

Ernest Mandel:

## Dollar's Downfall

Bolivia:

## Workers Unable to Block Military Coup

Ireland:

## Rising Resistance to British Troops



U.S. TREASURY SECRETARY CONNALLY: "We are at the end of an era in our economic policy." "We have awakened forces that nobody is at all familiar with."

## 32,000 Antiwar Marchers in New Zealand

# Mandel Still Refused U.S. Visa

The American consul in Brussels has withheld favorable action on a visa application made by Ernest Mandel to fill speaking engagements in the United States this fall.

The noted Belgian Marxist requested permission on July 13 to visit the U.S. from October 13 to December 16, 1971. He has been asked to speak at a number of leading Eastern universities, including Harvard, from whose Economics Department he received a unanimous invitation.

The consul informed Mandel on August 9 that he was still considered ineligible for a visa because "There is an appeal now pending in the Supreme Court bearing upon the previous refusal of a waiver of these grounds of ineligibility [under the 1952 McCarran-Walter Act]. The Embassy has been notified by the authorities in Washington that no action will be taken on your current visa application until final judgment has been rendered on this appeal."

After Mandel was twice prevented from lecturing in the U.S. in 1969, he and eight distinguished American professors filed suit to force the government to open the doors for his visit. This action was initiated by the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and argued by the constitutional lawyers Leonard Boudin and David Rosenberg of Harvard Law School.

In a landmark decision in March 1971, a three-judge federal court ruled that the restraint upon the visit of the scholar violated the First Amendment right to hear, thereby knocking out the exclusion provision of the McCarran-Walter Act invoked in his case.

The Justice Department has appealed the District Court decision to the Supreme Court, where the issues are expected to be argued in the next session. If the high court upholds the majority opinion soon enough, Mandel should be able to lecture at U.S. universities in the late fall. □

## Diplomatic for 'Shut Up'

Chiang Kai-shek's ambassador to Washington commented August 13 on Nixon's forthcoming trip to Peking:

"Both my government and I, personally, have had a chance to state our views. It's time for quiet diplomacy on our part."

## In This Issue

|                    |     |  |
|--------------------|-----|--|
|                    |     | <b>FEATURES</b>  |
| Ernest Mandel      | 723 | The Downfall of the Dollar U.S.A.  |
|                    | 722 | Mandel Still Refused U.S. Visa   |
|                    | 725 | Carlos Feliciano Wins Bail Reduction   |
|                    | 729 | Official Cover-Up Charged in Hampton Killing   |
|                    | 730 | Third Trial Set for Newton   |
|                    | 736 | Mitchell: No Kent Inquiry  |
|                    | 743 | Calley's Sentence Reduced  |
| Jon Rothschild     | 746 | Trotskyists Hold National Convention   |
|                    |     | <b>BRAZIL</b>  |
| Eduardo Pinheiro   | 726 | Luiz Eduardo Merlino—Exemplary Revolutionist   |
|                    | 727 | SWP's Tribute to Luiz Eduardo Merlino  |
|                    |     | <b>JAPAN</b>   |
|                    | 727 | Tokyo Militants Rally in Behalf of Irish   |
|                    |     | <b>SOUTH VIETNAM</b>   |
| Allen Myers        | 728 | Nixon Biggest Loser in Saigon Election Farce   |
|                    |     | <b>PHILIPPINES</b>   |
| Francisco Blandino | 730 | Maoists Defeated in Student Elections  |
|                    |     | <b>BOLIVIA</b>   |
| Gerry Foley        | 731 | Workers Unable to Block Military Coup  |
|                    |     | <b>PAKISTAN</b>  |
|                    | 734 | Nixon, Mao Seeking Ways to Shore Up Yahya  |
|                    |     | <b>SOVIET UNION</b>  |
|                    | 735 | Kremlin Strengthens Indira Gandhi's Hand   |
|                    |     | <b>BANGLA DESH</b>   |
|                    | 736 | Japanese Groups to Aid Bangla Desh   |
|                    |     | <b>IRELAND</b>   |
| Gerry Foley        | 737 | Rising Resistance to British Troops  |
|                    | 742 | A Message From Crumlin Road Prison   |
|                    | 743 | SWP Hails Irish Freedom Fighters   |
|                    |     | <b>NEW ZEALAND</b>   |
| George Fyson       | 744 | Second Wave of Massive Antiwar Demonstrations  |
|                    |     | <b>INDOCHINA WAR</b>   |
|                    | 745 | McMahon, Holyoake Promise Pull-Out   |
|                    |     | <b>CHAD</b>  |
|                    | 752 | Regime Accuses Libya   |
|                    |     | <b>DOCUMENTS</b>   |
|                    | 748 | The Deepening Crisis of the Imperialist System   |
|                    | 752 | The Meeting Between Nixon and Mao<br>[Statement of the Fourth International]   |
|                    |     | <b>PHOTOS</b>  |
|                    | 744 | Christchurch antiwar demonstration July 30   |
|                    |     | <b>DRAWINGS</b>  |
| Copain             | 721 | John Connally; 724, George Meany;<br>728, Ellsworth Bunker; 731, Victor Paz Estenssoro;<br>738, Bernadette Devlin; 739, Brian Faulkner |

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 Guenee, 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.

## The Downfall of the Dollar

By Ernest Mandel

Brussels

The July issue of *Quatrième Internationale* carried an editorial dated July 5, 1971, on the worsening crisis of imperialism.<sup>1</sup> The following sentences are of particular interest:

"The capitalists will thus follow a different tack. Their response [to a recession that threatens to become general] will be concentrated in two areas. They will try to increase their foreign markets and to boost the rate of profit at the expense of the working class.

"Increasing international markets means expanding East-West trade, with the U.S. joining in the game (relaxing embargoes against the USSR, resuming exports to China). Likewise, it means stepped-up penetration of the markets of semicolonial countries and a new sharpening of interimperialist competition. The attempt to raise the rate of profit at the expense of the working class involves trying to limit or abolish the only substantial right the workers have under the capitalist system, the right of collective bargaining. The means for this are 'incomes policies,' which virtually all tendencies in the international bourgeoisie have begun to demand."

And further on:

". . . in order to strengthen the dollar, American imperialism will combine increased protectionism with a slowdown in real capital outflows and a new effort to retool American industry. . . ."

Six weeks later, these forecasts were borne out by the decisions Nixon announced to the world August 15.

The Marxist analysis of the class nature of the American state, of the fundamental nature of the capitalist system, has been confirmed once again. The American bourgeoisie defends its class interests—not an ideal of freedom. This defense is mounted today not only against the states that have broken out of the imperialist

system and against the colonial revolution that threatens to take several more countries along the same road.

It is directed against what is historically the most redoubtable enemy of Wall Street—the American proletariat. It is aimed at shaking up Wall Street's most precious "allies," that is, its most efficient competitors—Japan, Western Germany. "Freedom," including the famous free trade, is swept aside, as is always the case when the system founded on private property, that is, competition and anarchy, is shaken by a serious crisis.

### Disintegration of the International Monetary System

For three and a half years we have been witnessing the slow death agony of the international monetary system founded at Bretton Woods under the banner of supremacy of the dollar. This system sought to escape from the dilemma that has confronted the capitalist economy since the beginning of its historic crisis of decline marked by the first world war: either maintenance of the gold standard with more and more catastrophic crises of overproduction; or abandonment of the gold standard and a retreat toward economic nationalism, protectionism, and inconvertible currencies, which signifies not less disastrous consequences for capitalist international trade.

The solution consisted of basing capitalist currencies both on gold and on the dollar, of maintaining stable rates of exchange, and of installing flexible rules, tolerating in reality a permanent inflation, above all whenever a crisis of overproduction impended, in order to avoid a new 1929.

So long as the inflation remained moderate, and the dollar lost its purchasing power at a slower rate than the currencies of the other important imperialist powers, the system functioned to the satisfaction of all the imperialists.

Already at that time, it is true, the arrangement signified a more and more ruinous indebtedness for the

semicolonial countries, the big losers at Bretton Woods. But that the "great" should exploit the "small" is the most natural of all things in the capitalist world.

No imperialist complained about the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments in the fifties—and with reason! Without this deficit, the system invented at Bretton Woods would not have been able to function. The capitalist expansion would have died for lack of dollars and gold, that is, of means of international payment.

Things began to turn sour not because of inflation of the dollar—that had been going on uninterrupted for thirty years. Things began to turn sour when the decline in buying power of the dollar became greater than that of other currencies, when the rest of the world's holdings in dollars expanded out of all proportion to the rapidly diminishing stock of gold held by the U.S.

From then on it was clear that devaluation of the dollar would occur sooner or later. The international bourgeoisie—including a good part of big business in the U.S., whether through the multinational companies directly or through go-betweens—began to ready themselves for this contingency. In plain language, this is called speculating on devaluation of the dollar. And in a market economy, when many capitalists ready themselves for a contingency, they precipitate it with a sure hand.

The inconvertibility of the dollar into gold—a consequence of the disproportion between dollar holdings in the hands of foreigners and the gold reserve at Fort Knox, which shrank to the "minimum strategic reserve" of \$10 billion—did not begin on August 15, 1971. It has been the reality since the end of the "gold pool" (end of 1968).

From that time on, the central banks of the big imperialist powers have in reality stopped exchanging dollars for gold. What was a provisional mutual undertaking has now become a definitive rule because of Nixon's unilateral decision.

The real change announced August 15 was thus not the inconvertibility of the dollar, already in force for three years. The real change was the factual devaluation of the dollar, not in relation to gold but in relation to the other currencies of the imperialist world.

Nixon's decision to let the dollar "float" signifies in reality a decision

1. A translation of the editorial appears elsewhere in this issue of *Intercontinental Press*.

to depreciate the dollar in relation to other currencies. Because once supply and demand is permitted to operate freely on the exchange market, this outcome is inevitable in view of the current state of inflation of the U. S. dollar in relation to the currencies of the principal competitors of the United States.

The irony of history is that in thundering against the "international speculators," Nixon gave in to them all along the line. It was exactly this depreciation that they were prepared for. In affirming that he was out to defend the stability of the dollar, Nixon did exactly the contrary. He acknowledged *urbi et orbi*<sup>2</sup> that the dollar has been devaluated. Double talk comes naturally to the American bourgeois politicians just as it does to the gangsters of the star-spangled republic.

In European capitalist circles—beginning with the Gaullists in France—the devaluation of the dollar is being denounced as a serious blow against trade for Europe and for Japan. It is certain that Nixon's immediate aim is protectionist in nature. It is designed to help American exports and make imports to the United States more difficult.

But these same circles forget that in the capitalist system, money is not only a means of exchange but a means of payment. Dollars serve not only for world trade; they also serve for the export of capital. What American capitalism gains in the "commodities" column, it loses in the "capital" column. From now on, American capitalism will need more dollars to buy a factory in Europe. And a German or Japanese capitalist will be able to buy a factory in the United States with fewer deutsche marks and yen.

That is why American imperialism long resisted the temptation to devaluate. The Gaullists, who have spouted for a long time against the Yankees for buying "our" factories, are decidedly inconsistent in their ideas. Yesterday's complaints are forgotten in exchange for the new complaints. Today, what is involved above all is to protect "our" foreign markets and to sell "our" goods. If not, unemployment will rise in France and along with it the

2. "To the city (Rome) and to the world." The words with which the pope formerly accompanied benedictions pronounced on the Catholic world during certain solemn church festivals.

threat of a new May 1968 at the door. . .

The different reactions of the various imperialist powers is tied in with their particular interests and their respective levels of power. The West German capitalists, who are the strongest, do not fear a new minor revaluation of the deutsche mark (an inevitable consequence of floating exchange). The British, who are the weakest, are seeking to profit from the confusion and carry out a discreet new devaluation of the pound. The Italians, the most threatened so-



MEANY: "Robin Hood in reverse because it robs from the poor and gives to the rich."

cially, wish above all to avoid any change in the lira.

As for the French capitalists, who benefited from the effects of the devaluation of the franc during the West German boom, they would like to keep their cake while eating it. Their "two-tier exchange" means that French exports would profit from a lower exchange rate for the franc, while the movement of French capital would profit from the lower exchange rate of the dollar.

Such a system, possible in a small country for a short time, quickly becomes impractical in a more important imperialist power. It opens the way to all kinds of speculation, gambling on the stock market, illicit trading and outright frauds (but perhaps that is why the new Société du Dix Décembre, which was already up to its neck in the affair of les Halles and the Garantie Foncière, plunged into the new situation with delight; these gentlemen thieves have long

knives, particularly when they are inside the government!). Just who is to compel an exporter to repatriate his deutsche marks in a "commodities" column when he can obtain a larger sum of francs in a "capital" column? Just who is to check up on fictitious imports designed to obtain deutsche marks at a good price to be resold at a higher rate of the "free market"?

The fact that after twenty years of expanding international capitalist trade—which, it should be noted, had only by 1965 brought per capita exports back up to the level of 1913—complete anarchy, insecurity, and disorder again reign says a lot about the insoluble historic crisis shaking the system that survives in the West, thanks to the traditional labor leaders!

### Behind the Monetary Screen

Marx liked to repeat that monetary phenomena were only reflections of the economic life, and whoever sought to explain crises essentially by these phenomena, was mistaking the appearance for the reality. This observation remains as valid as ever.

When the dollar is depreciated, when the international monetary system set up at Bretton Woods goes down, this is above all not because of wicked speculators, of too imprudent creditors, or too prudent bankers (especially in other countries!). It is not because money is "badly managed" or because the advice of Professor Rueff has not been followed, or because one has not gone back to the exalted philosophy of the French peasants and kept one's savings in a sock, or hidden in a washing machine, in the form of gold coins. It is because the economic system as a whole is sick.

