tragedy far more serious than that involved in the fall of the Chinese mainland" to the Communists in 1949.

The "more serious" tragedy, of course, would be the necessity of fleeing from Taiwan.

In Washington, Chinese Nationalist Ambassador James C. H. Shen denounced Nixon's planned visit as a "shady deal."

Chiang Kai-shek and his son and heir Chiang Ching-kuo have been waiting to be "unleashed" as part of a U. S. invasion of China ever since they fled from the mainland more than two decades ago. Now they fear that Nixon regards them as expendable, a conclusion that may well be accurate.

Similarly in Saigon, some of the puppets began talking about a "betrayal" by their patron in Washington.

In the United States, the extreme rightists sent up a few trial balloons. Senator James L. Buckley, the Republican-Conservative of New York, in his first major criticism of the Nixon administration, said: "At home it will inevitably strengthen the hand of those seeking accommodation with the Communist world at almost any price" and in Asia "the grand scale of this overture to Peking will be anything but reassuring to those who have to live with the aggressive reality of mainland China."

It is not likely that the ultraright, which includes the once-powerful China Lobby, will meet with much response. Buckley, for instance, overlooks one of the key slogans now obviously being prepared for Nixon's 1972 campaign: "He won China."

## Republican Machine Elated

The reaction of the Republican machine can be judged from the immediate responses of some of its key leaders.

Gerald R. Ford of Michigan, the House Republican leader, said: "The prospect of a visit of President Nixon to Peking will be singularly significant in the pursuit of world peace.

"I would expect, for instance, that the one subject the President and Chou En-lai would discuss is the convening of an Indochina peace conference."

Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, the Senate Republican leader, said that now "Hanoi is bound to be looking over its shoulder wondering how much longer China would support its war effort."

Jacob K. Javits, the liberal Republican senator from New York, who is a member of the Senate Foreign

Relations Committee and a "dove," said that Nixon's announcement "forecast the real likelihood of a troop withdrawal from Indochina by the time of the President's trip before May, 1972."

As for the Democrats, Mike Mansfield, who holds the powerful position of Senate majority leader, said that Nixon's announcement "could very substantially help to end the Vietnam war." He added that "China may well be the third party, or one of the third parties, behind what has been happening at the Paris peace talks this month."

Mansfield was referring to the seven-point plan submitted by Nguyen Thi Binh calling for the release of American prisoners of war in exchange for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam by the end of 1971. This plan was endorsed by Peking.

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey of Minnesota, the 1968 Democratic candidate for the presidency, voiced the official position of his party. He commended Nixon for "this important diplomatic initiative," expressed the hope that Nixon could visit Peking "in the very near future," and expanded eloquently on the meaning of it all: "Such a visit could be of immense importance in bringing about a speedy end to the war in Vietnam and of laying the groundwork for an extended period of peace and development throughout all the world and especially Asia."

The essence of the Democratic party view was expressed by an unidentified machine politician in Washington: "The Democratic nomination is worth \$5 less today than it was yesterday."

### The Trotskyist View

Those who have faithfully defended the Chinese revolution against its foes — among whom the bitterest and most powerful have been the imperialists of the U. S. — will feel deep satisfaction that at long last Washington has been compelled to recognize that the People's Republic of China does exist.

The normalization of relations has been a primary objective of all defenders of the Chinese revolution since the victory in 1949. On a world scale, the sections and sympathizing organizations of the Fourth International, for instance, have stood in the forefront of the struggle to win recognition of the People's Republic of China from all the capitalist countries.

In the United States, the Socialist Workers party fought for this demand even in the worst period of McCarthyism, when it could prove costly to stand up in defense of the Chinese revolution. In those days, Nixon was one of the pack who built their careers on witch-hunting even members of their own class who proposed taking a rational attitude toward China.

But while rejoicing over the momentous gain for China represented by the turn in U.S. foreign policy, revolu-



CHIANG CHING-KUO: Nixon decides not to "unleash" hero of China Lobby.

tionists are duty bound to examine the circumstances in which this has occurred; for the question naturally arises — why the change at this particular time? What led Nixon — who remains little changed from what he was in the fifties, a reactionary of the McCarthyite school — to begin quipping about his taste for Chinese dishes, particularly those prepared by Chou En-lai and Mao Tsetung?

The reason is quite clear. The Mao regime has indicated to Nixon that it is willing to help him in Vietnam. In short, Peking is in the business of betraying revolutions in the tradition of the master betrayer whom they hail as their guide and teacher — Stalin.

The proofs could not be more palpable. Peking came out foursquare against the people of Bangla Desh who rose almost unanimously against

the dictatorship of Yahya Khan. Peking supplied arms and money to the dictator to crush the rebellion; and it openly denounced the people of Bangla Desh for striking out for their freedom.

Peking followed precisely the same course in the case of the rebellion in Ceylon. Chou himself went to the most brazen lengths to associate Peking with the Bandaranaike regime and against the rebels. He put money on the line in the form of a most generous loan; he offered arms to be used against the rebels; and he denounced the rebels.

Not even Nixon could misunderstand that language — if he had not completely grasped the meaning of Mao's consistent policy over the years of seeking alliances with "progressive" sectors of the colonial bourgeoisie, a policy that helped pave the way in Indonesia for the debacle of 1965 and the slaughter of as many as a million Indonesian Communists.

Quite likely Mao and Chou spelled out in plain terms what they are prepared to do in Vietnam; otherwise why the secret diplomacy?

### Another Geneva Conference?

Even while Kissinger was in Peking, another diplomat, unaware that Nixon's agent was in town, was given a briefing by Chou En-lai that made front-page news throughout the world. Gough Whitlam, leader of the opposition Labor party in Australia, cabled Prime Minister William McMahon of Australia that Premier Chou had informed him in a conversation that the Mao government was willing to participate in a new Geneva conference. The Australian embassy in Washington relayed the information to the State Department July 14.

It was at the Geneva conference in 1954 that the Vietnamese were cheated of their victory over French imperialism. The country was divided in half and the basis was laid for installing a puppet regime in Saigon.

The clear implication of Chou's conversation with Whitlam was that the Mao regime is willing to participate in a new Geneva conference that would still leave U.S. imperialism a beachhead of some kind in Indochina.

This is precisely what Nixon has sought to achieve — some kind of Korea-type settlement.

Peking could, of course, put enor-

mous pressure on Hanoi for such a deal, since a good part of the arms and supplies required to keep up the struggle against the U. S. aggression comes from China, or through China from Moscow.

## Blow to the Antiwar Struggle

It remains to be seen whether Chou's proposal to stage another Geneva conference is accepted by either Hanoi or the freedom fighters in Indochina. The counterrevolutionary effects of Mao's invitation to Nixon were nonetheless immediately apparent.

The antiwar movement in the United States succeeded through its mass mobilizations in putting enormous pressure on Nixon to end the U. S. aggression and withdraw all the U. S. forces from Indochina *now*. Nixon was in deep trouble politically, and his excuses—all of them designed to gain time—were getting flimsier and flimsier.

When the representatives of the Vietnamese people at the Paris talks proposed their seven-point plan to exchange the American prisoners of war for an early withdrawal date, the heat was really on. Nixon's last excuse had been blown up.

He was saved by the invitation to visit Peking. Setting the date of the visit for next spring gave him a new breathing space. *He has an excuse for prolonging the war at least until then.* In ten months a lot of people can be killed. And then Nixon will see. . . .

The antiwar forces in the United States, which now include a significant sector—if not a majority—of the troops in Vietnam, came under quick fire.

Since the announcement of the trip, the communications media have been flooded with propaganda about the immense step allegedly taken toward peace. Nixon and Mao will reach a settlement! Everything can now safely be left in their powerful and competent hands! No more need for mass actions or for protests of any kind!

## Have the Tables Been Turned?

Will Nixon's diplomatic coup convince the American people that peace is now in the bag? Will it soften the class antagonisms that have grown sharper and sharper as the war dragged on?

This remains to be seen. The impa-

tience with the war, with Nixon's lies, with the domestic economic and social consequences of the costly and bloody adventure, is very deep in the United States. Significantly, within a day of the announcement about a May deadline for the trip, the White House was spreading the word that Nixon might go to Peking much earlier—possibly by the end of December or early in January.

In any case, it is certainly the hope



SCOTT: Compelled to admit that "Mao Tse-tung Thought" can work miracles.

of the ruling class that the tables have now been turned on the swelling antiwar movement, thanks to the good offices of Mao and Chou. The long-standing rift in the ranks of the ruling class over the war was healed as if by a miracle.

The *New York Times*, which only weeks ago published the Pentagon papers, precipitating an unprecedented showdown between the press and the administration, shifted 180 degrees overnight and with the next edition after Nixon's broadcast was praising the president to the skies and beginning the task of creating new and more likable images of Mao and Chou. Light has finally been seen at the end of the tunnel!

Nixon likewise scored heavily at the expense of the Democratic Republic of

Vietnam, the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, and the National Front for the Liberation of South Vietnam.

All the evidence indicates that they were not consulted in advance. They were handled by Peking as expendable in reaching a deal with U. S. imperialism.

Not without maliciousness, Anthony Lewis observed in the July 18 *New York Times*: "As for the Vietnamese Communists, they might not know for some time what deal Peking could be prepared to make at their expense, for some larger purpose. Mrs. Binh, interviewed by Reuters on Friday, said the Chinese would never settle with Mr. Nixon over the heads of the Vietcong.

"'This would be inconceivable,' she said. Was there a touch of self-persuasion in her words?"

Evidently the *New York Times* has good reason to believe that it is not inconceivable that Peking would slip a knife into the back of the Vietnamese at the very moment they were within sight of a clear-cut victory over U. S. imperialism.

## Moscow Displeased

The reaction in Moscow was displeasure, as indicated by official silence. The displeasure was not motivated by revolutionary considerations but by the alteration in relations between Peking and Washington, which now places the Kremlin at a greater disadvantage in its own dealings with U. S. imperialism.

The Soviet bureaucracy has only itself to blame. The Sino-Soviet dispute was precipitated by Khrushchev's decision to make a nuclear pact with the Eisenhower administration at the expense of China. The chickens have now come home to roost. U. S. imperialism turned out to be the ultimate gainer. The State Department is finally in effective position to play Peking against Moscow and Moscow against Peking, applying increasing leverage in efforts to widen and deepen the differences between the two giant workers states.

One of the consequences of Nixon's announcement will be recriminations in top circles of the Soviet bureaucracy. The prestige of Brezhnev and Kosygin will drop to a new low. Perhaps they may find themselves in the unhappy position of being converted

into scapegoats, just as they joined in making a scapegoat of Khrushchev.

## The Dupes of Maoism

Those most stunned by the current diplomacy of the Mao regime are the currents in the left that have been favorably disposed toward Maoism. The ultraleft posture of the Mao regime was mistakenly interpreted by them to be genuinely revolutionary. They were taken in by the willingness of Peking to offer training to prospective guerrillas and to supply them with small arms in certain countries. The ultraleft language of "Mao Tsetung Thought" bolstered this false interpretation.

The disaster in Indonesia made many of them uneasy. Mao's brazen betrayal of the people of Bangla Desh and the rebels of Ceylon completed the education of a good many others. It is to be hoped that Mao's current wheeling and dealing with Nixon will dispel any final illusions that may still linger here or there.

One of the most ironic aspects of Mao's decision to make a deal with U. S. imperialism is that this was one of the main charges leveled against his opponents in the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Mao is now doing precisely what he accused Liu Shao-chi of wanting to do.

To find a parallel it is necessary to go back to the Soviet Union of the thirties, when Stalin butchered a generation of revolutionists and potential political opponents on framed-up charges of plotting to make a deal with German imperialism, only to end up making a pact with Hitler himself.

## China's Bureaucratic Caste

Like Stalin, Mao represents a bureaucratic caste. This formation in China is not identical in all its features to the one in the Soviet Union, but it is basically similar. Its chief characteristic is that it places its own narrow, nationalistic interests above the interests of the world revolution, including the interests of the Chinese revolution.