The fundamental cause of the inflation is the indebtedness of governments, businesses, and consumers. This indebtedness has been mushrooming since 1940 (that of the governments since 1914). Without this indebtedness and this permanent inflation, expansion, full employment, economic growth have become impossible in a capitalist system in decline. The armaments economy is the basis of state indebtedness. Abnormally swollen credit is the basis of private indebtedness. For thirty years, neo-capitalist "prosperity" has ridden an ocean of credit. Sooner or later waves of inflation were bound to engulf the ship. The collapse of the dol-

lar has shown that the "stabilizers," constructed with such pain, were no longer able to resist the smashing of these ever more powerful waves.

Capitalist prosperity depends on two conditions — a rising rate of profit and an expanding market. The logic of capitalism is such that these conditions coincide only at certain moments. When they coincide temporarily, this in itself creates the conditions for their subsequent separation. The two coincide momentarily during the course of each economic cycle and periodically on a more general and durable scale. Since 1966, we have entered a long period in which the coinciding of the two is being undermined more and more.

To emerge from the recession that has been hitting the American economy for the past two years, Nixon requested Congress to give a tax credit on investments and to repeal an excise tax on automobiles. The industrialists and bankers, as well as not a few "liberal" politicians, applauded. What's good for profits is good for the United States. Who would dare think otherwise in the paradise of "free enterprise"?

Right-wing trade-union figures like George Meany protested under pressure from the ranks. What about the freeze on dividends and undistributed profits as a counterweight to the freeze on wages? Where are the guarantees against rises in prices? Where is the compensation for *past* losses in buying power already sustained by the wage workers?

These protests signify that the American workers are going to battle harder for their standard of living, threatened by inflation, taxes, the consequences of the war in Vietnam, and the repercussions that can be counted on as the American bosses seek to answer international competition. They signify longer and harder strikes. But not only that. They involve above all a new contraction of the domestic American market (the reductions in public expenditures and the increased cost of imported products both serve to reduce overall buying power already under full retraction).

How is unemployment to be wiped out under these conditions? Moreover, don't the bosses at bottom want to maintain unemployment in order to hold down wages? But under these conditions, how can the economy be

genuinely started up again (and, in passing, assure Nixon's reelection next year)?

The European capitalists are not without guile. They point their fingers at American protectionism. They have become the attorneys of free trade. But at the least economic shock, they too will come out foursquare for sacred self-interest. They will defend their foreign outlets by devaluations one after the other (French franc, pound sterling) or by stabilization measures (deutsche mark) which will end up by provoking unemployment either at home or among neighboring countries.

With Wall Street playing some of its trump cards, the reaction in the Common Market was *every man for himself* to such a degree that the European bourgeoisie could not lay out any collective defense against American protectionism. Big business may well end up by compelling its politicians to act in the sense of closer European "solidarity" out of fear that Uncle Sam will export his unemployment to the old continent. But how to divide the risks, the losses, and the profits of such solidarity? This is the subject of the current bargaining.

Under these conditions, it is excluded that the inflation will stop. A recession that threatens to become general, increasing unemployment, excess capacity hitting a half dozen key industries cannot be combined with a halt to inflation except at the price of a new 1929, a price that no imperialist power is ready to pay. But persistent inflation joined to exacerbated interna-

tional competition signifies an erosion of the international monetary system that can no longer be averted. This means that an interimperialist agreement on a sufficient new international reserve money is impossible. And that makes certain the threat that the growth of international trade will be slowed down. The conclusion is accentuation of the reversal of the 1945-65 expansionist tendency.

The violent perturbation of the dollar means more than devaluation of a symbol and a monetary system. The international capitalist system as a whole has emerged from a long cycle of expansion to begin a long cycle of much slower growth and many more crises.

In reality, since the German recession of 1966-67, the international capitalist economy has not had a single year of general prosperity. There has not been a single year without a recession or monetary crisis somewhere. The merry-go-round has only begun. The long cycles last on an average twenty to twenty-five years.

If the workers so desire, if they provide themselves with a revolutionary leadership that is up to the height of the historic task, this cycle can give rise to the victory of socialism in the West. If their struggles end in defeats because of lack of an adequate leadership, then capitalism will seek to resolve its structural crisis on their flesh and bones, as it did during the thirties and forties. The crisis that has begun is thus both a promise and a warning.

August 24, 1971

## Carlos Feliciano Wins Bail Reduction

Puerto Rican nationalist Carlos Feliciano won a reduction of his bail from \$175,000 to \$25,000 on August 18 in Manhattan City Court.

Feliciano has been held in jail since May 16, 1970, when he was arrested by New York City police on sensational charges of bombing forty-one public buildings. This accusation was used by the prosecutor as justification for the astronomical bail figure, even though the indictment charges Feliciano with but one count of attempted arson.

The prosecutor also asserted that Feliciano was "affiliated, we believe,

with an alien government outside the territorial limits of the United States."

These witch-hunt accusations are seen as an attempt to establish a non-existent link between bombings of buildings in New York and Puerto Rico and the Nationalist party, of which Feliciano is a member. In the Fall 1970 issue of *USLA Reporter* (the newsletter of the United States Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners), Ruth Reynolds wrote:

"Once such a false but juridical link has been established through Carlos's conviction in a court of law, the gov-

ernment will feel confident to proceed at will against Puerto Rican Nationalists both in the United States and

in Puerto Rico, incarcerating whomsoever it wishes on false charges of bombing or conspiring to bomb pub-

lic and private buildings."

Feliciano's trial has been set for September 27.

## Martyr of the Fourth International

# Luiz Eduardo Merlino — Exemplary Revolutionist

By Eduardo Pinheiro

The military dictatorship, an instrument defending the perpetuation of capitalist exploitation and imperialist domination in Brazil, has just committed a new crime: the assassination of Luiz Eduardo Merlino, Comrade "Nicolau," a journalist and revolutionary activist and adherent of the Fourth International. This crime comes as an addition to the long list of those tortured and assassinated for raising their voices against the antidemocratic policies of the dictatorship.

Comrade Luiz Eduardo Merlino was arrested in São Paulo July 15 by soldiers of the Bandeirantes Operation (OBAN — the specialists in tracking down revolutionaries). On July 21 his body was returned to his family. He had been savagely tortured to death for refusing to give information which they tried to wrest from him through methods that can only be compared with those of Nazism.

Luiz Eduardo da Rocha Merlino was twenty-three years old. He was born October 18, 1947, in Santos (state of São Paulo). Prior to the 1964 military coup d'etat, he had participated in Santos in the activities of the People's Cultural Center (CPC), a group guided by the National Student Union (UNE), which was one of the channels through which the radicalized youth carried out a program of politicization in contact with the masses.

From 1965 onward he worked in São Paulo in journalistic circles, first on the *Jornal da Tarde* in 1965 and 1966, then on the *Fôlha da Tarde* in 1967 and 1968, and finally on the *Jornal do Bairro* in the years 1969 to 1970. Luiz Eduardo Merlino took an active part in all the meetings and struggles of his profession, such as the demonstration against the arrest of journalists in front of the São Paulo military tribunal in April 1968, and

the protest movements sparked by promulgation of Institutional Act No. 5 in December 1968,<sup>1</sup> when he led the *Fôlha da Tarde* journalists' strike.

In 1967 he was the principal inspirer of the ephemeral *Amanhã*, a weekly published by the powerful students' association of the Faculty of Philosophy, Science, and Letters at the University of São Paulo. This paper, which ceased appearing at the end of several issues following increased pressures, was scarcely a student journal but rather a broadsheet aimed at the ranks of the workers.

Alongside his work in journalism, Luiz Eduardo Merlino carried on intensive activity in the student movement, notably in the front lines at the University of São Paulo School of Philosophy. On his initiative, the school was occupied during the upswing of the mass movement in 1968. As a member of the Executive Commission of the State of São Paulo Student Union (the clandestine UEE) headed by José Dirceu, he was present at the Ibiúna Congress of the National Student Union in 1968. Besides this, he worked on *Grêmio Informa*, organ of the students' association at the University of São Paulo School of Philosophy.

1. Institutional Act No. 5 of December 13, 1968, gave the president of Brazil virtually unlimited power to oust dissidents from public office, to strip individuals of their political rights, and to intervene in state politics. It also suspended the right to writs of habeas corpus in "national security" cases. President Arthur Costa e Silva took these repressive steps in response to refusal of the Brazilian Congress to waive parliamentary immunity of a dissident member, Marcio Moreira Alves, and turn him over to the army for a military trial. Promulgation of the act prompted mass protests against the dictatorship. It was followed immediately by a crackdown against political activists involving hundreds of arrests. — IP

In 1968, he joined the Communist Workers party (Partido Operário Comunista — POC), where he was known under the pseudonym of "Nicolau." He was active from the outset in this organization's student wing, where he played an important role in the actions around the Rockefeller visit in 1969.

Beginning with the second semester of that same year, he was included in the São Paulo regional leadership of the POC. After December 1969 he organized and led one of the POC's worker cells in the industrial section of São Paulo state known as ABC (after the triangle formed by the towns of São André, São Bernardo, and São Caetano).

Comrade Nicolau was one of the leaders of the opposition to the traditional POC leadership in the internal struggle which broke out in the party in 1969-70. He struggled against the heritage of propagandism and against opportunist centrism, which were the outstanding traits of the POC and of the POLOP [Política Operária — Workers' Politics]<sup>2</sup>, out of which that organization grew.

It was during the prolongation of this battle that he, along with other cadres, joined the Fourth Internation-

2. *Política Operária*, or POLOP, was a reformist journal published by left Christian Democrats prior to the 1964 military overthrow of the populist regime of Joao Goulart. The name was used by a series of clandestine left journals after 1964. In early 1968 *Política Operária* was in the hands of the Revolutionary Marxist Organization (ORM), which was popularly known as POLOP, after the title of its journal. The ORM, or "POLOP," was one of the main components of the POC at the time of the latter's formation in April 1968. The other chief element within the POC was a "Leninist Opposition" grouping from the old pro-Moscow Brazilian CP (Partido Comunista Brasileiro — PCB) of Luiz Carlos Prestes. — IP

al, taking this step so as to implant in the heart of the POC the program of revolutionary Marxism and a correct strategic and tactical orientation within the perspective of a prolonged revolutionary war on a continental scale. His experience in the mass student movement and in the workers' movement enabled him to make a significant contribution to political formulations in the domain of tactical and organizational questions facing the Brazilian workers' movement, precisely the domain in which the POC was so greatly lacking.

With his comrades of the Fourth International, he centered the debate he was conducting within the POC around five theses. These dealt with revolutionary war, with the Brazilian workers' movement, questions on organizing the vanguard within existing Brazilian conditions, the analysis of the revolutionary left and the tactic of alliances flowing from it, and finally with the analysis of the international Communist movement and the construction of a revolutionary international. These theses offer a substantial correction to the conceptions prevailing up to now within the POC.

He had recently been in France for several months and was present as an observer at the Second Congress of the Communist League [Ligue Communiste], French section of the Fourth International, at Rouen in May 1971.

Hunted for a long time, Comrade Nicolau was savagely assassinated after his arrest in São Paulo. The mercenary scum killed a political cadre whose qualities they had reason to fear: his courage, his combativity, his devotion to the cause of national and social liberation of his country, to the cause of the socialist revolution. Everyone who knew him, even his political opponents, recognized these qualities in him—qualities so necessary to carrying out revolutionary struggle under the difficult conditions of today's Brazil.

He saw most lucidly all the enormous difficulties to be overcome. These difficulties led him to say that the fight of revolutionary Marxist activists in the present Brazilian situation meant going against the stream. Nevertheless, he drew from this a stronger determination and firmness in these conditions.

The Brazilian revolution has lost a fighter beyond compare. The Fourth International has lost an activist who

symbolizes all that is best in this new generation of activists, who are rediscovering Trotskyism in the context of the international revolutionary upsurge prompted by the victories of the Cuban and Indochinese revolutions.

Nonetheless, the gorillas of the Brazilian dictatorship would do well not to rejoice at this latest exploit of the fascist-type repression they have launched in the country. Even if reaction momentarily scores some points in Brazil, the ruling classes and imperialism confront a challenge that

transcends national frontiers and is continental in scale. This challenge of the Latin American revolution, of the anticapitalist and anti-imperialist struggle of all the peoples of Latin America, cannot be met by the defenders of an antiquated order. Today a valiant fighter has fallen, but he will become a banner for all those who will succeed him and who will follow his example. And they will be numerous.

Our fidelity to Comrade Luiz Eduardo Merlino consists in continuing his fight until victory.

August 1971

## SWP's Tribute to Luiz Eduardo Merlino

[The following message was sent by the national convention of the Socialist Workers party (SWP) to the Ligue Communiste (French section of the Fourth International) on August 11.]

\* \* \*

Dear Comrades:

The delegates at the twenty-fourth national convention of the Socialist Workers Party join you in mourning the death of Comrade Luiz Eduardo Merlino at the hands of the torture squads of the Brazilian political police.

Comrade Eduardo Merlino refused to give any information that could lead to

further victimizations, even though it meant dying. His example will never be forgotten by the revolutionists working in the underground in Brazil. It will inspire and help harden all those, the world around, who are fighting to bring this brutal era to an end.

The name of Luiz Eduardo Merlino has been added to the long list of martyrs of the Fourth International, who gave their lives in the struggle for socialism.

That struggle goes on. We dedicate ourselves to do everything possible to bring it to the early and victorious conclusion for which Comrade Eduardo Merlino fought. □

## Tokyo Militants Rally in Behalf of Irish

In Tokyo August 12, about fifty workers and students held what is probably the first Japanese demonstration in support of the struggle for national liberation in Ireland.

The action began with a rally at Johchi University, one of the most prominent Catholic schools in Japan. Although most students were on vacation, some, according to our correspondent, came to the rally, where the Marxist writer Wataru Yakushiji explained the nature of the struggle going on in Ireland.

The students were especially interested, it is reported, by Yakushiji's explanation that the nationalist people are not fighting to impose Catholicism on the Protestants but in fact their struggle for liberation is undermining the position of the Catholic church.

"After a rally of an hour," our cor-

respondent writes, "we marched on the British Embassy, which is about thirty minutes' walk from the place where our rally was held. The British officials as well as the Japanese police were completely taken aback by our demonstration.

"We were able to carry on a militant action in front of the embassy for thirty minutes before a 200-man riot squad came to disperse us.

"Our slogans were: Down With the Special Powers Act! Withdraw All British Troops from Northern Ireland Now! Down With the Orangemen's Parade! We Shall Fight Together With the IRA! We Extend Unconditional Support to the Irish Struggle for Self-Determination and Against Imperialism! Down With Imperialist Rule in Northern Ireland! Down With Neo-Colonialist Rule in the Twenty-Six Counties!" □

# Nixon Biggest Loser in Saigon Election Farce

By Allen Myers

*"The Americans are going and I am staying, at least for four years. I should make the decision that I will have to live with. . . . The Americans no more want me to lose the war or become the victim of a coup than I do. They have virtually no alternative but to support me or withdraw."*  
— Nguyen Van Thieu.

*"The whole thing is in a shambles. None of us knows where we are going from here."*—An unnamed U.S. "specialist on Vietnam," as quoted by Terence Smith in the August 24 *New York Times*.

The winner of the Saigon presidential "election" scheduled for October 3 has been decided. The current incumbent, Nguyen Van Thieu, is now the only candidate.

The losers in the contest are U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, Richard Nixon, and perhaps Thieu as well.

Nixon's attempt to hold a "democratic" mask over the face of the puppet regime began to collapse August 20, when General Duong Van Minh withdrew from the campaign. The Nixon administration, which had been telling the American public that a choice between two or three generals constituted "democracy" for South Vietnam, immediately expressed "regret."

The sentiment, we may be sure, was sincere. Ton That Tien of the Asian News Service wrote in a dispatch published in the August 21 *Christian Science Monitor*:

"President Thieu of South Vietnam and United States Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker have lost a colossal gamble, and the price to be paid for it may be just as big.

"President Nixon's Vietnam policy may now be floating down the Saigon River.

"The gamble was that Gen. Duong Van Minh could be coaxed and threatened to stay in the South Vietnamese presidential race to give a high-price window dressing to Mr. Thieu's reelection on a 'peace through victory'

platform and to preserve South Vietnam's democratic facade.

"But even before the game really got started, 'Big Minh' picked up his marbles and went home because he was convinced that there would be heavy cheating."

Minh's withdrawal came after the failure of repeated attempts to force the U.S. to restrain Thieu's manipulation of the elections. Minh provided the U.S. embassy with documented proof of some of Thieu's tricks, in-



BUNKER: Loses bet on Saigon "election."

cluding multiple voting cards that had been issued to Thieu supporters and a copy of a secret directive Thieu had sent to his hand-picked province chiefs.

"The 5,000-word directive," Alvin Shuster reported in the August 21 *New York Times*, ". . . suggested that the 'police can best be used to sow confusion and intimidate the opposition.' It said that each province should have a special staff in charge of the

election campaign plan, that it must be kept a secret and that every effort must be made to harass anti-Government elements.

"If they are civil servants they can be transferred," it said. "If they are elected village or hamlet chiefs, they can be neutralized by other village councilors and, in general, we can always dig up in our files to see if any of them have personal files of bad conduct or even guilty conduct and we use these documents to persuade them to work for us or, if they refuse, arrest them."

The day after Minh's announcement, Thieu and Bunker put the "vice president," Nguyen Cao Ky, back into the campaign. The Saigon Supreme Court, which had disqualified Ky on August 5, reversed itself on August 21. Craig R. Whitney described the event in the August 22 *New York Times*:

". . . On Friday night [August 20], he [Bunker] went back to the palace for another session with President Thieu, who reportedly told the Supreme Court to postpone from Friday night until yesterday morning [August 21] its final ruling on his own electoral law.

"What the Ambassador and the President talked about is still a secret. But yesterday morning, a couple of blocks away in their gently decaying French-style Palace of Justice, the nine ermine-robed judges of the Supreme Court sat dutifully waiting. At noon, Mr. Bunker called on Mr. Ky. At 1 o'clock, the judges filed to their semicircular bench.

". . . Quicker than the rap of a gavel, Mr. Ky was declared a qualified candidate for President and posted on the ballot."

But by this time, even Ky was tired of the charade. Bunker's attempts to keep him in the campaign were no more successful than they had been with Minh, and Ky announced the next day that he would not be a candidate. Thieu, making the best of a bad situation, declared that Ky's name would remain on the ballot re-



ardless of whether the latter campaigned.

This public exposure of the real nature of the Thieu regime drove the influential *New York Times* to the verge of despair. "A one-candidate election," the paper's editors wrote August 24, "amounting to a plebiscite for Thieu, would be the worst defeat the United States has yet suffered in Vietnam."

The day before, the editors had made clear their belief that Nixon and his ambassador had seriously mishandled the whole affair:

"The presidential election and the whole constitutional system built painstakingly in South Vietnam over the past five years at the cost of 45,000 American lives now are being turned into a farce by President Thieu's clumsy maneuvers to assure his return to office with a large majority. Continued connivance by the American Ambassador in these extraordinary tactics, designed to create

the appearance of a contested election, will disgrace the United States before the world—a disgrace compounded by Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky's decision to withdraw from the race whether or not his name remains on the ballot.

"Ambassador Bunker's tut-tutting for eight months failed to convince General Thieu that the United States was more interested in a genuine election than in his victory. If that has not been the American position, it ought to be. It is still not too late for President Nixon to assert that view and change events in Saigon. He may have to change ambassadors at the same time."

Somewhat belatedly, the Nixon administration escalated its pressure on Thieu to come up with some sort of face-saving compromise. At an August 24 press conference, State Department spokesman Robert McCloskey brought up the possibility of a coup even before reporters asked about it.

"I sense in this room the speculation that coup efforts might be mounted," McCloskey said. "We have no evidence to that effect, although it is understandable speculation in this period because of the political dissatisfaction manifested over the past week."

Thieu, however, seemed unconcerned by this threat. Daniel Southerland wrote from Saigon in the August 26 *Christian Science Monitor*:

". . . most Vietnamese sources say that things have now gone too far for Mr. Thieu to back off from his plans to go through with a one-man election, regardless of how farcical this might seem both in Saigon and abroad.

"Whatever the American hope may be, Mr. Thieu seems to be preparing more for trouble with his opponents than for compromise. The government has ordered additional combat police into Saigon in the past week to guard against possible disturbances." □

## Daley's Crony Fails to Block Indictment

# Official Cover-Up Charged in Hampton Killing

After months of legal wrangling, a Chicago judge on August 24 was finally forced to open a sealed indictment charging Cook County State's Attorney Edward Hanrahan and thirteen other persons with conspiracy to obstruct justice. Hanrahan is considered the second most powerful figure in the political machine of Mayor Richard Daley.

The indictment stems from the December 4, 1969, police raid on the Chicago apartment of Illinois Black Panther party chairman Fred Hampton. In the predawn attack, Hampton and another Panther, Mark Clark, were killed and four other Panthers were wounded.

Immediately following the raid, Hanrahan and the police presented news media with sensational accounts of a "shoot-out" in which the Panthers had fired as many as 200 shots. Hanrahan went so far as to reenact his version of the events for the benefit of television viewers. The Panther survivors of the raid were charged with attempted murder and illegal use of weapons.

However, contradictions in the official story and widespread disbelief in the police account—particularly in the Black community—led to the calling of a federal grand jury, which presented its report on May 15, 1970. The federal jury found that of approximately 100 shots fired during the "shoot-out," only one could conceivably have come from the Panthers. Of the police investigation of the killings, the grand jury said it "was so seriously deficient that it suggests purposeful malfeasance." The jury also said the raid had been touched off by false reports from the FBI that Panthers were "stockpiling" weapons. (See *Intercontinental Press*, June 1, 1970, p. 520.)

The federal grand jury, however, failed to act on its own report. None of the police or government officials involved were indicted.

Following legal petitions by several local civic groups, a special grand jury was ordered impaneled by the Cook County Court in December 1970. It was this jury that brought the indictment announced August 24.

The indictment had actually been voted four months earlier, at the end of April. But Judge Joseph A. Power, a political ally of Mayor Daley as well as his neighbor and former law partner, ordered the indictment sealed. Power instructed the special prosecutor, Barnabas Sears, to call additional witnesses and imposed a fine of \$50 an hour when Sears refused. Power also ordered a review of the grand jury proceedings, appointed an outside investigator to determine if Sears had improperly influenced the jury, and announced his intention to question individual jurors.

These moves were finally blocked by Sears's appeal to the Illinois Supreme Court.

The indictment charges the fourteen defendants with "unlawfully, willingly and knowingly destroying, altering, concealing and disguising physical evidence by planting false evidence and by furnishing false information."

Hanrahan is also specifically accused of presenting another grand jury with "false and inflammatory" evidence in order to secure indictment of

the seven Panthers who survived the police raid.

His assistant, Richard Jalovec, is charged with concealing information from the police Internal Investigating Division and with helping to prepare answers for the cops who were questioned about how the killings occurred.

Eight of the police who participated in the raid are accused of deliberately mishandling evidence: collecting weapons without tagging them properly or processing them for fingerprints; placing the weapons on public display instead of turning them over to the police crime laboratory.

The indictment also charged that the eight cops, Hanrahan, and Jalovec deliberately supplied false information to Chicago newspapers and television stations.

The former deputy police superintendent, who led the investigation of the raid, and his assistant were indicted for preparing questions "with suggested exculpatory answers" for the raiding party to give investigators.

Two members of the crime laboratory are accused of preparing evidence to back the police version of events.

The grand jury also listed as co-conspirators, but did not indict, police superintendent James B. Conlisk Jr., two assistant state's attorneys, and two cops involved in the police investigation.

Considering the fact that two persons were killed in the raid on Hampton's apartment, the indictment is extremely lenient. John Kifner reported in the August 26 *New York Times*:

## How to subscribe

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

Jot 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 \_\_\_\_\_

"Spokesmen for the city's blacks reacted warily to the news of the indictment, praising the grand jury for bringing charges at all, but contending that the charge should have been murder.

"Laplois Ashford, director of the Urban League, called the allegation of

## Philippines

# Maoists Defeated in Student Elections

By Francisco Blandino

### Manila

The ultraleftism of the Maoist students on the Diliman campus of the University of the Philippines in Quezon City took its toll in the student council elections August 6. When the votes were counted, the Maoists had won only six of fourteen seats.

Their presidential candidate lost by 200 votes. The Maoist candidate for vice president lost by more than 1,200 votes, and the candidate for the Women's Union by more than 1,500.

In the 1970 elections, the Maoists rode the upsurge of demonstrations in Manila to win twelve of the student council seats. Their presidential candidate, Ericson Baculinao, defeated his three opponents by more than 1,000 votes.

The Maoists' ultraleftism reached a climax in February when they proclaimed a "Democratic Commune" and threw up barricades on the campus during demonstrations in support of striking jeepney [minibus] drivers. This action alienated the drivers, who soon returned to work, and most students, who were disturbed by the wild rhetoric and vandalism that accompanied it.

At the same time, the Maoists converted the student newspaper, the *Philippine Collegian*, into their own organ, and refused to permit any criticism of their actions. Anyone—including other radicals—with a contribution for the paper was told to "take it to the bourgeois press" or was shouted at as a "puppet of Marcos."

In this year's elections, the opposition radicals ran a single slate against the Maoists. In the convocation before the election, where all the main candidates were to deliver speeches, the Maoists attacked their opponents as

conspiracy to obstruct justice 'far too mild,' and Philip Smith, executive director of Voters Organized to Educate, added:

"There are many in the black community who will always believe the charge should have been murder in the first degree." □

"stooges of the president" and concluded by throwing bottles at them.

The Maoists have since proved incapable of drawing any lessons from their defeat on the Diliman campus, which is the stronghold of student radicalism in the Philippines. Following the election, they circulated a leaflet blaming the outcome on the Marcos administration and the Department of National Defense.

A woman student gave a more convincing explanation: "People just became tired of them, the strikes, boycotts, and everything. They just shout and order people around. You can't even talk to them." □

## Third Trial Set for Newton

On August 8, a mistrial was declared in the manslaughter trial of Huey Newton, a cofounder of the Black Panther party. Newton had been found guilty of voluntary manslaughter in September 1968 for allegedly killing an Oakland cop in October 1967.

After a one-and-a-half year defense campaign, the California state Court of Appeals, bowing to mass pressure, overturned the conviction and ordered a new trial. Newton, who had served twenty-two months of a two-to-fifteen-year jail sentence, was then freed on \$50,000 bail.

His second trial ended after the jury, following six days of deliberation, announced that it could not agree on a verdict. The deadlock was reportedly produced by one woman juror who held out for acquittal.

Despite the fact that the framed-up nature of the charges has now been clearly demonstrated, Alameda County District Attorney D. Lowell Jensen promptly announced that he would ask for yet another trial (now scheduled to begin October 12). His reason? "A case like this is not a normal case—it involves the slaying of a police officer, about the most serious offense we can think of." □

## Bolivian Workers Unable to Block Military Coup

By Gerry Foley

"While Ranger units were besieging Oruro, the center of the mine fields and the stronghold of the Torres regime," the Paris daily *Le Monde* reported August 24, "most of the big cities had been occupied by rebel military forces. On Saturday [August 21], with the rebels advancing on the capital, the government issued a call for a popular mobilization. The People's Assembly, representing the unions and the left parties, formed armed militias which were stationed in front of the strategic points in La Paz. But, in all, the population loyal to the government had 2,000 obsolete Mausers to combat the tanks of the rebels. For eight hours on Saturday they waged a bloody battle against the military. The shift of the air force and the chief of staff of the army to the side of the rebels gave the latter a decisive advantage. . . . Dozens of dead lay in the streets of the capital."

An editorial in the same issue of *Le Monde* commented: "Armed too late with too obsolete weapons, the popular militias could not hold out against tanks."

The August 19-22 military coup led by General Hugo Banzer Suárez, former head of the military academy, had been in preparation for at least six months. A general rehearsal was staged January 10 and another on March 3.