This was not seen by many analysts, primarily because of the persistence with which U. S. imperialism rejected dealing even with this conservative caste. Washington's refusal to recognize China helped maintain the revolutionary aura of the Mao regime.

The Peking government undertook defensive measures that sometimes had revolutionary consequences, outstanding examples being the military defense of China at the time of the Korean war and the accompanying expropriation of capitalist holdings within China.

It was notable, however, that at home Mao sedulously blocked and rooted out any tendency toward proletarian democracy; while abroad he relied in the main on alliances with the treacherous colonial bourgeoisie. Mao also sought to organize Peking-oriented movements in rivalry to the Moscow-oriented movements founded by Stalin.

This course was in conformity with the nature of the social formation represented by Mao.

The veneer of ultraleftism was not in contradiction to this; it constituted a necessary part under the circumstances.

When—under the blows of the antiwar movement in the United States and elsewhere and the unyielding resistance of the freedom movement in Vietnam—U. S. imperialism finally came to require the services of the Chinese disciple of Stalin, it did not require much to induce Mao to roll out the great red carpet.

In Bengla Desh, in Ceylon, and now in the invitation to Nixon to visit Peking, the underlying nature of the social formation holding power in China was suddenly bared in the most palpable way. The basic reality broke

through to the surface for all to see.

## Publish the Secret Commitments!

The world situation has been altered by the rapprochement between Peking and Washington. Of that there can be no doubt. But this will not change the deeper currents in the international class struggle. In fact in some areas it may give even greater impulsion to them.

A case in point is the antiwar struggle. The general conclusion among those who have been demanding the immediate withdrawal of U. S. troops from Indochina, and who have been organizing mass demonstrations to underline that demand, may well be that now there is all the more reason to insist that the U. S. get out of South-east Asia at once.

Nixon's last arguments have been utterly disposed of. Hanoi has proposed exchanging the prisoners of war for a 1971 withdrawal date. With Mao supporting this proposal and evidently now on friendly terms with the White House, a withdrawal can be undertaken at once without risking the life of a single GI. What is Nixon waiting for?

If Nixon still refuses to withdraw the troops, a new question can come to the fore: What secret commitments have Nixon and Mao already made?

A fresh demand may then be heard around the world: Publish the record of Kissinger's twenty-hour discussion with Chou En-lai! □

## Holyoake Raises a Reasonable Objection

The Nixon administration is not only attempting to keep U. S. imperialism's secrets from the American public. It seems almost equally concerned about withholding information from its accomplices.

James M. Naughton reported in the July 11 *New York Times* that the New Zealand government had been refused a copy of the Pentagon's secret study of the Indochina war. He said that Raymond L. Jermyn, minister of the New Zealand embassy in Washington, had requested the study on July 2.

"Although Mr. Jermyn was reported to have stipulated that the document would be subject to the same security

restrictions that apply to the copies held by Congress, he got nowhere with the request.

"A few days after the meeting, a cable from Secretary of State William P. Rogers advised the United States Ambassador to Wellington . . . that the best New Zealand could hope for would be a 'sanitized' version of the 47 volumes when parts of the study had been declassified."

Prime Minister Keith Holyoake was indirectly quoted the next day as observing that there is nothing unreasonable in the governments concerned asking to see the study when much of it had already appeared in the press. □



# Great Britain's Entry Into the Common Market

By Ernest Mandel

[The following article appeared in the July 9 issue of *La Gauche*, weekly journal of the Ligue Révolutionnaire des Travailleurs (Revolutionary Workers League), Belgian section of the Fourth International. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

\* \* \*

The British bourgeoisie has finally decided to enter the Common Market, hoping in that way — if not to solve — at least to ameliorate the chronic crisis with which it has been faced for over a decade.

## The Decline of British Imperialism

The economic structure of Great Britain is the result of a long period of British domination of the world market. Imports of foodstuffs and raw materials were paid for by income from capital invested abroad and by the "invisible exports" produced by the merchant marine, insurance companies, and the British banks, which dominated their respective sectors.

The decline of British imperialism, which began with the first world war and was accelerated by the second, upset this traditional economic structure. The proportion of British exports in world commerce has been steadily shrinking, so that Britain today is in fourth position, trailing the United States, West Germany, and Japan.

The world position of Britain's merchant marine, banks and insurance companies has been considerably weakened. Income from capital invested abroad represents a far smaller share of British imports than before the second world war. All these factors have brought about the decline of the pound sterling and Great Britain's permanent balance-of-payments crisis.

The severe losses suffered by imperialism throughout the world in the past twenty-five years have substantially increased the importance of the imperialist countries themselves as markets for industrial products. Technological competition and technologi-

cal superprofits today play a major role compared to the former "game preserves" in the colonies and colonial superprofits. In this connection, British capital is severely handicapped relative to its principal competitors — the United States, West Germany, Japan, Italy, France. Its industry is less modernized. Its rate of growth has been slower. Its technological lag threatens to become more pronounced.

For an entire period the British bourgeoisie thought it could hang on to its "Commonwealth" and its "special relations" with the United States to get itself out of the hole. Ten years later it had to recognize that it was mistaken. American imperialism has been buying out enterprises in Great Britain at an accelerating rate. It has increased its penetration of Canada, Australia, South Africa, India. The Common Market countries have contested British ascendancy in countries like Nigeria, Tanzania, and Kenya. The colonial "game preserves" have evaporated. All that British imperialism was left with was a more and more pronounced debilitation, not only in comparison with the United States and Japan, but even in comparison with the Six. The bankruptcy of Rolls Royce acquires real symbolic significance!

## The Turn Toward the Common Market and the Gaullist Veto

The British capitalists then applied the golden rule that governs gang warfare: "If you can't lick 'em, join 'em." By entering the Common Market they hope to enjoy a greatly enlarged outlet, which would assure them a higher growth rate.

In several areas (electronics, aeronautic construction, synthetic fibers, the garment industry, the petroleum industry, the food industry), they are still ahead of their continental competitors, whether in technology, the size of their most powerful firms, or both. Among the 200 most powerful European firms, forty-nine are British

(more than the German and French firms together).

Other industries (steel, electrical construction, probably automobiles, too) may not stand up well under the stepped-up competition. All in all, however, the British bourgeoisie hopes that as a result of entering the European Economic Community, its positions on the European market, and thence on the world market, will be stronger.

The following consideration is even more important. International competition leads to a more and more intense international concentration of capital. In face of the "multinational" American giants, with subsidiaries in practically every capitalist country, "multinational" companies controlled by European capital from several countries (such as Agfa-Gevaert, FIAT-Citroën, Dunlop-Pirelli, Hoesch-Hoogovens Ijmuiden, Empain-Schneider) are being established. This concentration in the industrial sphere is strongly reinforced by mutual cooperation agreements and interlocking between big European banks and financial groups.

As the example of the Dunlop-Pirelli merger demonstrates, British capital is constrained to participate in this merger movement, under penalty of being crushed between the American giants and the European giants. But if Great Britain remains outside the Common Market, British capitalists entering the "European" game will have no way to exert pressure on, and no avenue of direct political control over, the superstructure that is being erected little by little on this new economic base. By entering the Common Market, the British bourgeoisie is trying to develop its political instruments to meet the needs of its most powerful monopolies.

During the mid-Sixties, the decisive circles of the British bourgeoisie had already made a turn in this direction. If Great Britain was not able to join the Common Market at that time, it was due essentially to resistance on

the part of the Gaullist wing of French big capital.

The reasons for this resistance were complex. Two factors, nevertheless, played the principal role. French industry, which had not as yet achieved equilibrium with West German industry, feared entering the lists with a second competitor, superior on every count. De Gaulle, desirous of building a European army and government independent of the United States, feared that the maritime and Atlantic orientation of British imperialism would upset that plan.

### The French Bourgeoisie Changes Its Orientation

Nevertheless, the French bourgeoisie had to realize, and very quickly, that in blocking Great Britain's entry into the Common Market, it was engaging in a profitless venture—one that benefited its major competitor. After May 1968 [the month of the student-worker uprising in France], after de Gaulle's removal, it was Bonn and not Paris that became the uncontested leader of the Europe of the Six. Enjoying industrial predominance, having the most stable and desirable currency—the deutsche mark—at its disposal, coddled by Washington as its privileged ally, West German capital alone profited from the imbalance of political and economic forces that Great Britain's exclusion had caused within the Common Market.

Pompidou's change in orientation—the reason for his victory in the last presidential elections—stems from that.

Today the head man of the moderate Gaullists is keeping the promises made in 1969 to the entire French bourgeoisie. The difficulties on the path to Britain's entry into the Common Market have been removed.

Thus the Europe of the Six becomes the Europe of the Ten (Ireland, Denmark, and Norway, economic satellites of Great Britain, are also joining the European Economic Community). Inside this Europe of the Ten, a Franco-British *entente cordiale*, discreetly supported by Italy, will be the counterweight to West Germany's too pronounced supremacy.

Pompidou's choice is all the more logical in that the British bourgeoisie, still attached to its independence in numerous areas, will support (inside

the EEC) the reservations that French big capital has concerning new steps toward "supranational" integration (common European currency, common industrial policy, common public-works policy, etc.), to which the West German bourgeoisie, as well as the bourgeoisie of the Benelux countries, is more favorable.

### The Tories Want the Workers to Foot the Bill

There remains but one obstacle in the way of the Europe of the Ten: the trade-union militancy of the British working class.

In order to participate in the Common Market with a real opportunity for success, British big capital must, at any cost, reverse the tendency toward a falling rate of profit, which has been manifest in this country for almost a decade. To this end, it has to increase the rate of exploitation of the working class. It has to reduce working-class resistance to such an increase by reducing trade-union power and militancy at the work places.

The antistrike and antitrade-union law that the Conservative government pushed through the British Parliament represents one jaw of the pincers that is supposed to crack the militancy of the English workers (who, along with the Italian workers, are the most militant in Europe). The other jaw of the pincers is a deliberately prolonged recession that has produced 800,000 unemployed (the highest number since 1940!) and unemployment rates of 8 to 10 percent of the unskilled workers in working-class bastions such as Glasgow and other cities of Scotland and Wales.

In this connection, the status of British capitalism on the eve of its entry into the Common Market is rather similar to that of French capitalism just before the Common Market was inaugurated in 1958. Both were suffering pronounced structural deficiencies. Both had to "render harmless" an overly turbulent working class, so that these deficiencies could be removed at the expense of the masses. Thanks to Gaullism, French big capital achieved its aim. Mr. Heath is trying to imitate Charles de Gaulle's exploits. But the political and social relationship of forces is much more unfavorable for British capitalism in 1971 than it was for French capitalism in 1958.

The conservative policies of the Tories, added to the effects of recession and unemployment, have caused a fall in the government's popularity that might take the form of a landslide. Thus the Tories have to act fast, because they don't know if they have ten years ahead of them, as did de Gaulle. Their tactic of resorting to drastic remedies, which seems clumsy at a distance, derives from this necessity. It also takes into consideration the "moderating" role of the trade-union and Labour party bureaucracy.

### The Reformist Brake

It was the Wilson team that cleared the path for Great Britain's entry into the Common Market and for the "modernization" of British capitalism at the expense of the workers. It was the Wilson team that got all the reactionary measures of the Heath cabinet under way—from the anti-immigration legislation to the antitrade-union legislation, by way of the "incomes policy" and increased unemployment. Heath enlarged on what Wilson had started. Moreover, Heath could only have come to power because Wilson's profoundly antiworking-class policy had disgusted millions of Labour voters and had kept them away from the polls.

Today it is essential, for the relative stability (more and more relative, too!) of British capitalism, that Labour's return to power does not mean wiping out all the Tory "counter-reforms." With the help of the trade-union apparatus, Wilson is busily taking care of that.

He has succeeded in stifling the spontaneous tendency of the British workers to oppose the antiunion legislation by means of a political general strike. He is making no preparations for purely and simply deleting this legislation. He merely promises to eliminate its most "repugnant" aspects. Today he is maneuvering in the same way—to prevent the Labour party from declaring its opposition to the Common Market to the extent that it would take the country out of it if Labour were returned to power. Statements of principle are not too bothersome (they might even attract some votes in the elections, should the occasion arise). But above all must nothing be changed in what the Tories accomplished in these areas.

The most important factor, however,



is dependent neither on legislation nor on international treaties. It depends on the dynamic of the class struggle. If the working class is victorious in resisting the two-pronged assault of unemployment and anti-strike legislation, if it preserves its fighting potential intact, it will make every effort to compensate—through substantial wage raises—for every rise in prices (especially prices of food products) that would result from belonging to the Common Market. Joining the Common Market, far from reducing "economic" class struggles, would thus exacerbate them.

The naive confidence of this same working class in the efficacy of parliamentary reforms and the electoral process would receive a second heal-

thy shock, on the heels of the shock inflicted on it by its experience with the Wilson governments. In this way, its political radicalization would be reinforced. Increased recourse to organizing strike committees and growing understanding of the necessity to struggle for workers' control and workers' councils would thus gradually emerge.

The social crisis would thus little by little evolve toward a revolutionary outcome. The efforts of big capital to make the British bourgeoisie participate in the construction of "its" capitalist Europe would in that case end with the intensified participation of the British working class in the struggle for "our" Europe—the red Europe of the workers, a socialist Europe. □

carpet. Minister Marcellin [secretary of the interior], who has proved a bit too quick to react, may find himself on the carpet with them. During the trial we will do all in our power to mark out clearly the path that will take him there."

The campaign in defense of civil liberties has been marred by the sectarian actions of the Communist party.

On July 8, the CP withdrew from a press conference convened by the League for Human Rights on the grounds that the Ligue Communiste and Lutte Ouvrière had been invited. The CP claimed that the terms of unity had been violated by that invitation. It further explained that it refused to be associated with groups "whose activity makes a game out of the government's attacks on civil liberties and the demands of the workers."

In spite of the CP's attitude, the press conference continued. Daniel Mayer, president of the League, said that the rights established by the 1789 revolution were today "eroded, limited, and scoffed at." He protested the so-called antiwrecker law, which allows the government to hold any individual who participates in a demonstration responsible for any destruction of property that occurs during the action, and to place restrictions on that person's civil liberties even prior to trial.

The stir created by the antidemocratic actions of the French government, as well as the notoriety of the French cops, has already spread beyond France.

The July 21 issue of the West German weekly *Der Spiegel* contained a two-page article entitled "Police Terror in France." The article detailed five cases in which people arrested for such charges as drunkenness, disorderly conduct, etc., mysteriously died while in the hands of the police. (One of those cases was the Thévenin affair.) In no case were the police involved brought to trial.

Denis Langlois, the police expert of the League for Human Rights, was quoted by *Der Spiegel* as saying: "It is indisputable that in France today the police have become a state within a state. Nobody has the right any longer to denounce their actions and excesses without risking prosecution." (Langlois is the author of a book entitled *The Black Dossier of the French Police*. That dossier, noted *Der Spiegel*, "is a long one.")

Presumably, a French newspaper

## CP Refuses to Join Defense of Civil Liberties

# Broad Campaign Against Repression in France

By Jon Rothschild

The trial of Charles Michaloux, executive editor of *Rouge*, the weekly organ of the Ligue Communiste (Communist League, French section of the Fourth International), opened in Paris on July 6. Michaloux is charged with five counts of libeling the police in separate articles that appeared in *Rouge* over a five-month period. (See *Intercontinental Press*, July 12, p. 662.)

In the face of the general attack by the Pompidou regime against civil liberties, of which the *Rouge* indictment is a part, a broad defense movement has developed.

The July 5 *Rouge* described the three fronts on which the regime has chosen to try to restrict the functioning of the left: limitation of the right of association, limitation of the right of assembly, and attacks on the freedom of the press.

The Pompidou regime has already suffered a partial defeat on the first point. On July 17 the French Constitutional Council ruled that the 1901 law guaranteeing free association could not be annulled, as Pompidou had sought. This marked the first time that the Council, widely regarded as a Gaullist rubber stamp, had over-

ruled the regime on such a significant issue.

In its assaults on the press, the government has run into strong resistance. The number of signers of the statement of solidarity with *Rouge* (including solidarity with the allegedly incriminating articles) exceeded 120 as of July 5.

Michaloux, writing in the July 5 *Rouge*, outlined the counterattack planned by the Ligue Communiste:

"... we will do everything in our power to fight on both fronts: to prove the truth of our articles, and to use this legal battle to open a general political campaign denouncing the bourgeoisie's repressive plots.

"In this regard, the reopening of the Thévenin affair is to the point (it is not for nothing that we raised this issue). [Thévenin, a young worker, was killed while in police custody. One of the counts against *Rouge* is that it expressed doubts about the police claim that Thévenin had committed suicide.] ... It appeared that the police were absolved of all suspicion, since the magistrates ruled that there were no grounds for prosecuting them. But now, this judgment has been overruled. The police are again on the

publishing the *Spiegel* article would be liable to the same prosecution to which *Rouge* has been subjected.

Pompidou apparently chose the summer months for launching political trials because during this time students and many workers are on vacation. The regime hoped to bring the trials to a conclusion before the in-

tended victims could mobilize support.

The extent of the opposition to the *Rouge* trial, to the indictment of Jean-Paul Sartre for his support of press freedom, and to the government's attempt to abrogate freedom of association indicates that Pompidou may have miscalculated the response to his assault on civil liberties. □

## Peking's Invitation to Shah's Sister

# Iranian Stalinists Back Mao's Betrayal

By Javad Sadeeg

In an open letter to the Chinese government, the World Confederation of Iranian Students has protested the invitation to the shah's sister, Ashraf Pahlavi, to visit China.

Written before Ashraf's trip, the letter was printed in the May issue of *Shanzdahome-Azar* (Sixteenth of Azar\*), the monthly bulletin of the confederation, published in West Germany. It pointed out that the invitation was extended:

"... when the anti-imperialist and antidictatorial movement of the Iranian people was on the rise, when this movement was being savagely attacked by the fascist regime of the shah, and when the best revolutionary fighters of our country, group after group, are being tried in secret military courts and then executed or killed by torture. Under these conditions, our movement more than at any other time needs the solidarity and support of the revolutionary and anti-imperialist forces and people of the world."

The confederation views the Chinese government's invitation "to be in the interest of the shah's regime, a regime that in order to be able to prepare its celebrations [of 2,500 years of the Persian Monarchy] unhindered and to show the world that Iran is a 'peaceful and independent island,' has launched an unprecedented fascistic attack upon our people and its revolutionary elements."

The Chinese government has not

replied to the confederation. Perhaps the Maoist regime prefers not to communicate with an organization outlawed by the shah last March under a forty-year-old anticommunist act.

The confederation's protest contrasts with the position of the various Iranian Stalinist parties, all of which support the Maoist diplomacy.

The Tudeh party, which follows the line of the Soviet bureaucracy, cited these diplomatic moves as proof of the correctness of their line of peaceful coexistence. In the April issue of their monthly organ, *Mardum* (People), published in East Germany, they concluded:

"Whatever the motivation for this move, objectively it is a positive phenomenon that the People's Republic of China, despite its noisy propaganda against peaceful coexistence and its description of this policy as 'modern revisionism,' is forced by the compelling logic of history to take this road. This phenomenon and similar actions around the world are signs of the bankruptcy of the sectarian and ultraleft theories [of the Chinese] that the Iranian Maoists also follow."

The Iranian Maoists, who in the past have criticized the Soviet bureaucracy's dealings with the shah, now find themselves caught in a contradiction.

*Setare-Sorkh* (Red Star), which is published in Rome, is the monthly journal of the Revolutionary Organization of the Tudeh party, a Maoist split-off. In its April issue, it acknowledged that many Iranians are puzzled by the Chinese government's invitation to Ashraf. It asserted that the imperialists and their stooges are

being forced by the revolutionary masses of the world to recognize the Chinese government, and predicted that the shah's regime would try to sabotage this development, which it viewed as a gain for the world revolution. Thus it implied that the duty of Iranian revolutionists is to pressure the shah to draw even closer to China.

*Setare-Sorkh* justified this position with the claim that the Chinese government had never subordinated the interests of the revolution in any country to its diplomatic needs. The paper did not try to explain why Mao opposed the revolutionary uprisings in Bangla Desh and Ceylon, nor why he is trying to reach an accommodation with U. S. imperialism at the expense of the Vietnamese revolution.

These facts also escaped the attention of the rival Maoist grouping, the Marxist-Leninist Organization of Toufan. In the May issue of its monthly organ, *Toufan* (Storm), this grouping took the same position on China's relations with the shah as did *Setare-Sorkh*.

*Toufan* devoted less space to this question than to an article on Albania, "the beacon of socialism in Europe," less space even than to the Charles Manson murder-case in California. This unserious approach is characteristic of all these organizations.

By taking such positions, the Stalinists have cut themselves off from the revolutionary nationalist movement, which has always seen the struggle against the monarchy as an integral part of its program. Many persons who were attracted to Maoism because they mistakenly equated it with the socialist revolution of the Chinese workers and peasants have now begun to question this equation.

They now see that Maoism leads to the same class-collaborationist policies with which the Tudeh party betrayed the Iranian revolution. The only alternative for sincere revolutionists in the Maoist groups is to break with Maoism and begin building a Bolshevik party that can lead the coming revolution to victory. □

## Summer Schedule

In case you've forgotten—*Intercontinental Press* will not appear during the month of August.

Regular weekly publication will resume in September.

\* On that day in 1954, just before a visit by then Vice President Nixon, the shah's army invaded the University of Teheran to silence the opposition movement. Three students were killed.

# Women Launch U.S. Abortion Repeal Campaign

By Dianne Feeley

The women's liberation movement in the United States demonstrated its emergence as an important political force July 16-18 as more than 1,000 women mapped out a plan for a national campaign demanding the repeal of all abortion and contraceptive laws.

Meeting in New York City in a conference organized by the Women's National Abortion Coalition (WNAC), the women showed a high level of political understanding, as they rejected red-baiting and other distractions, and concentrated on adopting a strategy that can mobilize masses of women in action.

The women came from 246 organizations in twenty-nine states and Washington, D. C. Women from Canada, Germany, France, and Sweden were also in attendance.

The potential support for the abortion repeal campaign is indicated by polls showing that 77 percent of American women believe abortion laws should be changed. Suits contesting the constitutionality of the laws are already under way in twenty-three states. Two of them are scheduled to be heard by the Supreme Court this fall.

In a survey conducted at the conference, 29 percent of the women who responded said they had already had an abortion. This bears out the estimate that approximately one woman in four in the U. S. has had an abortion.

More than fifty workshops debated the issues of the conference and discussed implementation of the campaign. Some focused on specific tactics; others brought together constituencies such as students, working women, Third World women, etc.; and a third set of discussion groups dealt with issues such as the relationship between the abortion campaign and the feminist movement, women and the war, gay liberation, etc.

The major debate of the conference centered on the nature of the abortion campaign and the demands that would be most effective in building it.

One caucus, led by the International

Socialists, called for making the major campaign slogan "Free Quality Abortion on Demand."

Speakers who favored the demand for repeal of abortion laws and no forced sterilization pointed out that experience has proved how difficult it is to organize a mass movement around the "free abortion" slogan. They argued that even among those who agree that abortions should be free, there were differences as to what the demand meant concretely, which made it unsuitable as the basis for a coalition.

A heterogeneous group of women, most of whom were opposed to an abortion campaign, organized a caucus called WISE—Women for Inclusion of Sexual Expression. Realizing that they could not overcome the enthusiasm of the conference majority for an abortion campaign, they tried to hide their disagreement behind the abstract slogan "freedom of sexual expression," and refused to clarify whether this demand was directed against the government and its repressive laws or was intended as an educational demand within the women's liberation movement.