In the first rehearsal, General Banzer's cadets joined with the ultrarightist Ingavi regiment in an abortive putsch in La Paz, seizing the general staff of the armed forces, including the chief of staff General Reque Terán, who has now turned up on the side of the new rightist regime. The plot failed after Torres called on the workers to mobilize and after the air force strafed the rebel stronghold.

On March 3, 2,500 peasants staged a "march against the infantile left" in Santa Cruz. They seized the city, occupied the worker-run radio station, and ousted the prefect of the province, setting up a local military commander in his place. They also demanded the



PAZ ESTENSSORO: Rides back with Bolivian fascists and generals.

removal of five ministers from President Torres's cabinet. Both the ousted prefect and the five ministers were members of the MNR [Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario — Revolutionary Nationalist Movement], whose leadership has backed the latest coup.

The putsch was supported by the bureaucratic National Confederation of Agricultural Workers built up under Barrientos and in fact controlled by Colonel Hugo Céspedes, Torres's minister of agriculture.

Torres was able to beat back the March 3 putsch in Santa Cruz by basing himself again on a mobilization of the workers and students. Mario Gutiérrez, head of the fascist FSB [Falange Socialista Boliviana — Bolivian Socialist Phalanx] was arrested following the failure of the coup. Despite their involvement in these previous putsches, both Gutiérrez and Banzer were set free to lead their latest and finally successful attempt to oust the weak, dem-

agogic Torres government.

There are indications that the latest coup received support from Brazil. In the Rio de Janeiro daily *O Globo*, exiled Falangist leader Hans Koehler Monteiro wrote that circles had been formed in Brazil "to aid in the freedom struggle." He explained that preparations for the uprising had been in progress since March and that the aim of the new government was to "support private capital, to put an end to the armed militias, and to bring about order so that the nation can progress."

Almost simultaneously with the first putsch in Santa Cruz, General Hugo Bethlem, former Brazilian ambassador to La Paz, made the following statement May 5: "I propose a kind of protectorate for a certain time for nations like Bolivia, a sort of big brotherly tutelage permitting an integration with the nations of this continent and not with the world superpowers, both of which are materialistic."

The province of Santa Cruz, where the rightist insurrection began, borders Brazil and forms a natural continuation of the region on the other side of the frontier. A number of factors set it off from the rest of Bolivia.

Unlike the highlands, where the tin mines are located, this lush tropical plain is inhabited by a people who are mostly of European stock and who have developed racial prejudices against the Indians of the barren Altiplano.

Santa Cruz is an area of prosperous ranches. (General Banzer owns one of them.) It is also the location of Bolivia's most promising oil fields—the main attraction for foreign capital at present. This last factor, in particular, has led the imperialists to grant special privileges to the area in order to build a stronghold against revolution on the Altiplano, their idea being to construct a South American Katanga.

The scenario opened on August 19 in almost exactly the same way as on March 3. According to a Reuters dispatch in the August 21 *New York Times*, thirty persons, including General Banzer, were arrested in Santa Cruz following violent antigovernment demonstrations.

A report in the August 21 *Le Monde* gave a slightly different account. According to this version, the right-wing demonstrations were held to protest the previous arrest of Banzer and his

associates. A thousand rightists, *Le Monde* said, gathered in the center of the city and stormed the labor-run radio station but were driven back from the university by armed students and workers.

"The army was ordered to occupy the city, but a certain hesitation seemed to develop among the officers," the *Le Monde* report continued: "The situation remains confused. The rebels claim that the city and province of Santa Cruz are in their hands. According to other information, students and workers are smashing the rebels."

At that point the local garrison seems to have intervened decisively in the struggle on the side of the rebels.

From Santa Cruz, the Falangist chief Gutiérrez broadcast "an appeal to the nation" to rise up and "stop the Communists." He spoke in the name of a "National People's Front" including the MNR and the Falangists, which was allegedly directing the uprising.

The garrisons in Oruro, Cochabamba and Tarisa went over to the side of the rebels. The rightists now appeared to be in control of two-thirds of the country. Along with a large force of peasants from the bureaucratic agricultural organizations, they began marching on La Paz.

In the capital itself on August 21 the cadets of the military school rebelled against the government, entrenching themselves in the headquarters of the army general staff.

In less than forty-eight hours, virtually all the armed forces, including Torres's own service, the air force, lined up solidly behind the rebellion. Finally, the high command itself deserted, leaving Torres with no military support except his personal guard.

Against the betrayal of the armed forces, Torres called for a mobilization of the masses of workers and students. The workers themselves moved in a belated attempt to block the rightist takeover.

"An immediate mobilization of the workers and students was ordered in Oruro in response to the dynamiting of the COB [Central Obrera Boliviana — Bolivian Labor Federation] headquarters, as well as in La Paz, where there were several rightist outbreaks Thursday [August 19]," *Le Monde* reported in its August 21 issue.

"The COB and the Student Federation seized a radio station whose director was supposedly implicated in

the plot. The People's Assembly, which has no legal status but includes the left organizations, called on the people to form armed groups."

But the hastily formed and poorly armed militias were no match for the U.S.-trained and equipped military forces now solidly united behind the rebellion. It is clear, moreover, that the COB and the People's Assembly, which had been adjourned a few weeks before the coup, were unable to give effective political direction to the masses.

The last hold-outs were the students, who put up a desperate resistance at the university in La Paz. A large group refused an opportunity to surrender and were driven from their redoubt in the university tower only by bombardment from tanks and airplanes. Torres had fled to the Peruvian embassy at 2:00 a.m. August 22.

The COB declared that it would continue the struggle underground and called for a general strike August 23, with little result, according to the international capitalist press.

In a front-page editorial August 24, *Le Monde* gave an autopsy of the Torres government:

"General Torres had thought that he could base his regime in a lasting way on 'revolutionary nationalism' without carrying out a severe purge of the army and without reorganizing the only force capable of sustaining him — the workers militias which in 1952 guaranteed the application of the agrarian reform and the nationalization of the tin mines but were later disbanded. To the contrary, in October 1970 he put a last-minute supporter, General Reque Terán, in charge of the army; and the latter's desertion to the rebel camp Sunday [August 22] gave the coup de grace to the regime."

Torres had tried to balance between two irreconcilable forces and was inevitably toppled. "The miners' unions and the student organizations which brought him to power and which he had allowed to form a People's Assembly were pressing for a 'socialism' that the majority of the Bolivian officers considered unacceptable.

"Their privileges threatened, the technical and administrative personnel of the mines went over to the opposition, while the Confederation of Private Enterprises, feeling the pressure of the workers, called on its affiliates to go on 'emergency footing.'"

The officers were frightened by the

spread of revolutionary ideas in the climate of relative democratic freedom permitted by the Torres government. "What remained of the army's independent and progressive spirit was wiped away by the fear of the open agitation of the Trotskyist unions and pro-Peking groups advocating armed struggle and occupation of the rich agricultural estates of Santa Cruz, occupations already begun in fact."

Two specific causes sparked the military revolt, according to *Le Monde*. The first was the demand by the People's Assembly to reestablish diplomatic relations with Havana. The second was the publication in mid-August of a manifesto by a group of left-wing officers calling for reorganization of the military forces into a "people's army."

Torres began playing a left bonapartist role when the armed forces split out of fear of the popular response to the abortive rightist coup of October 4, 1970. Once the military reunified its ranks, Torres was left hanging in mid-air. The only forces opposing the coup were the popular organizations, chiefly the People's Assembly and the COB.

The response of the mass organizations to the rightist uprising cannot be fully evaluated from the sketchy information published so far in the international capitalist press. But weaknesses have been apparent in the People's Assembly, the broadest and most authoritative body emerging from the mass upsurge that began in October.

The most obvious dereliction of the People's Assembly is that, in the face of the extreme tensions in the country, rumors of coups, and open plotting by rightist officers, plus the clear debility of the Torres government, it adjourned in July for two months.

Despite this, according to *Le Monde*, the only armed resistance to the coup was directed by the People's Assembly. But there is no information about how the body was reconvened, if it was, or how representative it was at the time of the fighting, or what forces were leading it. The standing committees of the assembly, dominated by bureaucrats whose first concern was opportunistic maneuvers, may have been the only organs that could act in the name of the People's Assembly.

Other weaknesses of the People's Assembly have been stressed in a report by two members of the International

Marxist Group [IMG—the British section of the Fourth International] who attended sessions of the assembly held before the coup. The two English revolutionists noted there was very little peasant representation, although the peasants comprise two-thirds of the population of Bolivia. Apparently taking advantage of the failure of the assembly to include representatives of the peasants, the new rightist regime has promised to give special attention to the demands of the people on the land.

Furthermore, there was a most dangerous lack of political leadership in the assembly: "The disorganization of the revolutionary left meant that points of real substance were not discussed and directly confronted. Although some delegates tried to protest, the question of the armed organization of the Assembly went by with a shrug, a long list of organisational posts to be filled in some hypothetical armed force, and a totally disingenuous attempt at evasion by a pro-Moscow delegate who said that such matters could not be discussed in the Assembly because of the demands of clandestinity."

The reformist wing, however, had a well-oiled machine, according to these two English observers: "It was aggressive and coherent and above all it had a marked capacity for manoeuvre, showing itself in its element in the manipulations of committees and drafts. They controlled sections of the union bureaucracy and were able to manoeuvre themselves into positions of power in the Committees of the Assembly. . . . As a result the reformists played a role disproportionate to their support in the Assembly. Above all, although the reformists were forced by the voting to accept modifications in resolutions which tended in a revolutionary direction, the majority was unable to devise or even to begin to discuss the means by which the resolutions might be carried out through the independent power of the working class."

Furthermore, along with other deficiencies in its composition, the assembly did not include, as a party, one of the most important forces on the Bolivian left, the POR [Partido Obrero Revolucionario—Revolutionary Workers party, the Bolivian section of the Fourth International, the party headed by Hugo González M.]. Many of the union delegates were

members of the POR but the party itself had no voice in the assembly and its leadership could play no direct role in its proceedings. A fight was waged to win inclusion of the POR but the reformists succeeded in getting the question tabled until the session scheduled to open in early September.

In an article in *Le Monde* August 22, Charles Vanhecke noted that the People's Assembly had "brought together the unions and the left parties in a structured form for the first time" but that it "had unfortunately been paralyzed by a series of internal conflicts and contradictions."

It is too early to tell whether the rightist takeover has meant the crushing of the workers organizations. The two English observers mention regional People's Assemblies that may still be capable of organizing resistance to the new regime on the local level, especially in the mining regions. Nor is there sufficient evidence to assess the meaning of the apparent failure of the COB's strike call.

But it is clear that the workers in Bolivia face a ruthless attack. Banzer has promised, according to the August 24 *Le Monde*, to follow the path laid out by President Barrientos who crushed the unions, established military control of the mines, and massacred the miners on St. John's Day 1965. Already the left parties have been outlawed, censorship has been imposed, and meetings of more than four persons have been banned. In La Paz, Falangist goons destroyed the offices of the left parties.

"Elections don't interest me," General Banzer said, according to the August 26 *Le Monde*. He also stated that "the traditional friendship binding Bolivia and the United States" would be reestablished.

The U. S. ambassador to La Paz, Ernest Siracusa, has been identified as the former head of the CIA in Peru by Antonio Arguedas, the Bolivian minister of the interior who created an international scandal by revealing that he had been a CIA agent while holding office in the Barrientos government.

A report from Santa Cruz in the August 30 *Washington Post*, moreover, linked Major Robert J. Lundin, a military adviser to the Bolivian air force, with the coup. Lundin allegedly met Banzer when he returned to the country clandestinely and provided

the means for the rebel commanders to communicate with their followers in La Paz.

In his statement in Havana, Arguedas also linked the MNR leader Víctor Paz Estenssoro to the CIA. Returning from exile in Lima, this ex-president of Bolivia did, of course, pledge to wage "a great struggle against imperialism." At the same time, he said that he was "returning to the country traveling on the road of freedom with the Phalange and the national army."

The fascistic FSN is largely made up of landowners dispossessed by the MNR governments in their radical phase. Paz Estenssoro's association with this ultrareactionary force—to say nothing of the right-wing militarists—indicates how far the degeneration of his old petty-bourgeois nationalist party has gone. What is not yet clear is how the fascists and "gorillas" will use this discredited demagogue.

In view of the indications of U. S. support for the uprising, some reports by Juan de Onís, the *New York Times*'s well-informed Latin American expert, sound ominous. In the August 28 issue of the authoritative capitalist daily, he wrote:

"This [Bolivia] could become very much like Guatemala,' said a diplomat who has served in that Central American country where thousands have been killed in a conflict between Communist guerrillas and the army and the rightwing 'Death Squads.'"

In the August 29 *Times* de Onís wrote: "To many observers, it looked as though this landlocked country in the heart of South America, where Indian peasants are a great majority but where urban politics are violent and ideologically radicalized, was headed for a long and bloody struggle—as similar conflicts continue to be in Guatemala and the Dominican Republic."

In these two countries, the CIA has pushed a policy of permanent terror, supporting armed rightist gangs who beat up or gun down all suspected opponents of the regime. The notorious Esquadrão da Morte [Death Squadron] operates in the same way in Brazil.

*Le Monde* reported August 27: "Gun fire in the suburbs of La Paz indicates that a manhunt is in progress for the student, trade-union, and political leaders who have gone into hiding waiting for a chance to escape into exile." □

## Nixon, Mao Seeking Ways to Shore Up Yahya

"State Department officials and the Indian and Pakistani ambassadors agree that the potential for an Indo-Pakistani war is high," Stephen Klaidman wrote in the August 23 *Washington Post*.

"The circumstance that could set off such a war, they all agree, would be the execution of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, the East Pakistani political leader who is on trial in West Pakistan for 'waging war' against the state, or a new influx of Bengali refugees into India in response to a famine forecast for the fall."

The possibility that Pakistani dictator Yahya Khan will order Rahman's execution remains a real one. In the August 2 issue of *Newsweek*, Loren Jenkins quoted Yahya as "almost boastfully" telling a visitor: "My generals are pushing for a military trial for Mujib and for his execution. I have agreed and the trial will be held soon."

Jenkins also cited approvingly the remark of a Western diplomat: "Yahya is simply out of his mind. He still doesn't even understand what the army has done. He thinks they can kill off a couple of hundred thousand people, try Mujib for treason, force a return to order and all will be forgotten. This is utter nonsense. These people will not forget."

Rahman's trial was later reported to have begun on August 11. The only information that has so far been released about it is the name of his lawyer—who was not appointed until August 20.

The Nixon administration is reported to have warned Yahya not to take "any summary action"—meaning execution—against Rahman, and to have threatened to cut off its support if it is disobeyed.

It is likely that Yahya takes such threats with a grain of salt. Nixon is firmly committed to backing Pakistani attempts to colonize Bangla Desh, despite the fears of part of the American capitalist class that such a policy is doomed to failure.

The U. S. government has continued to supply Yahya with arms, and the airlift that carries Pakistani troops to Bangla Desh has been made possible

by two jet airliners leased from an American charter airline.

"The lease," Lewis M. Simons reported in the August 19 *Washington Post*, "was arranged with the knowledge and explicit authorization of the State Department, the Commerce Department and the Civil Aeronautics Board."

In an August 6 editorial, the *New York Times* warned Nixon that his support for Yahya was endangering imperialist interests:

"Despite . . . evidence that Bengali resistance is deep-rooted and spreading, President Nixon insists that the United States should continue economic assistance to West Pakistan in order to preserve President Yahya's 'ability to create some stability' in the East.

"But Islamabad's current policies cannot bring stability to East Bengal. In trying to impose law and order by force of arms—mostly American arms—instead of through political accommodation, the military regime is merely fueling the fires of Bengali rebellion. Brutal repressive measures have driven millions of East Pakistanis into exile in India where their presence is generating economic, social and political problems of unprecedented magnitude."

Nixon's backing of Yahya, the editors added, ". . . has put the United States in the position of subsidizing, and thus seeming to condone, crimes against humanity unequalled since Hitler's time."

Press reports indicate that those crimes include the murder of 250,000 to 300,000 persons in the occupied province. The number of refugees, according to a report by Jean-Claude Pomonti in the August 8-9 issue of the French daily *Le Monde*, is 8,000,000—that is, more than one-tenth the population of East Bengal.

Reacting to the public revulsion at this genocide, the U. S. House of Representatives voted to suspend the \$225,000,000 in aid for Yahya that Nixon had requested.

Nixon, as it turned out, had already prepared for this eventuality by seeking out other ways of helping Yahya.

"The United States," Benjamin Welles

wrote in the August 1 *New York Times*, "working behind the scenes, has won the agreement of both Pakistan and the United Nations to station an international group of 156 civilian relief and rehabilitation experts under United Nations sponsorship in East Pakistan. . . ."

The planned relief operation turned out to be considerably less humanitarian than it sounded at first. Its chief task was to be to "help Pakistan restore communications and remobilize the province's private fleet of 40,000 river boats and 10,000 trucks."

"The U. N. itself won't operate anything," one official told Welles, "but it will provide coaching and technical assistance and help restore confidence in the East Pakistan administration."

It is of course precisely communication and transport that have been the main targets of the Mukti Fouj (Liberation Army) guerrillas in Bangla Desh, who realize that rapid transportation is indispensable to the Pakistani army. Alice Thorner pointed out in the August 19 *New York Times*:

"To the extent that the United States, acting in the name of a United Nations relief project, can restore the lines of communication, the grip of the Pakistan Army on East Bengal can be prolonged."

With fewer resources at its disposal, the Maoist regime in Peking is nevertheless doing its best to match Nixon's backing for Yahya. In the August 14 *Washington Post*, Dilip Mukerjee reported that China is outfitting two Pakistani infantry divisions before their departure for Bangla Desh.

Reporting on the "National Independence Day" celebrations of the occupying army in Dacca, Malcolm W. Browne wrote in the August 15 *New York Times*:

"In downtown Dacca, portraits of Mao Tse-tung appeared with those of Pakistani military leaders. Communist China is currently considered here as Pakistan's only strong ally."

Despite his powerful patrons, Yahya has still not succeeded in overcoming the Bengali resistance. It is, if anything, on the increase.

". . . even without direct Indian mil-

itary interference," Werner Adam reported in the August 14 *Far Eastern Economic Review*, "the situation in the East is likely to get worse. The army has met increasing guerrilla activity over the last six weeks—resistance no longer improvised and now showing signs of co-ordination. This kept the troops on the move to retaliate even harder and prevented the restoration of communications. The vital railway link between the Chittagong port and Dacca remained inoperative, two bridges having been blown up by the rebels just as the army had finished repairing three others. The guerrillas also succeeded in cutting the link between Dacca and Ashuganj where only recently one of East Pakistan's biggest power plants had started operating. Even installations in the interior of the province are thus not exempt from sabotage. Dacca itself suffered daily bomb attempts and has been repeatedly without electricity.

"Observers in the eastern wing commented that the increase of guerrilla activity showed that many Bengalis

had overcome their shock and were now determined to fight. . . ."

The successes of the Bengali guerrillas come at a time of increasing difficulty for the Pakistan economy. The July 3 *Far Eastern Economic Review* estimated that without foreign assistance Yahya's convertible exchange assets would be exhausted by the end of August.

"Regarding the internal financial situation," the magazine continued, "against an original estimate of Rs600 million the government now expects to have to obtain Rs1,650 million from the banking system to finance the budget deficit in 1970-71, inflationary financing on a scale 25% over the peak reached during the Kashmir war with India in 1965-66."

These facts are an indication of the scale of the war that Yahya is waging against the Bengali people. They are also a warning to Nixon and Mao that they will have to pay a high economic as well as political price for their attempts to suppress the Bengali revolution. □

region was assured by Henry Kissinger's trip to Peking and the resulting announcement of Nixon's planned visit. Razia Ismail reported in the August 10 *Christian Science Monitor*:

"Mr. Kissinger's trip was cited here [New Delhi] as a triggering factor in the Indian invitation to Moscow. Indians think the first hint of Pakistani belligerency dates from the Kissinger trip, giving the impression that China would back Pakistani pugnacity and that American reluctance to weaken the thaw would prevent American opposition to the Chinese stance."

While the treaty is thus intended to force Yahya to think twice before plunging into a war with India, it also provided the Kremlin with a means of restraining those sections of the Indian capitalist class who might think that Bangla Desh could be seized through a surprise military thrust.

The *Far Eastern Economic Review's* correspondent noted that Indira Gandhi's government will now have to consult with Moscow before taking any major initiative:

"While Swaran Singh stated the treaty in no way restricted India's right to take unilateral action—that is, to move against Pakistan—to defend its national interests, the treaty in effect provides Moscow with a semi-veto on any Indian adventures against its neighbours. If Moscow judges Indian action along its frontiers would lead to an unnecessary and unjustifiable war with Pakistan or China, the terms of the pact are vague enough for Moscow to leave New Delhi to face the consequences alone."

Recognition of this restraint on their jingoistic aspirations caused some of the right-wing Indian parties to oppose the pact. The right-wing Hindu communalist party Jan Sangh in fact organized a protest rally of 500,000 persons in New Delhi August 10.

The treaty has nevertheless already proved advantageous to Indira Gandhi, who is attempting to avoid conceding to the public demand to recognize Bangla Desh, a move that could touch off revolutionary upsurges in the neighboring Indian states.

"When the treaty between India and the Soviet Union was signed on August 9," A. Hariharan reported from New Delhi in the August 21 *Far Eastern Economic Review*, "the relief of finding a powerful friend outweighed political differences—whether over its possible impact on Sino-Indian rela-

## Indian-Soviet Treaty

# Kremlin Strengthens Indira Gandhi's Hand

"Each of the high contracting parties undertakes to refrain from giving any assistance to any third party taking part in an armed conflict with the other party. In case either of the parties is attacked or threatened with attack, the high contracting parties shall immediately start mutual consultations with a view to eliminating this threat and taking appropriate, effective measures to ensure peace and security for their countries. . . ."

"Each of the high contracting parties solemnly declares that it will not undertake any commitment, secret or open, towards one or more states incompatible with the present treaty. Each of the high contracting parties declares further that it has no commitments towards any other state or states and that it will not take any commitments that may cause military damage to the other party."

The "Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Co-operation" signed on August 9 by Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko and Indian External Affairs Minister Swaran Singh was motivated mainly by the Soviet bureauc-

racy's desire to counter Peking's alliance with Pakistan.

Strengthened by political and material support from the Mao regime, Yahya Khan was threatening war against India because of Indian sympathy for the victims of his genocidal course in Bangla Desh. An outbreak of war between India and Pakistan would have unforeseeable consequences.

"For the Indian government, the threat of hostilities with Pakistan could not have come at a worse time," the *Far Eastern Economic Review's* New Delhi correspondent wrote in its August 14 issue. "Although Peking has carefully refrained from spelling out what China would do to help its ally Pakistan in a showdown with India, New Delhi has every reason to suppose that Peking has committed itself to giving substantial assistance. Peking's public statements that the East Pakistan crisis is a purely internal matter in which no outside power can be allowed to interfere was a plain enough warning. . . ."

Mao's relatively free hand in the

tions, or the burial of the concept of nonalignment which has governed India's foreign policy for two decades, or over the say it might give the Soviet Union in action contemplated by India vis-a-vis Pakistan.

". . .Strengthened by the proof that India was no longer alone, Mrs Gandhi was able to avoid recognising Bangla Desh either that day when the huge rally took place, or on India's national day last Sunday [August 15]."

## Mitchell: No Kent Inquiry

U. S. Attorney General John Mitchell announced on August 13 that he would not ask for a grand jury investigation of the murder of four Kent State University students by the Ohio national guard in May of 1970.

This was Mitchell's answer to increasing pressure for such an investigation after the publication of a report by Peter Davies, a New York insurance broker. The report, sponsored by the Board of Christian Concerns of the United Methodist Church, charged that there was evidence that a group of guardsmen had arranged in advance to fire on the student anti-war demonstrators.

Mitchell conceded that the shootings were "unnecessary, unwarranted and inexcusable," but maintained that it

was doubtful that a grand jury could produce any new evidence that would make possible successful prosecution of the guardsmen.

According to an article in the August 14 *Washington Post*, Justice Department officials said that prosecution of the guardsmen would require establishing their "intent" to violate the civil rights of the students. That would be, the unnamed officials said, difficult to prove.

The cynicism of Mitchell's statement was so obvious that even the *New York Times* was compelled to note, in an August 18 editorial, that "a Federal judge has allowed the indictments of 24 students and one faculty member to stand, even though the indictments are based on a county

grand jury report which the judge ruled illegal." The *Times* suggested that "the cause of fair-minded leniency" would be served by dropping the indictments against the victims, although it did not oppose letting the criminals off.

Others, however, were not so content with the Mitchell decision. In the August 23 *New York Times* Joseph Kelner, attorney for the family of one of the murdered students, demanded a public trial of the national guard.

Kelner pointed out that the FBI had found that the claim of the guardsmen that their lives had been endangered by the students was a fabrication. He stated that photographs showed riflemen taking direct aim and firing simultaneously. He asked, "How many killings in America can be 'unnecessary, unwarranted and inexcusable' and yet no effort made to prosecute?" □

## Japanese Groups to Aid Bangla Desh

Calcutta

Professor Setsure Tsurushima, chief of a Japanese delegation sent jointly by the Japan Bangla Friendship Association and the Japan Bangla Solidarity Front, said at a press conference here August 13 that the two organizations would send material aid to the freedom fighters of Bangla Desh.

The delegation arrived here on August 7 to investigate the situation of the Bengali refugees and to gather information about the war in Bangla Desh. After interviews with High Commissioner Hossein Ali and other officers of the mission of the People's Republic of Bangla Desh, they visited several refugee camps and attended meetings of the Calcutta University Bangla Desh Sahayak Samiti and other organizations working for Bangla Desh.

"The plight of the refugees is much worse than we had been led to expect from newspaper reports in Japan," Tsurushima said. "Nothing could be more inhuman or more terrible. . . . Something should be done immediately, by international organizations and governments, to force the Pakistan government to stop the atrocities and maltreatment of innocent people, and to withdraw their criminal troops from Bangla Desh territory." □

## 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



## Rising Resistance in Ireland to British Troops

By Gerry Foley

"They [the British military police and the Royal Ulster Constabulary] shouted: 'crawl like a dog, you bastard: you are a dog,'" Gerard McErlean reported.

The nineteen-year-old youth was one of about 300 persons seized August 9 in predawn raids on the nationalist ghettos of Northern Ireland. Roughly 230 of these, according to press reports, are still being held in the Crumlin Road jail in Belfast and on the prison ship Maidstone anchored in Belfast harbor. They are threatened with indefinite imprisonment without charge or trial.

Another released detainee, Brendan Anderson, aged twenty-five, told reporters: "I was lined up with others and a sergeant in the military police forced us to answer his question. 'What are you?' The answer he wanted was, 'We are animals, Sir.' He choruised this several times."

In a letter smuggled out of the Crumlin Road jail, the Irish journalist Séamus O Tuathail described how the young ghetto dweller Gerry Campbell was arrested: "Taken outside house by soldiers, paratroop regiment. Hands tied behind back. Pushed and shoved to a Saracen tank about 300 yards distant. Soldier holding end of rope constantly pulling hard on same.

"Saracen took six prisoners to troop carrier. Rope strung from hands put around neck to choking point en route to Girdwood barracks via Monagh road. Residents turned out to pelt with bricks and bottles. Held Mr. Campbell at open back of lorry with hands, back and neck still tied as human shield. Soldier put gun to prisoner's head. 'If any shots are fired, mate, I'll blow your fucking head off.'

"Going through Ardoyne pushed out again as human shield and beaten with batons in full view of crowd to provoke them."