They attempted to impose their position by means of red-baiting and undemocratic tactics. Their leaflets attacked the Socialist Workers party (SWP) and the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA) for their leadership role within the feminist, antiwar, and student movements. They also attempted to obtain a monopoly for their views by seizing the microphone.

These tactics were rejected by the majority of the conference, and some members of this caucus—after they had walked out on three separate occasions—repudiated the more extreme statements of their own leaders.

At its concluding plenary session, the conference voted by a large majority to launch the national campaign around the demands for repeal of all abortion laws, no forced sterilization, and repeal of all laws restricting contraception.

Methods that will be used include legal action, teach-ins and campus referendums, and petition drives in local areas.

On November 20, WNAC will sponsor mass demonstrations in Washington, D. C., and San Francisco to show the power of women who are united around the determination to control their own lives.

As women pointed out during the conference, this campaign has the potential not only to win repeal of abortion laws, but also to recruit millions of women to feminism. They stressed that as women become aware of their power, they will begin to fight on a variety of other issues that affect their lives. A victory in the abortion campaign will broaden and strengthen the women's liberation movement.

The spirit of confidence characteristic of the conference was best articulated by a Chicana from Los Angeles who explained why the issue is essential to the very survival of Third World women. Pointing to the "no forced sterilization" slogan as a clear demonstration that the campaign supports the individual woman's right to decide for herself, she contrasted this with the government's racist and sexist population-control policies, especially as exemplified by attempts of state legislatures to require sterilization of women on welfare. She received a spontaneous standing ovation.

In calling for mass demonstrations in Washington and San Francisco on November 20, the conference noted that restriction of a woman's right to choose whether she will have a child is an international issue. WNAC urged that women throughout the world join it November 20 by organizing mass actions to demand the end of all such restrictions:

"We urge our sisters all over the world to demonstrate with us on November 20. We are the majority, and united we will win."

The coalition has established its office at 137A West Fourteenth Street, New York City. □

# Nationalists in Derry City Battle British Tanks

By Gerry Foley

"Push the people into Bogside . . . and let's have a death," residents of Derry City, Northern Ireland, heard a British army radio broadcast say late July 7, according to Frank McManus, member of parliament for Fermanagh and South Tyrone. Leaders of the nationalist community in Derry regularly monitor these broadcasts, which can be picked up by even poorly functioning, rented TVs. I spent evenings listening to them myself in Derry in the summer of 1970.

"Seamus Cusack was shot by a British soldier at practically point-blank range, not 50 yards from where I stood on Bogside on Wednesday night [July 7]. He carried neither rifle nor petrol bomb, nor stone, but was, in fact, bending down to pick up an object from the ground.

"In the short silence following the rifle report, the cry went up, 'British murderers.'"

In the July 9 issue of the *Irish Times*, Nell McCafferty gave this eyewitness account of the death of a twenty-eight-year-old man in the Catholic, nationalist ghetto of Bogside. This death occurred shortly after the reported British army radio broadcast.

Cusack was gunned down at an entrance to the medieval wall surrounding the old center of the city. This section, built on a hill overlooking "the Bog," is the historic bastion of the loyalist Protestant colony settled in Ireland by the British monarchy.

The ancient wall has been maintained religiously by the descendants of this colony as a symbol of the impregnability of British ascendancy. Until the rise of the civil-rights movement, the Protestants defended the principle that no demonstration by the Catholic, nationalist people would be permitted within the sacred walls of the "Maiden City."

On holidays commemorating defeats of the native population, the Protestants have traditionally draped these walls with the British and royalist colors, and marched around them hurling insults and more substantial



LYNCH: Calls on British imperialists to recognize right of Irish unity.

things at the Bogside houses below.

Not far below the walls is the center of the ghetto rebellions, the Rossville flats—congested, modern multistory apartment buildings erected to replace the surrounding older slums. Fortified British military posts have been set up at all exits from the Bogside.

In the summer of 1970, on one of the walls in this area I saw a huge painted slogan: "British murderers, Remember O'Hagan." Young Danny O'Hagan was shot down by British troops in Belfast in July 1970. One year later, Derry has its own martyrs to commemorate.

After fatally wounding Cusack, British troops swept into the ghetto behind a wedge of armored cars. "The youths fell back several hundred yards to Westland street, having dragged Mr. Cusack along with them," McCafferty continued. "The soldiers occupied Bogside for some time, listening to the cry of murderer.

"In an unprecedented scene, Mr. Vincent Coyle, a former Civil Rights steward, left his home, went over to the troops and ordered them out of the area. Within seconds he was accompanied by several women of the district. They thumped the Saracen tanks with their fists, ordering the soldiers out of the area, and accusing them of wanton shooting in a built-up housing estate."

The soldiers retreated to the top of the Bogside, where the ghetto youths attacked them again. "During this time I saw at least three youths walk up to the soldiers, thump on the tanks and challenge them to fight like men with stones, not rifles," the *Irish Times* reporter noted.

On the afternoon of the next day, July 8, a second youth, George Desmond Beattie, nineteen years old, was shot to death by British troops as he tried to march into the walled city in a procession of mourning for Cusack. Black flags hung in the windows of Bogside homes, and barricades went up in the ghetto streets.

After running battles between the troops and Bogsidiers throughout the day of July 8, a crowd of nationalists gathered next to an army post on the edge of the ghetto at midnight. They raised the flag of the Irish republic on a lamppost and sang the national anthem: "Soldiers are we, whose lives are pledged to Ireland . . . we're children of the fighting race that never yet has known disgrace . . . No more our ancient sireland shall shelter the despot or the slave."

The following night, July 9, an impromptu commando group fired machine guns at British troops stationed in the American-owned Essex Wire Assembly plant in the Creggan, the suburban Catholic ghetto on the slopes northwest of the city.

"At 9:45 p.m., the Essex plant was set on fire," the July 10 issue of the *Irish Times* reported. "Palls of pitch-black smoke rose over the Creggan Estate. A crowd of about 1,000 young people surrounded the empty factory. An Army helicopter circled overhead.

"Soon after 10 o'clock troops burst out of the Essex factory, and with the assistance of CS gas, drove the attacking crowd back into the Creggan Estate."

Even British armor proved ineffective against the furious ghetto youths: "In an incident at Beachmount avenue a crowd of youths who forced seven Saracen armoured cars out of the area were met with CS gas. Eventually an Army commander ordered the cars out of the area," the *Irish Times* reported.

Throughout the week leading up to the Protestant parades of July 12, battles and impromptu commando attacks on British troops continued. The buildup of pressure in the oppressed community obviously frightened its "moderate" leaders. Ivan Cooper, elected MP on the basis of his reputation as a civil-rights leader, said on the BBC that the situation in Derry was the most serious he had seen in the past three years, according to the July 9 *Irish Times*.

On July 11, the main opposition party in the Northern Ireland parliament, the Social Democratic and Labour party (essentially the discredited old conservative Nationalist party under a new name), issued a statement threatening to set up an alternative parliament if the British army did not set up an impartial inquiry into the deaths of the two Bogside.

This threat seemed to be an index of the pressure on the most moderate bourgeois representatives of the nationalist minority. This is especially true since it came on the heels of an offer by the Unionist prime minister to give opposition MPs powerful positions on special parliamentary commissions, an offer that must have been mouth-watering to products of the corrupt old machines in the nationalist ghettos.

In an editorial July 6, the *New York Times*, the voice of the most internationally minded section of American capital, hailed this offer as the most important concession yet to the nationalists: "No Ulster Prime Minister in fifty years of separate Government has proposed so substantial a change from straight majority — meaning Protestant — rule, with such enhanced authority and status for Catholic leaders. The proposal is similar to one made by Catholic members last year."

Any attempt to set up an alternative

government directly representing the people of the nationalist ghettos could be perilous for these opportunist leaders, especially since the revolutionary forces in the aroused population are not likely to leave the political field clear for them, as they have in the past.

An alternative government could quickly become a revolutionary pivot for mobilizing the nationalist population of the entire island against the Unionist machine and the British occupation forces. In a confrontation of this type, conservative political structures would have little chance of survival.

In the face of the rising pressures in the North, the neocolonialist Dublin government adopted its most militant-appearing stance in decades. At the ceremony July 11 commemorating the Anglo-Irish truce of 1921, Prime Minister Jack Lynch called on the British to recognize in principle the right of Irish unity:

"It would take nothing away from the honour of Britain, or the rights

of the majority in the North, if the British Government were to declare their interest in encouraging the unity of Ireland, by agreement, in independence and in a harmonious relationship between the two islands."

He read a letter sent by Eamonn de Valera, the founder of his party, to British Prime Minister Lloyd George during the 1921 truce: "We cannot admit the right of the British Government to mutilate our country, either in its own interest or at the call of any section of our population."

The biggest Protestant demonstrations are yet to come in Derry City, which is only ten miles from the border of formally independent Ireland. On August 12, tens of thousands of Orangemen have traditionally paraded in the "Maiden City" to celebrate the perpetuity of the Protestant ascendancy. It was in the wake of these marches three years ago that the Northern ghettos exploded, threatening, among other things, to sweep away the capitulationist regime in Dublin. □

## Dominican Republic

### Political Prisoners Jailed Illegally

Extralegal persecution seems to have become the major repressive technique of the Balaguer government. Not only have the police set up and maintained rightist commando groups — with CIA support, according to former Dominican President Juan Bosch — but persons arrested on political charges are detained at will by prison officials, regardless of the decisions of the courts.

The case of Domingo Quezada, a thirty-four-year-old member of the Sindicato de Artes Gráficas [Graphic Arts Union] is representative of many. In late May he was arrested on charges of "Communist activity." In early July he was sentenced to two months in prison on this charge. He was tried in absentia, not even brought before the court.

It is not clear whether this blatantly illegal procedure was a result of a decision by Balaguer's judges or by the prison officials themselves, Dominican civil libertarians report. In the

past, prison officials have refused to allow prisoners to attend their own trials, where the marks of torture could be seen by reporters and where they might get an opportunity to testify about prison conditions or the treatment they received.

Quezada has now served more than his sentence in the ill-famed prison of La Victoria outside Santo Domingo. [See "Torture in La Victoria Prison," in *Intercontinental Press*, July 5, p. 633.] According to Dominican law, he should be released. But there is no indication the prison authorities intend to let him go.

The best way to prevent the Dominican police and their American advisers from maintaining a climate of terror in the Dominican Republic is to internationalize the campaign in defense of the political prisoners. As a first step, letters and telegrams should be sent to Balaguer demanding Quezada's release. □

## Moroccan Coup Aimed at Corrupt Officials

"I had just finished my smoked salmon," British Ambassador Thomas R. Shaw said, "and was sitting by the swimming pool in the palace courtyard. Together with the Swedish Ambassador, I wandered over and chatted briefly with the King, who was sitting under a tent. . . .

". . . suddenly bullets were whizzing all around us.

"Back at the swimming pool, I found the Yugoslav Ambassador, who had long partisan experience in World War II, lying on the floor with a chair over his head, so I lay down beside him and did likewise."

Hassan II, the king of Morocco, was giving a party for diplomats and high government officials to celebrate his forty-second birthday July 10. "There were diplomats, ministers, officers and politicians and their wives in a variety of costumes ranging from bathing suits to Arab galabias," the July 12 *New York Times* reported, summarizing the statement of U.S. Ambassador Stuart W. Rockwell.

General Mohammed Medbouh, the king's personal military chief, attired in sports clothes, had organized a golf match to entertain the guests. He

had also organized an event that was not on the program. "Hundreds of cadet officers had arrived in trucks and charged the palace gate, killing those guards who resisted, and charging to the palace, hurling grenades," the *New York Times* reported July 12.

"A number of guests dashed out of the main entrance of the palace, where they were mowed down by a hail of fire," Rockwell said. "Others jumped through the windows facing the sea and still others, among whom I found myself, found that the safest place was the throne room itself."