Sending overwhelming military forces into the Catholic ghettos throughout Northern Ireland at 4:30 a.m. and dragging off 300 men, the British government left no doubt

about its intentions. It was trying to crush all opposition to the status quo by brute force. Hundreds of arrests and brutal searches carried out by heavy assault forces were a massive blow against a population of 500,000 people living in scattered ghettos, the largest of which is no bigger than a small town.

According to Northern Irish Prime Minister Brian Faulkner's statement of August 9, the raids were aimed at extremists and terrorists belonging to the outlawed Irish Republican Army (IRA). This claim might seem likely to mollify international public opinion, which has been trained to regard Irish freedom fighters as mystical fanatics. It could not impress the people of the nationalist ghettos who know that in Northern Ireland the IRA has served most often as a neighborhood defense force against Protestant pogroms.

It was obvious, moreover, that the attack was aimed not only at the IRA but at all militant opposition to the oppressive system on which the imperialist fortress state of Northern Ireland is based.

Leaders of the Civil Rights Association like Kevin McCorry and Desmond O'Hagan were arrested, along with leaders of the young socialist group People's Democracy like Michael Farrell and John McGuffin, and finally a Belfast city councilman, James O'Kane.

The raids by British troops and the notoriously bigoted Royal Ulster Constabulary were followed up, later reports indicated, by pogroms against the nationalist population. "A simple matter like getting baby food becomes complex because the area is under constant fire from British troops and from Protestant snipers," *Christian Science Monitor* correspondent Jonathan Harsch reported from a Belfast ghetto August 11. "Men here can distinguish the relatively few shots by British troops from the heavier, more erratic fire of the Ulster Volunteer Force [UVF—proimperialist Protestant ex-

tremists], and both of these from the closer single shots and rare repeat bursts from Roman Catholic snipers."

The reactionary Tory government of Edward Heath had sent British troops into a full-scale assault on the Irish nationalist population for the first time since 1921. Since being forced to concede formal independence to four-fifths of Ireland, the London regime has preferred to exercise control over its Northern Irish enclave indirectly. It has supported a fortress state centered in Belfast and based on the hatreds and fears of the Protestant upper caste created and fostered by centuries of colonial rule—a state that could maintain itself only by oppressing a Catholic, nationalist minority totaling more than one-third of the population.

In this way the British government could claim that it had given self-determination to both sections of the Irish population, the nationalists and the "loyalists." If anyone objected to the repressive conditions in Northern Ireland, the London authorities would point out that, with their traditional tolerance, they were just letting the incorrigible Irish be themselves. In this way, the British had ample room for maneuver (much more characteristic of their policy than "tolerance"). On the one hand, they guaranteed to defend the caste state in Belfast against any threat to its bigoted system; on the other, they promised to restrain the dim-witted Protestant Irishmen.

So, in August 1969 British troops were sent into Northern Ireland ostensibly to defend the nationalist minority against pogroms by the RUC and the Protestant B Special militia. In Belfast police and militiamen were driving through nationalist neighborhoods firing indiscriminately on an almost unarmed population.

In Derry, the RUC and the B Specials stormed into the Catholic ghetto, singing the traditional "loyalist" song: "We are, we are the Billy Boys [for King William of Orange who completed the "pacification" of Ireland]; we're up

to our knees in Fenian [nationalist] blood, we're up to our knees in Fenian blood, surrender or you'll die."

In 1969, the intervention of British troops halted fighting that threatened to become uncontrollable. Now, only two years later, these same troops have themselves spearheaded terrorist attacks on the nationalist ghettos. Despite their tanks and heavy weapons, the elite units of one of the most powerful imperialist states in the world were met by the nationalist people with the same desperate courage that threatened to set all of Ireland aflame in 1969.

The *Irish Times* reported August 10: "The first arrests began around 4:30 a.m., and inside three hours a full-scale battle was going on between Catholic rioters and British troops. Countless buses, lorries and vans were freely hijacked to make burning barricades.

"The Army could not break through the barricades, so fierce was the fury of the fires — and the rioters.

"Units of the fire brigade had to retreat under a hail of petrol bombs, stones and other missiles. A huge block of offices and warehouses and four factories were burnt out by 9:00 a.m. . . .

"Every British Army post in Catholic areas came under attack at some time or other, and in Ardoyne and Andersonstown the conflict was almost continuous.

"There were frequent bursts of gunfire in these areas, and the scene of desolation and destruction was horrific: much worse than that which occurred in rioting last year and 1969."

In Derry, the second largest city in Northern Ireland, the nationalist population fought as hard as they did two years ago when they drove the Protestant Black Hundreds and the Orange repressive forces out of their neighborhoods: "It was the worst day of rioting the city had experienced since August 1969, and the first time that guns had been used to any extent against the troops," *Irish Times* correspondent Denis Coghlan cabled.

"The [internment] raids were carried out shortly after 4 a.m. and at about five o'clock a crowd of about 400 had gathered outside Rosemount Police Station, which has been the scene of many battles during previous riots.

"Thirty women with dustbin lids hammered on the door of the station

in protest against the arrests and then bottles and stones began to fly."

Major explosions of violence also occurred in Coalisland, Stabane, and Newry.

The August 10 issue of the moderate loyalist *Belfast Telegraph* reported that the Faulkner government was "stunned" at the power of the nationalist resistance.

Despite days of heavy fighting, destruction of whole neighborhoods, and an exodus of 7,000 Catholic refugees to camps across the Southern border, the nationalist population showed little sign of letting itself be intimidated. In repeated sharp confrontations



BERNADETTE DEVLIN

across the province, the minority stood up to the troops and won tactical, moral victories. For example: "Workers at Coalisland Pipe and Brick Company yesterday staged a walk-out when British troops arrived to carry out a search of the premises," the *Irish Times* reported August 13. "A spokesman for the workers said that they were not going to be intimidated by the action of the British Army and were not prepared to continue working while trigger-happy soldiers poked guns in their backs."

The militant leaders still free did not tone down their attacks on the regime. In Coalisland on August 16, when the town was completely shut down by a protest strike, Bernadette Devlin told an enthusiastic crowd: "For 50 years we have been denied the right to work, to have decent

homes or decent jobs, but now the people of the North are standing on their feet and as long as they remain staunch and determined they will quickly bring this State to its knees.

"We must not wait to see what our neighbors are doing, but we must immediately stop payment of all rents, rates and taxes and let the authorities know that we are not going to subsidize them in keeping our fellow-Irishmen in prison camps or on prison ships. We have the power in our own hands, and we can show to those in power — the bosses in factories, etc. — that without the working people of this state they cannot exist."

Under the pressure of the Tory government's repressive terror and the deepening anger of the nationalist people in all parts of Ireland, the moderate leaders of the Northern Catholic minority and their mentors in the Dublin government found themselves forced to take militant-appearing positions.

On August 12, Irish Prime Minister Jack Lynch issued a call for the abolition of the present Belfast government and its replacement by a special administration in which Protestants and Catholics would be equally represented. The plan was not incompatible with continued British domination of Ireland, and might even be a means for strengthening it. But Lynch's statement was still a bold one for the head of a regime built on liquidation of the national revolution, accommodation with Britain, and acceptance of the partition.

"For the head of the elected Government of the Republic to make such a frontal attack on the elected representatives of the Northern State is without precedent in the last fifty years," an editorial in the August 13 *Irish Times* said.

But at the same time, Lynch made a concession to London and Belfast by moving away from the demand for ending the partition outright, a position which has been formally maintained by every government since the end of the war of independence. More importantly, he also renewed his pledge that the Irish army would not go to the aid of the embattled Northern ghettos or support armed resistance by the nationalist people.

On this last point, a split was evident between the bourgeois and reformist leaders of the Northern minor-

ity and their traditional patron, the Dublin government.

In the midst of British army claims that it had smashed the militant nationalist armed forces, leaders of the anti-Communist breakaway Provisional IRA held a joint news conference in a Belfast neighborhood August 15 along with Patrick Kennedy, member of parliament for a large working-class area of the city. Kennedy called on Dublin for immediate military support:

"We appeal to you, for God's sake, to come to our assistance, because our supplies are limited and we cannot hold out for ever. . . . The odds against us are desperate. The situation is desperate. It is for these reasons that we call on our fellow countrymen in the South of Ireland to come to our assistance."

At the same time, the nationalist MPs in the Northern Irish parliament endorsed a plan for a campaign of civil disobedience, which seems to have already been initiated in some localities.

In their statement, the MPs said: "The purpose of this campaign is to demonstrate clearly that a large section of this community has withdrawn its consent from the system of government. No system of government can survive if a significant section of the population is determined that it will not be governed under this system."

The confrontation sharpened when the civil-disobedience campaign began to pick up momentum. On August 18, the British troops broke up a sit-in in Derry, arresting the moderate civil-rights leaders John Hume and Ivan Cooper, both of whom are independent MPs in the Belfast parliament. By this move, the London government seemed to cut its last links with conservative Catholic forces, ruling out any settlement less than complete surrender.

It was evident, moreover, that the moderates were having a hard time in controlling their followers. After the troops broke up the sit-in, according to Donal Musgrave writing in the August 19 *Irish Times*, a priest addressed the retreating demonstrators: "'Go home. You behaved magnificently well. Keep this up. Don't go back to the stone.' A man in the crowd shouted back: 'Tell Hume and Cooper to stick with us now. They led us today for the first time in two years. Let

them organise us, the people on the streets, and we will win.'"

Musgrave noted, among other things: "At one stage youths had climbed all over the Saracen cars, punching them with their fists and kicking the metal armour. They burned a few berets snatched from the heads of the soldiers."

The troops swept the area clean of barricades, but the youths rebuilt them during the night: "The Army was expected to begin removing the barricades again this morning," Musgrave



BRIAN FAULKNER

continued, "but as one youth who was carrying paving stones across a street remarked, 'if they take them down in the morning, we'll put them up again every night.'"

The arrest of Hume and Cooper—although they were quickly released after being charged—put the Dublin government in a difficult position, since by this act the British government had demonstrated that it would not negotiate with any element in the nationalist community. Lynch now felt it necessary to denounce the British government itself.

On August 19 the Dublin premier sent a public communiqué to Heath, making a combined threat and plea:

"In the event of the continuation of existing policies of attempting military solutions, I intend to support the policy of passive resistance now being pursued by the non-Unionist [i.e., non-supporters of the Protestant party favoring unity with Britain] population.

"In the event of agreement to a policy of finding solutions by political means, I am prepared to come to a meeting of all the interested parties designed to find ways and means of promoting economic, social and political well-being of all the Irish people North and South, without prejudice to the aspiration of the great majority of the Irish people to the reunification of Ireland."

Despite the thinly veiled plea for some gesture by the British government to maintain the credibility of the moderates, Lynch got an old-fashioned imperialist dressing down. Heath replied: "Your telegram today is unjustified in its content, unacceptable in its attempt to interfere in the affairs of the U. K. and can in no way contribute to the solution of the problems of Northern Ireland. . . .

"The military operations to which you refer are designed solely for the defence of the people against armed terrorists, whose activities, many of which originate in, or are supported from the Republic, I hope you would deplore and join us in suppressing."

The British army had moved units to the Irish frontier and there were unconfirmed reports of violations of Twenty-Six County territory.

In the face of Heath's brutal attempt to crush the nationalist community as a whole, all elements of the minority united in resistance to the authorities.

On August 18, twenty-four Catholics resigned from the Seventh Belfast Battalion of the Ulster Defense Regiment [UDR], the allegedly nonsectarian home guard set up to replace the discredited B Special militia after the 1969 explosions.

On August 19, four Catholics resigned from the County Tyrone platoon of the UDR, denouncing the force for sectarian repression. "The men also complained," according to the August 20 *Irish Times* "that patrols were, in the majority of cases, carried out in Catholic areas. One of the men who resigned said that he had witnessed the selective procedure of searching of vehicles by members of the U. D. R., who, he alleged, allowed cars driven

by Protestants to pass through check points while those driven by Catholics were subjected to the most rigorous searches."

On the same day, thirty prominent Catholic officeholders resigned their positions in protest against internment. At almost the same time the non-Unionist councilors on twenty local bodies in Northern Ireland announced that they would withdraw from their positions and pledge allegiance to an alternative Six County assembly. Various plans were put forth for forming a rebel government in the North, by the Provisional IRA, the Official IRA, and the conservative nationalist MPs in the Belfast parliament.

The mood of the nationalist population in the South could not be gauged from press reports. No organization seems so far to have succeeded in creating a mass movement of support for the nationalists in the North.

Shortly after the outbreak of fighting in the North, Bernadette Devlin urged an enthusiastic but relatively small (2,000) crowd in Dublin to make a socialist revolution throughout the island:

"The people in the South can best help us in the North by bringing down Jack Lynch, by bringing down Fine Gael [the second capitalist party in the Twenty-Six Counties] and by bringing down the hypocrites of the Labour Party.

"We in the North are bringing down one of the pillars—Brian Faulkner, and we appeal to you in the South to bring down the others. You have helped with money; you have helped in caring for our refugees. But now you must bring down the others that have betrayed us!

"Do not feel sorry for us," Devlin told the cheering crowd, "rather bring down the 26-counties [the Dublin regime] and try to build a workers' republic."

Devlin's appeal probably expressed the feelings of a fairly broad vanguard in Ireland. It is true that the imperialist forces cannot be defeated unless the neocolonialist regime in Dublin is swept away and the workers and poor farmers throughout the country are mobilized independently in a militant struggle—a struggle that can only take the form of a socialist revolution.

However, there is no conclusive evidence as yet that the broad masses in

the South are ready to fight or that any organization has developed a program and a strategy that can give a concrete political focus to the present upsurge and channel it toward a revolution throughout the island. But there are some indications that the latest explosions in the North may have had a deep impact on Southern workers.

"About 1,000 shoe and clothing factory workers marched through Limerick [a small, conservative industrial town in the west of Ireland] today [August 16] in protest against internment in the North," the *Irish Times* reported August 17.

"The workers in a token stoppage carried placards calling for an end to partition and the removal of British troops.