Like cadets in most bourgeois countries, the young cadets who stormed into the royal beach party were apparently heavily indoctrinated with the Spartan mystique of their caste, a type of indoctrination that has usually proved necessary to ensure the loyalty and morale of the defenders of corrupt regimes. Greed and ambition can normally be counted on to make officers more flexible and manipulable as they gain experience.

In the case of the July 10 coup, however, the illusions and disillusionments of idealistic officers proved deadly both to themselves and many of the

ruling elite, as well as innocent servants slaughtered indiscriminately by fervent moral reformers.

Colonel Ababou reportedly led the assault of one group with the shout "We are sick of this corruption." The rebels lashed out at symbols of luxury. "They didn't take any money," the British ambassador noted, "but they took such things as gold cigarette lighters, threw them on the ground and crushed them under their boots. . . ." The cadets also heaved grenades into the openings of the sumptuous royal kitchens, apparently seeing royal cooks and scullery boys as accomplices of corruption.

The leader of the coup, General Medbouh, seems to have stood out in the king's entourage as a relatively honest man. Perhaps that is the reason he was trusted. Reports in both the *New York Times* and *Le Monde* after the coup pointed out that Medbouh informed the king of cases of corruption, appealing to him to take action.

Once the rebels had seized the palace, they read off a list of persons in the king's entourage and shot them summarily as they appeared, *Le Monde* reported July 14. Since the cadets did not execute the top political figures in the regime, it is possible that the executions were intended to punish corruption.

Despite the king's *Arabian Nights'* tale of last-minute repentance on the part of the rebel officers, it seems that those involved in the coup had no intention of killing him.

Hassan was almost killed in the first phase of the attack, apparently accidentally, according to Jean Mauriac of Agence France-Presse: "The first explosions roared. The king continued to eat his lunch. A grenade rolled under the tent. M. Bourguiba [son of the Tunisian president] grabbed it and threw it into a corner. It failed to explode. 'You're throwing it into the orchestra,' Louis Joxe commented phlegmatically."

After the attack had begun, the king took refuge near the swimming pool in a tent housing portable toilets. With him were Prime Minister Ahmed Laraki and General Oufkir, the strong man of the regime.

The Sharifian monarch seemed to be in a state of shock similar to that which he later attributed to the attackers. He watched the rebels through a hole in the tent, recognizing Colonel

### Still Available

#### Complete Back Files

## Intercontinental Press

Volume 4	1966	42 issues	\$21.00
Volume 5	1967	42 issues	\$21.00
Volume 6	1968	44 issues	\$22.00
Volume 7	1969	43 issues	\$21.50
Volume 8	1970	43 issues	\$21.50

P. O. Box 116  
Village P. O. Station  
New York, N. Y. 10014



Ababou's cadets: "This is the best-disciplined unit in my army," he said. "The colonel is a friend of Moulay Abdallah. He is a graduate of our military academy."

General Medbouh came to the king's undefendable and inglorious refuge, offering to negotiate. It was after one such visit, Mauriac reported, that the rebel leader was accidentally shot by one of his men.

After their chief's death, the rebel forces seem to have become confused, allowing the king and Oufkir to escape and regain control of the army. The lack of a political basis for the rebellion apparently led to its rapid disintegration once the "incorruptible commander" was removed.

"An Opposition political leader here emphasized that when they [the rebels] held the radio station Saturday evening they never offered any indication of a program of government to the nation, limiting their broadcasts to martial music and a proclamation that the monarchy had been overthrown by the army," *New York Times* correspondent John L. Hess reported July 12 from Rabat.

"The Opposition leader said this helped explain the passivity with which the public received the news of the plot."

Obviously shaken by the unexpected uprising of the most trusted elements of his army, Hassan reacted savagely. All the participants were executed without trial within forty-eight hours. The executions were broadcast to the entire nation, which heard the commanders order the firing squads to spit on the bodies of the dead rebels.

Hassan was not the only ruler who received a nasty shock. Hussein of Jordan made a special flight to Morocco to congratulate his royal cousin on his victory. Bourguiba sent warm greeting to the king "after the attempted treachery of this plot." Nixon sent a telegram saying that "the American people" were relieved to see the king safely back on his throne. The Algerian regime maintained an embarrassed silence. Only the military moral reformers in power in Libya supported the rebels. □

### China Trips More Effective?

The U.S. Information Service has shelved a \$250,000 film on the Vietnam war, shot by the "Cowboys and Indians" virtuoso John Ford. It is now considered to have "dubious propaganda value."

## Nixon Tries to Muzzle Press

### Seek Indictment of 'N.Y. Times' Reporter

Having lost its bid to restrain the *New York Times* and *Washington Post* from printing portions of the Pentagon's secret study of the Vietnam war, the Nixon administration is now seeking to make an example of persons thought to be involved in making the material available to the public.

In addition to the charges filed June 28 against Daniel Ellsberg, who has acknowledged delivering the Pentagon papers to the *New York Times*, the government is reported to be seeking an indictment against Neil Sheehan, who wrote several of the *Times* articles, and possibly against other persons as well.

A federal grand jury has been meeting in Boston since July 6. Although the government has maintained tight secrecy around its proceedings, press reports indicate that the jury is considering the Pentagon case.

Ellsberg is accused of stealing government property and of unauthorized

possession of material "related to the national defense." If charges are filed against Sheehan, they apparently will also be based on the Nixon administration's contention that the Pentagon study was "stolen." Quoting "sources close to the [grand jury] investigation," the *New York Times* reported July 15:

"The presentation, the sources said, was aimed at an indictment charging that Mr. Sheehan had violated statutes against moving stolen property in interstate commerce by receiving secret documents taken from the Government without authorization."

Such an accusation would, of course, be occasioned by more than Nixon's desire to defend the sanctity of property. The claim that the Pentagon study is "stolen property" is a poor cover for his real intention, which is to warn the press that he will not tolerate further disclosures of the imperialist plans hatched in Washington by his predecessors' administrations — or by his own. □

## Antiwar Officer Convicted

Captain Thomas S. Culver, the antiwar air force officer accused of illegally participating in a demonstration, was convicted by a court-martial at Lakenheath Air Force Base, England, June 13. The charges grew out of a May 31 protest in which 300 American servicemen presented an antiwar petition to the U. S. embassy in London.

Captain Culver was convicted of violating a regulation that states: "Members of the Air Force are prohibited from participating in demonstrations . . . in a foreign country." He was also convicted of urging others to participate.

He maintained that the May 31 protest was not a demonstration and that the regulation is unconstitutional.

On June 14, the court imposed the relatively light sentence of a reprimand and a \$1,000 fine. Captain Culver could have been sentenced to four

years in prison, dishonorable discharge, and forfeiture of all pay.

The mild sentence was apparently a result of widespread support for the officer and the publicity attracted by the case.

"In a sense," Captain Culver said afterward, "the reprimand seems a vindication of the innocence of what happened. The Air Force made a mistake. It wasn't worth the time, the trouble and the money they spent. . . ."

"A reprimand is no problem. General Bell [commander of the U.S. Third Air Force] just sends me a letter and says I'm a bad boy."

Captain Culver added that he still intended to appeal the decision in an effort to have the regulation overturned:

"This is a test case and we're still going to take this through the courts." □

## Bretons Stage Language Demonstration

Galv, a united-front organization defending the right of the Breton people to education in their mother tongue, held its second annual demonstration May 30. Some 700 demonstrators marched twenty-five kilometers from the town of Plouay, through Cléguer, Pont-Scorff, and Quéven, to Lorient. Along part of the way, they carried signs in French and Breton, such as "Ar Brezoneg, Yez ar Bobl" [Breton Is the Language of the People].

"It was no coincidence if this type of action recalled some practices of the American Blacks or the Northern Irish," the June issue of the Breton nationalist paper, *Le Peuple Breton*, commented. "The state is also denying us Bretons part of our civil rights, that is, the elementary rights of citizens in a democracy. The official verbiage about French citizens having identical rights is specious, inasmuch as these citizens are not identical. Education in French is a right for Parisians whose mother language is French. It is a discriminatory constraint for those whose home language is Breton."

The marchers demanded as a minimum that the Breton language be given parity in the schools with living foreign languages. Although the French government has made some concessions since the start of the new language movement, Breton teaching is still only a token effort.

The Celtic language of Brittany, still spoken in the rural areas of about half the peninsula, is closely related to Welsh, although the vocabulary has been invaded by large numbers of French words over many centuries of domination by a French-speaking ruling class. Galv has been inspired to some extent by the militant actions of *Cymdeithas yr Iaith Gymraeg* [the Welsh Language Society] in its sister country across the English Channel.

Breton is more distantly related to Irish, and the fight for introducing the language into the schools and for asserting the rights of Breton culture received an initial impetus from the Gaelic revival in Ireland, which was one of the driving forces in the independence struggle of 1916-21. Be-

cause of this relationship, the successes of the Northern Ireland Civil Rights Association have had an impact in Breton nationalist circles.

The Breton movement is also watched with some interest in the only formally independent Celtic country. At the time of General de Gaulle's last visit to Ireland, the country's most prestigious newspaper, the *Irish Times*, remarked that the Paris government's treatment of the Breton language was about like the Belfast regime's attitude to Irish: "The language is dead, and anybody who insists on speaking it is a traitor." This mentality, the *Irish Times* wrote, indicated that General de Gaulle was a very dubious defender of the rights of small nationalities.

The British government, however, has been much more generous in granting concessions to minority languages, although the Celtic languages of the British Isles are spoken by much smaller numbers of people than is Breton. Perhaps this is because British capitalism has seemed strong enough and centralized enough to break up and assimilate the smaller

insular nations through the natural operation of the economy.

In France, the government has traditionally relied on indoctrination in a dogmatic centralist ideology and direct governmental constraint in its effort to liquidate the small nationalities incorporated into the French state.

"France is the only state in Europe that in practice forbids the teaching of minority languages on its territory," *Le Peuple Breton* wrote.

This year, for the first time, the Galv march received official support from some teachers' unions in the largely Breton-speaking *départements* of Brittany. It was endorsed by the SNI [Syndicat National des Instituteurs—National Union of Elementary-School Teachers] and the SNES [Syndicat National de l'Enseignement Secondaire—National Union of Secondary-School Teachers] in the *département* of Morbihan; and the FEN [Fédération de l'Education Nationale—National Federation of Educators] and the SNESup [Syndicat National de l'Education Supérieure—National Union of Teachers in Higher Education] in Finistère.

In Finistère, the departmental council of the second largest union in France, the CFDT [Confédération Française et Démocratique du Travail—French Democratic Confederation of Labor], also endorsed the march. □

## U.S. Fears 'Hostile Hordes'

### How Nixon Handles Vietnam Refugees

One of the effects of the U. S. "pacification" program in Vietnam has been the creation of millions of civilian refugees—people who have been forcibly removed from their villages and sent to areas under the control of the puppet South Vietnam government.

Officials in charge of this program now fear that the refugees, particularly those living in Saigon and the Mekong River delta, may violently rebel against the government before the end of 1971.

This fear was expressed in a report describing a meeting held early in May in Danang by officials of the Civil Operations and Rural Develop-

ment Support Agency (CORDS). Excerpts of the report were given to the *New York Times* on July 10 by Senator Edward Kennedy, who is chairman of the Senate subcommittee on refugees.

The report referred to the possibility that "hostile hordes" would be "spearheaded by disabled veterans and/or other war victims" and would initiate major urban rebellions.

The report recommended a \$200,000,000 program to improve the lot of the refugees, because "something new and difficult is now called for to avoid social and political chaos."

The Senate subcommittee has estimated that the total number of refu-

gees is approximately 6,000,000, of whom 3,000,000 have never been resettled. Of the total, nearly one-sixth live in Saigon slums or in the Mekong delta area.

During the first five months of 1971, at least 100,000 more Vietnamese became refugees. The report of the CORDS meeting acknowledged that these people are "living under conditions of real privation in camps."

One of the reasons the refugees live in miserable conditions was revealed by a classified survey released July 1 by the General Accounting Office of the United States. That survey found that although \$2,100,000,000 had been budgeted during 1968-70 for the pacification pro-

gram, records indicate that only \$339,200,000 has been accounted for—and \$65,000,000 of that was spent for unknown purposes not connected with the program itself.

This left a cool \$1,700,000,000 missing, or about 81 percent of the total money budgeted.

On July 13, the Pentagon came up with an explanation of what had happened to the money. Some \$400,000,000, it said, had been spent "for services and personnel costs." The other \$1,300,000,000 "was budgeted to provide military hardware and other commodities to the regional and popular forces. . . ."

Evidently Washington believes that there's more than one way to "help" a refugee. □

a meeting of all the residents of one area, ostensibly to work out a reconciliation. When everyone had gathered, troops arrived, picked out the 300 Hindus in the crowd, led them away and shot them."

The Bengali resistance, Schanberg reported, is "gathering momentum."

"Thousands of young Bengalis are being trained in demolition and guerrilla tactics—often on the Indian side of the border, with India providing many of the instructors. The first elements of the new guerrillas are beginning to flow back into East Pakistan.

"More and more road and railway bridges are being blown up and electrical power supplies knocked out. Some of the demolition work has been expert. Road mines are becoming common. Often the army, which is on combat alert, cannot get local contractors to repair the damage, so it uses forced labor, with meager results."

In the July 11 London *Observer*, Colin Smith wrote from Sylhet, describing the guerrilla struggle in that area:

"During the past six days the guerrillas . . . have been stepping up their own activities. They have made a series of raids on tea factories, power pylons and bridges in the area."

The Bangla Desh forces have been attempting to stop production on British-owned tea estates, which export most of their product to West Pakistan.

"Road transport," Smith reported, "is out of the question. Bridges are regularly blown throughout the area. The British-built steel bridge on the River Khowai . . . has been so neatly blown it looks as if somebody has sawn through it with a gigantic hacksaw. . . ."

"The Bengalis' liberal use of mines—including some particularly devastating British anti-tank models made in 1955 which rip Land-Rovers to shreds—has proved a good psychological weapon against the 'super soldiers' from the West."

The continued resistance of the Bengalis makes it increasingly unlikely that Yahya will be able to accomplish his goal of subduing the province before the West Pakistan economy collapses from the strain. His chief hope must be U. S. financial and military assistance—a hope that may be shattered by growing popular opposition to Nixon's plans. □

## Bengali Resistance Reported Growing

Richard Nixon's plans to continue material support for Yahya Khan's genocidal warfare in East Bengal received a setback, at least temporarily, on July 15. Reflecting the widespread public revulsion at the massacres, the House Foreign Affairs Committee voted to prohibit U. S. assistance to the Pakistani government until "reasonable stability" has been achieved in East Bengal and the 6,000,000 refugees now in India have been permitted to return in safety to their homes.

The prohibition was in the form of an amendment to a foreign-aid-authorization bill in which Nixon had asked \$5,500,000 in military aid to the Yahya regime, \$118,300,000 in economic aid, and \$8,000,000 in technical assistance.

By all accounts, "reasonable stability" in East Bengal is a long way off. On July 12, the *New York Times* published portions of the report of a World Bank mission that toured the area at the beginning of June.

"The situation," the report said, "is very far indeed from normal; nor are there any signs that normality is being approached or that matters are even moving in that direction."

The mission reported a "complete dislocation of the communications system," "fear and lack of confidence on the part of most of the population," and "persistent failure or refusal to report for duty" by Bengali workers.

A separate report by economist Hen-

drik van der Heijden, who toured the western part of the province, described the widespread devastation. Typical was the situation in Kushtia:

"It was only April . . . that the army moved north from Jenidah and into Kushtia. There must have been very strong resistance. When the insurgents withdrew, the army punitive action started. It lasted 12 days and left Kushtia virtually deserted and destroyed. The population was down from 40,000 to 5,000. Ninety per cent of the houses, shops, banks and other buildings were totally destroyed. People were sitting around dazed. When we moved around, everyone fled. It was like the morning after a nuclear attack. . . ."

*New York Times* correspondent Sydney H. Schanberg, who was expelled from East Bengal on June 30, reported similar conclusions in the July 14 issue of that paper.

". . . the killing, Schanberg wrote, "though it is more selective and less wholesale, has not stopped and the outlook, most observers believe, is for a long and bloody struggle."

"Foreign missionaries, who are posted even in the remotest parts of East Pakistan, report new massacres almost daily. One missionary said that the army recently killed over 1,000 Hindus in a day in a section of Barisal District, in the south. Another reported that in Sylhet District, in the northeast, a 'peace committee' called

# Why Trudeau Lost in Quebec

By Art Young

[The following article is reprinted from the July 5 issue of *Labor Challenge*, a revolutionary-socialist bi-weekly published in Toronto.]

\* \* \*

"It's a victory for freedom of speech," exclaimed Robert Lemieux on hearing the jury acquit Charles Gagnon and Jacques Larue-Langlois of the charge of "seditious conspiracy" on June 15.

Lemieux, lawyer for Larue-Langlois and a prominent defendant himself in the Québec political trials, was certainly correct. The acquittal verdict is a major victory for the Québec nationalist movement and for civil rights in Canada. The failure of the government to convince the jury, despite the voluminous evidence it presented, undermines its whole justification of the October repression it launched.

The trial was the most important of the series of political trials since the War Measures Act. It developed out of the government's attempt, last fall, to convict five leading Québec nationalists of conspiring to overthrow it. Michel Chartrand, Robert Lemieux, Pierre Vallières, Charles Gagnon and Jacques Larue-Langlois soon became known as the "Montréal Five."

The seditious conspiracy charge against them was later thrown out of court as being "too vague," but Gagnon, Larue-Langlois and Vallières were charged again with the same offense. Owing to ill health, Vallières' trial was put off until the fall. He is now awaiting trial on the charge of having conspired with Gagnon and Larue-Langlois, whom the jury has decided did not conspire with anyone!

Québec juries have consistently refused to believe the government's claim of an apprehended insurrection last October. All five of 14 persons charged with seditious offenses who have come to trial have been acquitted. Six of the seven persons tried for membership in or support of the FLQ [Front de Libération du Québec — Québec Liberation Front] have been acquitted.

Last October, the federal government seized upon kidnappings by two groups identifying themselves as the FLQ, to unleash a massive repression against the Québec left, declaring that there was a conspiracy to foment an insurrection. Québec was occupied by the federal army, civil rights suspended, and almost five hundred nationalists were rounded up and jailed. The Montréal working-class political formation, the Front d'Action Politique [Political Action Front], then challenging Mayor Jean Drapeau's hold on city council, was crushed. The federalists launched a campaign to identify radical independentism with the FLQ, violence and murder.

Trudeau's aim was to deal the left-wing nationalists a heavy blow, through outright repression and imprisonment of their leaders and through this kind of propaganda campaign.

To justify such repression, he had to unearth an insurrectional conspiracy. But the more than 3,000 police raids in Québec failed to turn up more than 33 firearms, mostly hunting weapons.

The "sedition" charges were then levelled against the nationalists. But these have now been rejected by a jury.

The failure of the government to justify its arbitrary actions in October, and its lengthy imprisonment of many accused, have discredited it among wide layers of the population.

With the acquittal of Gagnon and Larue-Langlois, a whole chapter of the post-October struggle comes to a close.

The government's attempt to turn the October FLQ adventure to its own advantage has largely failed. It has not succeeded in passing permanent repressive legislation to supplant the War Measures Act. The main Québec nationalist leaders are now out of jail. Québec Justice Minister Jerome Choquette's project of forcing all Québécois to carry police identity cards has been abandoned. In short, the relationship of forces that existed before October is now largely restored

— the nationalist, labor and student movements have succeeded in regaining their freedom of action.

This is not to say that there is no longer arbitrary police action and denials of civil liberties in Québec, but Trudeau and [Québec Premier Robert] Bourassa have been thwarted in their basic aim, which was to use the crisis to make permanent gains against the Québec nationalists and civil liberties.

How was this important victory won?

Trudeau's imposition of the dictatorial War Measures Act met immediate opposition across the country. The New Democratic Party [NDP—Canada's labor party] took a principled stand against the Act, immediately shattering any pretense of unanimity in favor of the repression. Meetings and protest demonstrations were organized across the country, in the early stages largely by left-wing groups including the Young Socialists and the League for Socialist Action. The repression did not go unnoticed outside Canada; the American radical movement staged a number of protests, and the Trotskyist Fourth International issued an appeal for solidarity with the victims of the repression.

Significant protests continued throughout English Canada during the October period. Many meetings were held; tours were organized for victims of the Act, notably Penny Simpson of the YS/LJS [Young Socialists/Ligue des Jeunes Socialistes], Robert Lemieux and Michel Chartrand. The tours received an excellent response; audiences became bigger and more sympathetic as time passed. The largest meetings were those addressed by Michel Chartrand in Winnipeg and Toronto in March. Both drew over a thousand people.

An important development was the important support for Québec's right to self-determination shown at the April federal NDP convention. The resolutions of the left-wing "Waffle" group and the nationalist Québec NDP demanding that the party recognize this right had dominated the pre-convention public debate. One-third of the delegates supported self-determination, against the opposition of the party brass.

In Québec itself, the repression did not, as Trudeau hoped it would, suppress protest. The Québec left, with most of its leaders behind bars, rapidly reorganized itself. Within hours of the proclamation of the War Measures Act on Oct. 16, a first defense com-

mittee was formed, the Comité Québécois pour la Défense des Libertés (CQDL). An emergency meeting of leaders of Québec's three union federations denounced the military occupation on Oct. 18, together with spokesmen of the Parti Québécois [PQ] and other nationalist groups.

An unprecedented unity meeting of over 500 rank-and-file representatives of the union federations met in Québec City on Oct. 22, and reaffirmed their opposition.

The CQDL, and another defense committee, the Mouvement pour la Défense des Prisonniers Politiques Québécois (MDPPQ) organized numerous actions, rallies, and demonstrations which gave voice to growing discontent with the repression. They began to involve other broader forces, such as those of the artistic community, and the PQ, the mass-based bourgeois-nationalist party. (The PQ at first tended to be very cautious in its opposition to the War Measures Act, most often limiting its criticisms to the "excesses" of the government.)

The government, forced to yield ground, released most of those arrested, and replaced the War Measures Act with the Public Order Act. This latter, supposedly more moderate, maintained the essential powers of the previous act. But protests continued, growing in scope.

The opening in November of the trials against the political prisoners gave a new impetus to the defense movement. From the prisoners' dock, the defendants vigorously counter-attacked, breaking through the attempts to silence them by contempt of court convictions and outright banishment from the courtroom. They succeeded in demonstrating the absence of evidence against them; this, in conjunction with the protests outside the courthouse and across the country, transformed public opinion.

Indicating the depth of the growing defense movement were the demonstrations against the political trials by two of the most conservative layers of students—those of the engineering and law faculties—that took place in January. In the same month, the top-name artists of Québec organized a show entitled "Poèmes et Chants de la Résistance," hitting out at the trials and repression. It played to full houses.

In a by-election held in February in the very riding the assassinated Pierre Laporte had represented, the Parti



**TRUDEAU:** Mass support for self-determination interfered with his plans to repress the left.

Québécois increased its vote over what it had received in the same riding during the April 1970 provincial elections. Clearly public opinion had not turned against the independentists. While polls had reported that during October more than 70 percent of Québécois supported fully the government's actions, another poll showed that in March half this support had melted away: only 38 percent said they now entirely supported these actions. More people declared in March that they feared the army and the police, than said they feared the FLQ. According to this poll, published in the Montréal daily *Le Devoir* on May 29, almost 60 percent said they never had believed that in October the government was menaced by an insurrection.