"Parade leaders carried black flags and workers—mostly girls dressed in hot-pants, minis and maxis—sang 'We Shall Overcome.'

"Later, at a news conference, a statement appealing to the people to show solidarity with the oppressed people of the North was issued. It was hoped that by their action in parading through the city the people would urge the Government and the Irish Congress of Trade Unions to demand an end to internment and the withdrawal of British troops.

"'We demand more practical action from our government and the Congress of Trade Unions to prevent the complete annihilation of the Nationalist minority,' said the statement from the workers.

"The demonstration was the first of what the organisers hope will be a series in the country, and it was hoped in the near future to stage a mass rally of all workers in Limerick."

Two weeks after the "masterstroke" of the Heath government (the Irish papers referred to his "Sir Francis Drake complex"), the British authorities seemed to be facing an increasingly explosive and uncontrollable situation. Even militarily, the British army did not seem to be having any notable successes. The Gaelic language column "Tuarascáil" published in the *Irish Times* noted that the British army's briefings were beginning to resemble "the type of report we have had a long experience with in the case of Vietnam: 'We lost six and killed twenty—in fact we killed twice that number but these people have a habit of hiding the bodies.'" After the ex-

perience of Vietnam, "Tuarascáil" said, the British command was having a hard time getting a serious hearing from the press. "Ba mhínicí ag gáire ná ag éisteacht iad" [They laughed more than they listened], the column said of the reporters attending Brigadier General Tickell's press conference.

On August 21, the British government made its first evident concession to the political pressures coming to bear on it, although the concession was still only a formal one. The army command issued the following statement: "The G. O. C., Northern Ireland, as director of operations, has, with the agreement of the Northern Ireland Government, asked Her Majesty's Government in the U. K. to introduce an independent inquiry to investigate the evidence relevant to allegations made by, or on behalf of, those arrested under the Civil Authorities (Special Powers) Act, Northern Ireland, 1922, on 9th August 1971 about their treatment while in the custody of the security forces prior to subsequent release, the serving of a detention order, or the preferal of criminal charges.

"The Government has agreed to do this."

There were also hints, according to *Irish Times'* London correspondent Michael Henry, that Heath might be preparing to undertake some new political initiative and recall parliament.

Most importantly perhaps, a split appeared to be opening up in the British political establishment. At the time of the August 9 raids, it seemed that both the bourgeois and reformist parties in London supported the repressive assault. But a few days after the extent of the resistance became clear, this unity started to crumble.

In its August 14 issue, the most outspoken voice of British capital, *The Economist*, stressed that the British bourgeoisie was unanimous in its determination to crush the resistance of the nationalist people of Ireland: "The British public has been told repeatedly of Protestant provocations, Protestant gun clubs and past explosions (such as the ones which blew Captain O'Neill out of office); it is concerned about these things, but it has not had many, or any substantiated, complaints of Protestant gunmen firing on the army in recent weeks.

"That is why British opinion has changed, sufficiently so now for Michael Callaghan [the main Labour party spokesman on Northern Ireland] and

all the main [that is, capitalist] newspapers, including the *Guardian*, which never lacks the courage to speak for unpopular liberal causes, to accept the resort to internment as a regrettable necessity. This may, or may not, surprise those in the Irish government, the Catholic church and the media in Dublin and Belfast, who have a much greater influence on the Catholic community in Ulster than Mr Maudling [the Tory minister of home affairs], Mr Callaghan and the London newspapers put together, but such unanimity needs to be recognised and understood if there is to be any constructive discussion about what can be done next in Northern Ireland. It means that Britain has not grown weary of its responsibility in Northern Ireland, that it is ready to take measures it dislikes and would not have dreamed of doing even a short while ago, and that it is becoming increasingly angry at the claims of an Ireland that must, apparently, be united only by blood."

*The Economist* must have been very sure of solid political backing for internment to put forward such a blatantly hypocritical line. It was true, of course, that the Protestant terrorists were not firing on the British troops; they were joining them. The August 21 *Irish Times* reported: "Those who were members of the Loyalist Institution were preparing, within the law, to actively assist the security forces in a war in which there could be no place for passive spectators, said Mr. James Molyneaux, Westminster M.P. for South Antrim [a pro-imperialist stronghold in Northern Ireland] at the unfurling of a banner for Leckpatrick Royal Black Preceptory No. 91 (Strabane), last night.

"Mr. Molyneaux, who is sovereign grand master of the Royal Black Institution, said that the effective, resolute action of the Army in dealing with the Queen's enemies had had encouraging results."

In the Protestant Shankill Road area of Belfast, leaflets were distributed calling for the formation of "loyalist platoons." The text was printed in the August 13 issue of the *Irish Times*. It said, among other things:

"Under no circumstances must platoons come into contact with Her Majesty's forces or the police. If through wrong political direction Her Majesty's forces are directed against loyalist people, members must do everything possible to prevent a confrontation.

We are loyalists, we are Queen's men. Our enemies are the forces of Romanism and Communism which must be destroyed."

Very quickly, however, some elements of the British political world seemed to become frightened, unwilling to pay the cost of "restoring order" in Ireland. Although the British government had deliberately sought a confrontation with the nationalist people, the resistance was apparently more than it bargained for. Some political figures seemed to reveal fears that Heath's bold stroke might turn out to be another Suez within the British Isles themselves. Perhaps some even thought that instead of being a daring pirate like Sir Francis Drake, Heath came closer to a Richard Nixon, trapped in a Vietnam of his own.

On a fact-finding trip to Belfast August 18, Liberal party peer Lord Avebury said, according to the August 19 *Irish Times*, that "although he was not always opposed to internment without trial in principle, he felt that the recent introduction of internment without trial in the North and the threat of internment had been 'militarily wrong.'

"He said that perhaps even worse than this, the introduction had brought about a dreadful deterioration in relations between the Army and a large section of the civil population."

In its August 21 issue *The Economist* expressed a considerable loss in confidence, even a cynically resigned attitude. "Bipartisanship on Northern Ireland is not dead—yet. But it is under severe pressure, and it will now be most surprising if the Labour party does not move away from its acquiescence in the Government's policy fairly soon after Parliament re-assembles."

Although Callaghan had been ready to back internment on August 8, his position shifted rapidly, *The Economist* said, when the extent of the crisis became evident.

". . . whatever may have been Mr Callaghan's position in the past, he now recognises the way in which opinion is swinging in the Labour party. The position of many moderates in the party was summed up by the former foreign secretary, Mr Michael Stewart, speaking in the same debate as Mr Callaghan. Mr Stewart said he believed that increasingly British public opinion would say: 'We will not have the lives of our young men placed at risk any longer.' He declared that we now seemed to be going down a road of blood which led nowhere and that this could not go on for much longer. He said he saw no solution except in the context of a united Ireland. And Mr Stewart said all this before the recent bloodshed in

## 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

the streets of Belfast and Londonderry.

"This represents more diagnosis than cure, but what was significant in Mr Stewart's speech was his move away from the previous position of the Labour party that no solution was possible in Northern Ireland outside the broad framework of the present constitutional arrangements [i.e., partition]. There can be little doubt, after the events of the past fortnight, that Mr Stewart's words now represent the sentiments of the majority of the parliamentary Labour party."

It is hardly profitable at this point to speculate on what the next moves of the London and Irish governments will be. But it does seem clear that the repressive course in Northern Ireland has essentially failed and that a very deep and extensive crisis has been touched off throughout Ireland. This situation presents both great opportunities and great dangers for the Irish revolutionary vanguard.

If the Irish revolutionists can win recognition as the most consistent exponents of the anti-imperialist upsurge that seems to be developing, if they can direct the workers and small farmers toward independent mass action against the imperialist and pro-imperialist forces in the country, they may be able to shatter the bases of bourgeois political stability. If they fail to understand the dynamic of this upsurge, fail to project a program that flows logically out of it, fail to organize the masses in independent action and instead become isolated or pushed to the sidelines, the frightened conservative forces will launch a fierce repression against them. And this repression will fall heaviest on those elements who understand that only the working class and its allies can lead a national revolution in Ireland, who understand that, to succeed, the national revolution must also be a socialist one. □

### Land of Opportunity

A Cuban air-force pilot who in 1969 stole a jet plane and flew it to the United States was arrested August 20 in New York on charges of selling marijuana. He later told reporters that he had not been able to find a "permanent, decent job" in the U. S. and had begun selling marijuana "just to keep alive—just to feed myself and my dog."

## 'But I Had Survived'

### A Message From Crumlin Road Prison

[The well-known Irish journalist Séamus O Tuathail was visiting friends in the Falls Road nationalist ghetto of Belfast when the Northern Ireland regime decreed imprisonment, without charge or trial, for all suspected "enemies of the state."

[Along with hundreds of people in the nationalist ghettos, O Tuathail was seized in the early dawn hours of August 9 in raids carried out jointly by the British Army and the infamous Royal Ulster Constabulary. O Tuathail was working as a free-lance journalist at the time of his arrest. However, as a former editor of the republican monthly *The United Irishman*, he may be held as a "political criminal."

[A few days after his arrest, O Tuathail managed to smuggle the following note, describing the August 9 raids and jailings, out of Crumlin Road jail. It was published in the August 19 *Irish Times*.]

\* \* \*

Arrived in Belfast on bicycle 6.30 p.m., Sunday, August 8th. Went to 40 Ton street, Falls. Nobody at home. Cleaned myself up, had meal. Sat watching TV all night. Watched "Hamlet" and listened to nail bombs explode about 50 yards distant at bottom of Cullingtree road. 11.30 p.m., went to bed after looking out into Ton street. . .

Windows lit. Doors open. Movement. Tension obvious. Gunfire noises and bomb blasts. Standing in street like inside of Picasso painting. Go to bed. Put chair behind door.

Five a.m. approx. Woken by thudding at door. Breaking timber. Chair holds for about a minute. English accents. Flashlight. Steps on stairs. Room door kicked in. Pistol gleams in light, blinding.

"Get out."

Me: "It's a bit early, isn't it?"

Lamp swings nearer, threateningly. "Button your lip, mate, and out quick."

"An Englishman's home is his castle."

"You're not in England now, mate—up."

Get up. Dress. Officer and soldiers

search house. Take some documents. One a speech by Tomás Mac Giolla at ard-fheis [convention of the militant nationalist Sinn Féin party]. Also take me—at gunpoint.

Street lined with soldiers. No other movement. Quite dark, still. House fronts gleaming in softening dark.

Hear a pistol crack some distance away. Around corner and into jeep. Sit down. Other prisoners there. One man mistaken for son. "No talk you." Drive at speed to Albert Street Barracks. More lorries. Saracens [armored cars] here. More prisoners. Soldiers threatening and abusive. Looking serious.

Taken into small office one by one from yard. Searched. Questioned. Personal belongings taken. Shoes taken. Name not believed. It should be like B. McMillan, Sean Dunne or John Garland [republican leaders]. I was sorry. Shooed at gunpoint across rough, rubble-strewn yard to barbed-wire corral. Put in with other prisoners. More coming in. Soldiers saying we were to be shot. We were "Fenian bastards" [the term "Fenian," meaning "republican", is an epithet applied to all Catholics in Northern Ireland], "fucking Irish swine," etc.

After half-hour, taken out one by one. Hands tied in front with strips of cotton. Frogmarched to lorries (two). About 25 prisoners in all by now.

Could hear crowds jeering and cheering. Bomb blasts. Thompson submachine-guns thumping. SLR's. Two plumes of smoke from fires to be seen. Onto lorries and sit down. One—Mr. Brady—has chair kicked from under him by soldiers as he gets in. Falls. Gets in second time. Driven off. More threats. Rifle butts aimed at feet. Driven to Girdwood Barracks. Standing waiting to go in.

Could see six men taken out by M.P.s. Forced to run and beaten by batons. Saw them coming back five minutes later being forced to crawl on hands and knees and being beaten. Blood on head of two. Feet bleeding. Told not to look by my guard.

Taken in and photographed. Put sitting down in gym with about 100 others. Hands untied at door. After

one hour Special Branch [political police] man starts calling out names. Batches of six taken out. Come back breathless, bleeding and limping. One led in with blood pouring from head wound.

Now I hear my own name called. Six of us in all. Grabbed on each side at outside door by M. P.s. Forced to run. Half jump, half dragged over low stone wall surround, through rose bed into field. Helicopter about 70 yards away. Propeller churning. Doors open. "Run, you swine." Kicked and thumped with batons. Police dogs snapping at either side of corridor. Soldiers jump in way. Knock you down. Fall and you are picked up.

Kicked up ramp into helicopter. No sooner sitting than told "jump out." Now told "bend down." Then "run." Everything straightened up to run, kicked. Back to gym building. Flung through door. Struck wrist badly here. A joint military-RUC exercise in brutality. Now taken for interrogation to Special Branch. Two men. Asked solicitor. No chance. No comment. Name, address and little else. "You could do four years for refusing to cooperate."

Taken upstairs. Sit on floor in crowded room. About 170 there—air short and stuffy. I see Mike Farrell and other P.D. [People's Democracy, a Northern Irish radical group]. "Be-jasus, the roof's come in." Sit on floor facing portraits of English Queen and Prince Philip. See Belfast city councillor, James O'Kane. See Frank Glade. He's been in situations like this before. See a blind man led in. Another victory for the all-conquering British Army. Red caps compete to threaten men on floor. Their biggest win since Waterloo.

Batches of six being called out and marched off. Some no shirts. Pyjamas others. Blue denims and work clothes predominate. One man led in in white overalls. Taken at work in Kennedy's Bakery.

About 11.00 a.m. now. Get a cup of tea. Now I hear my name called again. What had happened to the others?

Led out to rear. Barbed wire rolls from short corridor. Soldiers with batons each side. Here we go again and I know I won't hold out much longer. I am at head of column. 19-year-old (McErlean) behind.

"You got a certain message," says RSM Red Cap to corporal.

"Yes."

"Do it then."

"Come on, you lot—at the double."