The pressures on the government were greatly increased with the outbreak in February of the teachers' struggles against declassification. Québec City had arbitrarily changed the job classifications of thousands of teachers, cutting many of their salaries; it hoped to save money and to profit from the after-effects of the War Measures. But the teachers hit back in a powerful series of rotating strikes that brought the educational system to the verge of chaos; they enjoyed massive public support of their cause. Other sectors of Québec labor were also beginning to move.

Trudeau and Bourassa had to retreat. They dropped the "seditious con-

spiracy" charge against two of the most prominent defendants, Chartrand and Lemieux. They let the Public Order Act lapse without replacement at the end of April. But the protests continued. The accused fought back. And the partial victories only increased the possibilities of winning a fuller victory. Government prosecutors were no more successful in their attempts to convince the juries.

The acquittals of Gagnon and Larue-Langlois mark a major turning point in the defense struggle. Already the Crown has announced that it will not appeal the acquittals. It has finally released Vallières on bail, and it is almost certain that the conspiracy charge against him will be dropped.

Far from being crushed, the main forces of the mass movement have recovered and are pressing forward. The October crisis, it would seem, has increased the class polarization in Québec society, increasing at the same time independentist sentiment among Québec workers.

While its entire justification for the War Measures has now crumbled, the government has not abandoned its use of the courts against the nationalists. The "Montréal Five" and others are still charged with membership in the FLQ, even though the Public Order Act banning such membership has now lapsed and no longer applies. Chartrand, Vallières and Gagnon, among many others, must still serve sentences for contempt of court which they received in fighting the government's frame-up.

Montréal police are continuing to harass and arrest radicals.

An acceleration of the defense movement in Québec and in English Canada can put an end to this repression. It can halt the remaining political trials, scheduled for this fall. It can turn Trudeau's retreat into total rout.

#### **Guardian of the Public Weal**

Three fish caught in the Hudson River near a factory that has been known to discharge cadmium into the water were found to contain as much as 1,000 times the normal amount of the poisonous metal. On being informed of this, the chairman of the Senate environmental subcommittee warned against drawing conclusions based on only three fish.

#### **Shrewd Businessmen**

The Ford Motor Company is building a bulletproof limousine for President Nixon at a cost of \$200,000. The company will lease the car to the government for \$5,000 a year.

## Convention Plans Reactionary Constitution

By Francisco Blandino

Manila

The present Constitutional Convention, which is supposed to produce a "nationalist" constitution to replace the one imposed by the U. S. in 1935, is revealing itself as totally unconcerned with the interests of the people it supposedly represents. Although the elections, which were held last November, were supposed to be nonpartisan, the composition of the delegates proves the charge that the voting was dominated by the big bourgeois Liberal and Nationalist parties. [See *Intercontinental Press*, November 30, 1970, p. 1031.]

According to E. Garcia, the well-known newscaster of ABS-CBN television, "only sixteen of the 320 delegates have never had direct or indirect political, business, or legal relations with the politicians of the two major parties."

Garcia went on to point out that fewer than half the delegates even bothered to write anything when the *Manila Chronicle* offered them a free page in which to explain to the people their proposals for the convention.

Even the moderate groups, which had earlier advocated "a non-partisan Constitutional Convention, truly representative of the people," now mourn the fact that "not a single peasant or laborer sits in the 1971 Convention." (*Manila Times*, June 1.) The day before the grand opening of the convention, Edgar Jopson, president of the moderate National Union of Students of the Philippines, stated that while his organization would continue to lobby against the "selfish schemes of the vested interest groups," he had to admit that "the paper revolution . . . would not be the answers or solution to the country's numerous problems."

The most revealing evidence about the composition of the delegates is the list of individual incomes of the delegates provided by the Commission on Elections. This reveals that in 1969 their average income was 71,000 pesos [at that time, 3.9 pesos equaled US\$1].

This figure should be compared with

a national average *family* income in the same year of 3,150 pesos. For individuals, the average income was only 1,000 pesos.

Delegates who claim an income less than the national average for families make up only 4.5% of the convention, while those who earned more than 100,000 pesos are 12.1%. Delegates earning more than 15,000 pesos (the income of a well-paid university professor) account for 70% of the representatives.

Given these facts, it is not unnatural for such radical student leaders as E. Baculinao, the president of the student council of the University of the Philippines, to say that "the Convention has been rigged . . . and cannot bring about fundamental social change."

During the period between the election and the opening of the convention, numerous public meetings and television programs tried to drum up some interest in the proceedings. One format was to have delegates questioned by representatives of various organizations.

These programs soon revealed that the convention had little to offer the average citizen. Even on simple social questions like a divorce law, the outlook appears gloomy and conservative.

One delegate, a congressman's daughter, stated the issue here was "whether divorce is a constitutional or judicial question." While paying lip service to minority rights, the "Catholic" Philippines will probably remain without any divorce law. While delegates debate the legal fine points, thousands of Filipinas will just have to wait.

On the question of citizenship, there is a big drive to retain the reactionary anti-Chinese *jus sanguinis* [law of blood] rather than replacing it by *jus soli* [law of birth]. Even the moderate liberal and well-known newscaster for ABC television, delegate Jose Ma. Velez, favors the former because the latter would "not benefit Filipinos."

The *jus sanguinis* is also backed

by delegate Carmencita Reyes (150,000 pesos), whose husband, Immigration Commissioner Edmundo Reyes, found it quite useful in deporting the Yuyitung brothers last year.\*

The purpose of this is to encourage the petty bourgeoisie to continue using the Chinese as a scapegoat for the social ills of the Philippines.

Even the right to trial by jury is being threatened with the excuse that "jurors can be too easily bribed."

To top everything off, by a vote of 235 to 50 the delegates defeated an early motion for open balloting and voting on convention decisions.

The radical "progressives" have not looked much better in their many public appearances. Delegate Antonio Areneta (50,000 pesos) presented himself as a real apologist for the Moscow and Peking bureaucracies. In one television appearance, Areneta went so far as to discover workers' democracy in the Soviet Union: "Having been there myself, I can state that there are many political parties in Russia."

On the same program, he said that the Philippines should copy some aspects of the People's Republic of China. But in accordance with the theories of revolution by stages and the multi-class front called National Democracy, he was quick to emphasize that he did "not advocate a Marxist-Leninist system for the Philippines because such a system would not work here."

Another "progressive," E. Voltaire Garcia II (26,000 pesos), who is heavily backed by the Maoists, pushes National Democracy so hard that on one television appearance he opposed the suggestion that "elections and government should be organized upon

\* Quintin and Rizal Yuyitung were born in the Philippines of Chinese ancestry. Angered because their paper, the *Chinese Commercial News*, had published articles sympathetic to the radical student movement, President Ferdinand Marcos in May 1970 ordered the brothers deported to Taiwan, where they were jailed by the Chiang Kai-shek regime. — IP



occupational lines" because elections "are corrupt."

Finally, Delegate Alejandro Lichauco (90,000 pesos), who is backed by both the pro-Moscow Stalinists and the Maoists, presented his "nationalist" economic program. The "progressive bourgeois" Lichauco called for a national economic development board to be set up by the constitution. This board would somehow maintain capitalism but do away with imperialism by providing incentives for Filipino businessmen to invest here rather than abroad. On KBS television, Lichauco stated that the Philippines should study the "industrialization in other countries such as Japan, China, and Taiwan."

The "progressives" are quick to attack imperialism, but they spare all other aspects of capitalism except the "bourgeois compradore capitalists." Their emphasis is on economic schemes to the exclusion of the important political questions.

Thus they talk on and on about industrialization, land reform, and state ownership, but never about workers' control or workers' management. Everything is put within the context of National Democracy rather than raising the demand for a workers' and peasants' government. These radical "progressives" are just as guilty as the moderates when it comes to blurring class lines.

The convention is thus thoroughly controlled by the bourgeoisie. The early sessions saw the election of former president "Poor Boy" Macapa-

gal (135,000 pesos) over former senator "Christian Socialist" Manglapus (153,000 pesos), who represented the moderates. Pro-tempore president is Dr. Sotero Laurel, the president of the Lyceum of the Philippines, from which many student activists have been expelled. He is also related to Congressman Laurel, Senator Laurel, and the late President Laurel.

Senator Rene Espina summed up the attitude of the convention when asked about his views on a radical constitution. He said that the "Constitution should not be made in hatred for certain people, but out of love for the people."

When class struggle threatens, the bourgeoisie always recommends "love" and pacifism to the masses. □

## Napalm Sticks to Kids

[We have taken the following poem from the New York *Guardian* which reports that it was composed collectively by a group of air force and army GIs of the First Cavalry in Vietnam. Each verse depicts an actual event that at least one of the men participated in. The poem was published for the first time in *Helping Hand*, a GI antiwar newspaper at Mountain Home Air Force Base in Idaho.]

\* \* \*

*We shoot the sick, the young, the lame,  
We do our best to kill and maim,  
Because the kills all count the same,  
Napalm sticks to kids.*

*Flying low across the trees,  
Pilots doing what they please,  
Dropping frags on refugees,  
Napalm sticks to kids.*

*Flying low and looking mean,  
See that family by the stream,  
Drop some nape and hear 'em scream,  
Napalm sticks to kids.*

*A group of gooks in the grass,  
But all the fighting's long since past,  
Crispy youngsters in a mass,  
Napalm sticks to kids.*

*Drop some napalm on the barn,  
It won't do too much harm,  
Just burn off a leg or arm,  
Napalm sticks to kids.*

*CIA with guns for hire,  
Montagnards around a fire,  
Napalm makes the fire higher,  
Napalm sticks to kids.*

*A baby sucking on his mother's tit,  
Children cowering in a pit,  
Dow Chemical doesn't give a shit,  
Napalm sticks to kids.*

*Eighteen kids in a "no fire zone,"*

*Books under arm as they go home,  
Last in line goes home alone,  
Napalm sticks to kids.*

*Gather kids as you fly over town,  
By tossing candy on the ground,  
Then grease 'em when they gather round,  
Napalm sticks to kids.*

*Ox cart rolling down the road,  
Peasants with a heavy load,  
They're all V. C. when the bombs explode,  
Napalm sticks to kids.*

*Cobras flying in the sun,  
Killing gooks is macho fun,  
If one's pregnant, it's two for one,  
Napalm sticks to kids.*

*There's a gook down on her knees,  
Lauch some fleshettes into the breeze,  
Her arms are nailed to the trees,  
Napalm sticks to kids.*

*Blues out on a road recon,  
See some children with their mom,  
What the hell, let's drop the bomb,  
Napalm sticks to kids.*

*They're in good shape for the shape they're in,  
But, God, I wonder how they can win,  
With Napalm running down their skin,  
Napalm sticks to kids.*

### Wise Children

A Rhodesian university official who conducted a survey on the plans of white schoolchildren said he found "an overriding desire to leave the country, more particularly among the more intelligent children."

### Sound Prediction But Wrong Reason

In an interview before his death, Dwight Eisenhower reportedly predicted that Nixon would be a one-term president because "he's really going to fight inflation, and that will kill him politically."

## How to subscribe

If you'd rather not cut up this issue by using the subscription blank . . .

Put your name and address on any old piece of paper and send it with \$7.50 for a six-month subscription.

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

[ ] Enclosed is \$7.50 for a six-month subscription.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Street \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

## Nationalist Acquitted of Frame-Up Charge

"The acquittal of Frank Keane will be welcomed by all interested in justice," the June issue of the *United Irishman*, the paper of the Irish republican movement, wrote. "For over twelve months, Keane—an innocent man until he was proven guilty—has been deprived of his liberty. His life was threatened by the frame-up proceedings to be brought against him, and the pathetically poor prosecution case illustrates the nature of the frame-up. Both Keane himself and his family and friends have been made to endure the worry of twelve months confinement and the uncertainty about his future. Now that he is acquitted, he will receive no compensation; instead the authorities ordered his immediate re-arrest on other charges."

Patrick Francis Keane, a thirty-five-year-old television aerial installer, was found not guilty June 24 of the murder of policeman Richard Fallon. The policeman was killed during the Arran Quay bank robbery in Dublin on April 3, 1970, allegedly by the fleeing robbers.

"In fact, of course, reliable sources maintain that Garda [Policeman] Fallon was not shot by any of the bank robbers at Arran Quay," the *United Irishman* noted. "A special branch [political police] detective—who has never been called to give public evidence—was behind the uniformed Gardai. He fired at the fleeing bank-robbers, but Garda Fallon was in the way of his line of fire. All the bullets which killed Fallon hit him from the back. The theory that he turned round just before one of the robbers shot him is a little far-fetched. It seems clear that the man who killed Fallon was this as yet un-named detective of the special branch.

"Back in the thirties, branchmen shot one of their own and tried to use the killing as an excuse to take vendetta revenge against Republicans; a similar thing was tried against Frank Keane; tried but failed."

Keane was arrested by British police May 13, 1970, at the Highbury and Islington station on the London subway at the request of Irish author-

ities. After a long legal fight (see *Intercontinental Press*, June 29, 1970, p. 647), he was extradited to Ireland for trial. Keane claimed the status of a political refugee. He had argued, according to the April 1, 1971, *Irish Times*, that he feared that Saor Eire [Free Ireland], an organization which he supported, was about to be declared illegal.

This small, adventurist splinter group has taken responsibility for a

## REVIEWS

### A Guaranteed Best-Seller

*The Pentagon Papers* as published by the *New York Times*. Bantam Books, New York, N. Y. 677 pp. \$2.25. 1971.

This book is, of course, a runaway best-seller. In the week after the first copies went on sale July 8, some 900,000 copies were distributed to retail outlets. Bantam says it can't print fast enough to keep up with the demand.

The situation is hardly surprising. It is a rare event—being able to obtain classified government secrets for only \$2.25 (plus sales tax). And these particular secrets are of more than average interest, detailing as they do how four successive presidential administrations plotted and carried out deliberate aggression against the people of Indochina.

Despite the fact that it had a guaranteed market, Bantam took the trouble to put *The Pentagon Papers* into a convenient format and provide an index of the documents, a six-page glossary of abbreviations, and capsule biographies of important persons. The book also reprints several *New York Times* editorials, the text of the Supreme Court ruling permitting publication of the articles, and sixty-four pages of photographs.

The material in *The Pentagon Papers*—and in the *Washington Post* ar-

series of bank robberies in Ireland aimed at raising money to buy military equipment. It has been accused of other robberies and commando actions by the government, which in December 1970 alleged a plot by Saor Eire to kidnap government ministers. This claim was used as justification for threatening to reintroduce mass internment without trial of political opponents of the regime.

After his acquittal on the Arran Quay charge, Keane was rearrested on the charge of complicity in the armed robbery of a bank at Rathdrum, County Wicklow, on February 20, 1970. The court, however, has allowed bail until the case is decided. □

ticles—has been summarized in preceding issues of *Intercontinental Press*. The book is an absolute gold mine of evidence against American imperialism, and revolutionists have every reason to be pleased at its wide circulation.

At the same time, however, *The Pentagon Papers* cannot be a substitute for the complete forty-seven-volume Pentagon study, from which the *Times* has excerpted and summarized to compile this book. The public has a right to view the entire study rather than to read it through the editorial glasses of the *New York Times*.

In addition, there is the unfortunate fact that Daniel Ellsberg, who has acknowledged being the newspapers' source of the material, provided the *Times* with only forty-three of the forty-seven volumes. Four volumes on U. S. secret diplomacy were omitted. They would undoubtedly provide abundant information on the complicity of other governments in the U. S. aggression.

Ellsberg himself now faces the prospect of a long prison term. It is to be hoped that *New York Times* publisher Arthur Sulzberger will not consider it a violation of journalistic "objectivity" to contribute some of the paper's royalties from *The Pentagon Paper* to Ellsberg's defense.

—David Burton

## The Opening Move in Mao's Bid to Nixon

By Joseph Hansen

[The following article was first published in the December 16, 1968, issue of *Intercontinental Press* under the title "The Meaning of Mao's Bid to Nixon." Although it was written before Nixon was sworn into office as president, the article makes timely reading in connection with the current turn in diplomatic relations between Peking and Washington.]

\* \* \*

A statement issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China on November 26 [1968] concerning the possibility of "peaceful coexistence" with the United States produced a considerable ripple in diplomatic circles. The consensus was that it represented a bid from Mao Tse-tung to the incoming Nixon administration.

In an editorial, "New Prospects in Asia," the *New York Times* (November 29) offered the following comment: "Especially interesting is Peking's proposal that the United States join in 'an agreement on the five principles of peaceful coexistence,' a gesture that implies a remarkable turnabout in China's approach to the United States even though it was tied to obviously unacceptable demands that this country abandon its ties with Taiwan.

"The 'five principles' date from a period in the 1950s when Peking was trying to win friends and influence peoples, as against its more recent efforts to alienate the world. They called for mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, nonaggression, noninterference in other countries' internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit and peaceful coexistence.

"Peking's introduction of these concepts into its talks with Washington reinforces other evidence that the Cultural Revolution has run its course and that a leadership is emerging in China that recognizes the necessity for more responsible conduct in world affairs and for closer ties with the West.

"Incidentally, even during the Cul-

tural Revolution, Chinese trade with the non-Communist world has steadily increased, while the proportion of its trade with Communist-bloc countries has declined. The lure of trade, especially in agricultural and related products, may become an important source of leverage in the coming Sino-American talks."

Writing from Hong Kong, where the Western powers maintain well-financed staffs of specialists on Chinese affairs, Tillman Durdin reported in the same issue of the *New York Times*:

"Observers here do not regard the new Chinese behavior as an indication of policy changes. They see it instead as the adoption of a less crude and bellicose attitude toward the outside world. If the tendency continues, Communist China could become easier to deal with, the experts predict.

"One theory advanced here is that Communist China could be aiming at strengthening its position in foreign affairs to enable it to take part, at some future stage, in a settlement of the Vietnam war."

In Washington, according to Bernard Gwertzman (*New York Times*, December 1), "there was considerable surprise at the State Department" over the "statement proposing to meet with the Nixon Administration's representative in Warsaw on Feb. 20 and calling for the signing of an agreement on the 'five principles of peaceful coexistence.'"

Gwertzman said, "There was considerable speculation here that China might have decided that its tense relations with the Soviet Union might require an effort to ease tensions on its Eastern flank, where the American Seventh Fleet plies the water."

Gwertzman closed his dispatch with the observation: "Presumably, if the Taiwan issue could be shelved, there would be room for considerable discussion between Washington and Peking. Most experts see little chance of China dropping that demand. And unless there is a drastic change in the new Administration's foreign policy,

the United States is not prepared to sacrifice Taiwan's freedom."

From these sources, it can be gathered that Washington was agreeably surprised by Peking's move and responded by indicating willingness to talk and even to bargain, the references to Taiwan being made, of course, in accordance with the standard procedures of haggling.

In Paris, Peking's maneuver was likewise noted with interest. Philippe Ben, reporting from New York in the November 30 issue of *Le Monde*, said:

"For the West, the Chinese offer must be placed in actuality in the context of American-Soviet relations, in particular the explanations given in private by numerous Soviet representatives on the question of the invasion of Czechoslovakia. In New York as well as in Washington, the Soviet diplomats confide to their Western questioners that 'since China is becoming more and more threatening, the Soviet Union had no choice in Prague. In view of the hard evidence, the Soviet Union had to protect its rear before it was too late.' Peking's move is thus considered to be an attempt to scotch the Soviet diplomatic game and to block the American-Soviet rapprochement from becoming too close."

In passing, it is worth noting that while the Hong Kong experts speculate that China wants to ease tensions on the eastern flank because of Soviet pressure from the west, the Soviet diplomats explain to their Western conferees that they had to invade Czechoslovakia to protect Moscow's western flank because of pressure from China in the east.

It would seem that it would be of considerable mutual advantage to Peking and Moscow to close the breach and establish a common front against the common imperialist foe. Neither of the bureaucracies sees it that way, however, and each blames the other for the situation. Worst of all, in their rivalry each seeks an understanding with imperialism at the expense of the other.

Philippe Ben reports the intense way in which the Soviet diplomats are pushing "peaceful coexistence" with Washington (i.e., with Nixon), if not with Czechoslovakia. "The eagerness of the Soviet leaders to resume a dialogue with Washington is very visible at the United Nations, where hardly

a day passes without some sign being seen of it."

The Sino-Soviet dispute, clearly involved in Peking's November 26 statement, will most certainly be weighed by the State Department in its response to the invitation from Mao Tse-tung. Washington has in fact sought to capitalize on the dispute since it flared into the open. One of the outcomes, for instance, was the Pentagon's calculation that it could get away with armed aggression in Vietnam.

It remains to be seen whether Peking's November 26 statement marks the opening move in a "remarkable turnabout" in foreign policy; i.e., a 180-degree turn from ultraleftism to rank opportunism. Study of the statement offers nothing new outside of its timing and the addressee, Nixon. The Mao regime, from the very beginning, has espoused "peaceful coexistence" in the tradition of Stalin.

Chou En-lai in particular has stressed "peaceful coexistence" with the United States. He provided a succinct summary of his government's foreign policy in this respect in his interview with Edgar Snow in 1960 (published in the latter's book *The Other Side of the River*).

"Western opinion has been spreading rumors to the effect that China has given up the policy of peaceful coexistence," Chou En-lai told Edgar Snow. The premier sought to refute the rumor by citing the friendship treaties that had been signed that year and "the joint statements on peaceful coexistence with India, Indonesia, Cambodia, and Ceylon." The treaties were all based on the "Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence," which Chou stated were as follows:

"(1) Mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity; (2) mutual nonaggression; (3) noninterference in each other's internal affairs; (4) equality and mutual benefit and (5) peaceful coexistence."

Chou said that a possible peace pact among the Asian countries and countries bordering the Pacific involved "Sino-Soviet relations" and "relations between the four countries of China, the USSR, Japan and the U.S.A." With regard to the United States, he underlined two points:

*"It is inconceivable that a peace pact can be concluded without diplomatic*

*relations between China and the United States.*

*"It is also inconceivable that there can be diplomatic relations between China and the United States without a settlement of the dispute between the two countries in the Taiwan region."*

Chou En-lai cited the record at some length to show the consistency with which his government had sought to practice peaceful coexistence with the United States, and how Washington had made this impossible with its aggressive policy in the Western Pacific.

The main obstacle to the establishment of "peaceful coexistence" between China and the United States, Chou pointed out, has been Washington's insistence on maintaining the fiction of "two Chinas." Even here, however, it should be possible to find some formula to resolve the difficulty.

"Since it has been possible for China and the United States to hold ambassadorial talks in Geneva and Warsaw," Chou suggested, "talks can also be held at the same time between the Central Government of China and the Chiang Kai-shek clique. The former is an international question while the

latter is an internal question. Parallel talks can be conducted and solutions reached separately."

A new element in the situation is the Paris talks over the war in Vietnam. In agreeing to seat the National Liberation Front at the table as one of the negotiating parties alongside of the Saigon clique, Washington has, despite itself, set a certain precedent. Could a comparable formula be found that might open the way to easing tensions in the Western Pacific on a much broader scale?

Perhaps this is the question which Peking intended to put to the Nixon administration with its November 26 statement. If the *démarche* meets with a favorable response, there can be no doubt that the Mao regime would move further along this line with a readiness that might astound not a few observers.

This is the meaning of the otherwise enigmatic reference in the statement to the possibility of "peaceful coexistence" with an imperialist power not especially noted for its practice of the Five Principles, above all in recent years and in relation to some countries very close to the borders of China. □

## When You Move...

1. For FASTEST service attach old mailing label in space below. Otherwise please print clearly your address as we now have it.

Name	_____
Address	_____
City	_____
State	_____ Zip _____

Please allow  
6 weeks for  
change to  
take effect.

2. Print your new address here

Name	_____	
Address	_____	
City	State	Zip
_____	_____	_____

3. Mail to

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