All six now running on sharp shingle, over a wooden L plank, onto red bricks upended. Kicking, shouting, baton blows. Big RSM next to me. "So you're important, now—you're not so important now." Tries to stamp on my feet. Misses. Sweet Jesus, how far to go.

"Through that dump." Soldier skirts

## SWP Hails Irish Freedom Fighters

[The following resolution was passed at the twenty-fourth national convention of the Socialist Workers party in Cleveland, Ohio. It was reprinted in the August 19 issue of the *Irish Times*, the widely circulated Dublin daily newspaper.]

\* \* \*

To the Irish Freedom Fighters:

Dear Comrades,

We believe, as Patrick Pearse did, that the revolutionary representatives of the Irish people are the "voice of an idea that is older than empire and will outlast every empire." In every upsurge of revolutions and struggles for freedom, the Irish people have made their contribution, have raised the banners of an age-old defiance of tyranny. The new wave of revolutionary battles throughout the world could not pass without the voice of rebellion being raised again on Irish soil.

Everywhere on the globe today, the courageous young generations are coming to see the fight of the Irish people as part of their own, as part of the most precious tradition of all who struggle against oppression.

The blows of foreign enemies and native traitors have never broken the will of the working people of Ireland, who have remained faithful over the centuries. The latest cowardly attacks on the Irish people and their vanguard will also fail. Ireland in the past has fought many lonely battles. Today the world around her is rising up in struggle against all forms of oppression. Well over 1,000 socialist revolutionists meeting here in the heart of the greatest imperialist fortress that has ever existed pledge their solidarity

it. Rotten vegetables, broken glass, boxes. Now tree stumps. Hear the thumping of batons on bodies behind me. Screaming abuse. Can't very well understand English accent at that pitch. Must be their last stand.

See prison gates ahead. Flung down steps into D wing. Crumlin Road [prison]. Limping and bloody. But I had survived. Collapsed into cell. Forty-eight hours minus wash and exercise after that. □

to their embattled comrades in Ireland; we pledge to build a bulwark of brotherhood and sisterhood around the standardbearers of your ancient and indefatigable struggle. □

## Calley's Sentence Reduced

The life sentence of convicted mass-murderer Lieutenant William Calley was reduced to twenty years in prison August 20. Calley, who was convicted of the premeditated murder of at least twenty-three civilians during the Mylai massacre, will be eligible for parole after serving one-third of his sentence.

The reduction was ordered by Lieutenant General Albert O. Connor, the first officer to review the case. It will next be reviewed by the Army Court of Military Review, which could reduce the sentence still further.

Despite the magnitude of Calley's crime, Connor's decision came as no surprise to anyone. When Calley was convicted last March, there was widespread protest because of the belief that Calley was being held solely responsible for killings in which higher-ups were equally involved.

Nixon himself intervened in the case on April 1, announcing that he would make the final decision on Calley's sentence. This announcement inevitably put pressure on the reviewing officers. As the *New York Times* commented in an August 21 editorial, "It is hard to conceive of military tribunals unaffected by official notice that the Commander in Chief not only hovers over the proceedings but has already expressed special sympathy for the defendant." □



CHRISTCHURCH DEMONSTRATION of 11,000 on July 30 was largest antiwar action yet seen in that city. Three weeks after

year's second mass mobilization in New Zealand, Prime Minister Keith Holyoake promised to withdraw troops from Vietnam.

## New Zealand

# Second Wave of Massive Antiwar Demonstrations

By George Fyson

Wellington

In the second national mobilisation this year, on July 30, more than 32,000 people marched in cities and towns throughout New Zealand to demand the immediate withdrawal of all U.S., New Zealand, and allied forces from Indochina. Earlier this year, on April 30, some 35,000 marched. [See *Intercontinental Press*, May 24, p. 467.]

While in some places the July 30 demonstrations were marginally smaller than in April, four towns saw their first antiwar protest ever, and in four cities—Wellington, Christchurch, Nelson, and Hamilton—the demonstrations were the biggest yet.

The July 30 mass actions were the culmination of a broadly based campaign, which continued the upsurge in antiwar activity that began with the National Antiwar Conference in March.

The success of the second mobilisation was achieved despite the fact that preparations were initially hampered

by a red-baiting campaign directed by some forces in the antiwar movement against the Socialist Action League (SAL), which played an important role in the April 30 mobilisation.

The red-baiters, chiefly student politicians from the New Zealand University Students Association (NZUSA), in cooperation with a Maoist splinter group expelled from the pro-Peking Communist party of New Zealand (CPNZ), alleged that the SAL was planning a "take-over" of the antiwar movement. The most outrageous charges were contained in a document signed by the president of NZUSA and sent to antiwar coalitions throughout the country.

The appearance of this document followed a June 12 national meeting of representatives from antiwar coalitions. This meeting, although recognising that the July 30 mobilisation was under way, voted by a narrow majority to effectively dissolve the national coordinating body, the

National Liaison Committee. At this point, many of the delegates, including most of those representing antiwar coalitions in the three main centres, the SAL, and the pro-Moscow Socialist Unity party, walked out of the meeting and voted to continue national coordination. The meeting had in fact been stacked by student politicians and their friends who wanted at all costs to prevent the SAL from "dominating" the national coordinating body, even if this meant seriously weakening the mobilisation by having no national coordination.\*

The red-baiting document was an

\* In the July 12 *Intercontinental Press*, it was erroneously indicated that CPNZ members "representing no organisation but their own party" played a significant part in the vote to dissolve the National Liaison Committee. In fact, the CPNZ boycotted the meeting and it was the Maoist splinter group previously expelled from the party (and which continues to call itself the "Wellington District, CPNZ") that participated in the red-baiting manoeuvres. The *People's Voice*, paper of the



swered by an article in the SAL's fortnightly paper, *Socialist Action*, and the red-baiters were by and large silenced. In addition, a national co-ordinating body was set up following the June 12 meeting, and it produced more publicity material than ever before.

The SAL continued to play an active role in the movement, and *Socialist Action* was again well received on mobilisation day, 2,550 copies being sold.

The broad support for July 30 was reflected in public endorsements from trade-union leaders, Labour party MPs and branches, and church leaders. At rallies following the demonstrations, speakers included many prominent figures from these areas. Other speakers represented antiwar coalitions, university and high-school antiwar groups, the women's liberation movement, and left-wing groups (including the SAL).

More branches of the Labour party supported this mobilisation than the previous demonstration, although the party leader, Norman Kirk, refused to endorse it. His only excuse was that many on the march would not necessarily support Labour at the next election and that the only answer was a Labour government. The torrent of objections that greeted this remark when Kirk addressed a large student meeting July 27 showed that many antiwar activists would be even less likely to support a Labour campaign after that.

All the main Trades Councils in the country endorsed the mobilisation, and the Federation of Labour (the national trade-union body) called on its affiliates to support the marches. In Auckland, in particular, antiwar activists built support at job meetings prior to the mobilisation.

Many workers marched under their own banners—seamen, watersiders, railwaymen, and others. Large numbers of those marching in the main centres were young workers.

In a premobilisation referendum at Victoria University, Wellington, 80 percent voted to support the march, and 58 percent voted for cancellation of lectures on the afternoon of July

"official" CPNZ, did not announce its support of the mobilisation until July 14, and the party restricted its activity almost entirely to the distribution of ultra-leftist "workers'" leaflets that probably put off more workers than they attracted.

30. On the day of the demonstration, students in Wellington and Christchurch boycotted normal lectures to attend special lectures and other activities relating to the war.

Although further demonstrations on such a scale are unlikely to take place in the next few months because of university and high-school examinations and the summer vacation, the continuous campaign has greatly heightened political awareness among large numbers of young people.

Awareness of international issues and sympathy with oppressed people have extended to other areas. For some time there has been a movement against participating in sports with teams from South Africa. An all-

## Indochina War

### McMahon, Holyoake Promise Pull-Out

Taking advantage of Nixon's "Vietnamization" rhetoric and the U.S. withdrawals, the Australian and New Zealand governments on August 18 announced plans to withdraw all their combat forces from South Vietnam by the end of this year.

In simultaneous announcements to their respective parliaments, Australian Prime Minister William McMahon and New Zealand Prime Minister Sir Keith Holyoake made clear that this concession to growing public antiwar sentiment did not indicate any abandonment of their support for American imperialism's war aims. Both promised the continued presence of "advisers," and McMahon committed his government to provide the Thieu regime with \$28,000,000 in economic aid over the next three years.

At the same time, McMahon announced a reduction in the period of compulsory military service from two years to eighteen months. The antiwar movement in Australia has made opposition to the draft an important part of its position.

While the Australian and New Zealand contingents in Vietnam have never been of major military significance—they never totaled more than 9,000 troops—their presence has been an important political aid to both Johnson and Nixon. As the Australian and

white South African women's hockey team, which was scheduled to tour New Zealand in September, cancelled its visit because of anticipated demonstrations. A South African cricket tour has also been cancelled.

There is also widespread sympathy for the people of Bangla Desh, and while activity on this question has largely taken the form of appeals for refugee aid, some political activities are envisaged.

Thus the steadily growing antiwar movement has furthered the development of the general radicalisation—a fact that the government must take into account in deciding the extent of its support to U.S. imperialism in Southeast Asia. □

New Zealand troops are pulled out, the war-weary American public is not likely to miss the fact that the only U.S. "ally" that has not yet fixed a date for withdrawal is the puppet dictatorship of South Korea. □

### Shame on You, Will

"There's no telling where the Chinese struggle to eradicate the last vestiges of the influence of erstwhile head of state Liu Shao-chi, and his henchmen, may lead next. Shakespeare has been dragged into this five-year-old ideological battle. Liu's chums apparently sought to broaden their countrymen's minds by staging Hamlet. The last edition of Peking's magazine, Red Flag, has a stinging comment on the foul anti-Maoist plot to produce Hamlet under the guise of adding to China's 'general knowledge': 'Hamlet is a representative work of the bourgeois renaissance. It sings the praise of the bourgeois "human nature" and makes much of the bourgeois "man". Under the condition of proletarian dictatorship, something that sang the praise of the bourgeoisie was actually presented as a "specimen" and people were actually asked to learn the "general knowledge" of how to live as human beings from the bourgeoisie.'

"Was this attack on the pride of English literature designed to offset the polite speech made by China's acting foreign minister, Chi Peng-fei, at last week's reception given by the British mission in Peking for Queen Elizabeth's birthday?" — *Far Eastern Economic Review*, June 19.

# American Trotskyists Hold National Convention

By Jon Rothschild

The Socialist Workers party, which defends the views of the world Trotskyist movement in the United States, held the largest convention of its history in Cleveland, Ohio, August 8-12.

Attended by more than 1,100 delegates and observers, the convention discussed ten major points, and was followed by a three-day educational conference at Oberlin, Ohio, under the auspices of the Young Socialist Alliance.

The attendance statistics reflected the growth of the party, both numerical and geographic, as well as the increased level of its activity in the mass movement:

There were 113 full delegates. Their ages ranged from 19 to 67; all but seven were less than 36. There were nearly twice as many observers as there were at the 1969 convention, and of these, 596 had never attended a convention of the party before. More than half of the full delegates had been members of the party for 5 years or less. It was reported further that 718 of the participants were active members of mass organizations (antiwar or women's liberation groups), and 157 were members of trade unions.

The delegates and observers came from all parts of the country: 77 from the South, 102 from the Southwest, 170 from the West, 265 from the Midwest, and 457 from the East. There were 19 guests from outside the United States.

Membership statistics announced during the convention indicated that the party had nearly doubled in size since its 1969 convention, while the number of third-world members had grown by more than two-and-one-half times; 22 percent of all party members have joined since the beginning of 1971.

The convention opened with a report and discussion on the world political situation. The report, presented by Joseph Hansen, editor of *Intercontinental Press*, centered on the economic crisis of capitalism and the consequent rise in the level of the class struggle internationally, the worldwide character of the youth radicalization, the continued centrality of the Indochina war in world politics, and the implications of the negotiations between Nixon and the Mao regime.

The report, and the ensuing discussion, stressed the explosiveness of the world situation, the increased intensity of revolutionary uprisings (such as the struggle for Bangla Desh), and the need to resolve the contradiction between the ripeness of the objective situation and the small size of the revolutionary-socialist leadership. The report was approved unanimously.

The next point on the agenda was a report by Mary-Alice Waters, editor of the *Militant*, on the current developments in the world Trotskyist movement. Waters described the growth of the Fourth International, the increased opportunities before it, and the discussion on several questions now taking place within it in prepara-

tion for the upcoming world congress.

This discussion was followed by a report by Gus Horowitz on Israel and the Arab revolution. The convention was unanimous in its opposition to Zionism and the state of Israel, as well as in its unconditional support to the Palestinian struggle for national liberation.

The major task confronting American revolutionists, Horowitz stressed, remains that of educating the radicalizing youth about the real history of the Zionist movement and the revolutionary character of the Palestinian and Arab struggle for the destruction of the state of Israel. Combined with this is the necessity of exposing and opposing the intervention of the United States ruling class in the Middle East.

Differences existed around two questions. A minority resolution, reported on by Jon Rothschild, suggested that the establishment of a workers state in Palestine should be called for—rather than a democratic, secular Palestine. Further, it argued for an explicit statement that following the successful revolution in the region and the creation of a workers state, the Israeli-Jews, as a national minority, should be granted the right of self-determination.

The majority argued that to call for the Israeli right to self-determination, even if it were restricted to conditions existing after the destruction of Zionism and capitalism in the region, would inevitably intensify the unfounded fear of the Arab revolution that presently pervades Israeli society. It further argued that the right to self-determination is applicable only to oppressed nations, and that the perspective of the right of self-determination for the Israelis would be appropriate only if the Israelis were actually being oppressed by the Arabs.

The majority characterized the demand for a democratic, secular Palestine as a democratic slogan and reiterated its support to that demand.

The minority resolution received seven votes.

The next point on the agenda was the report and discussion of the political situation in the United States. The report to the convention, given by Jack Barnes, the party's national organizational secretary, reiterated and expanded the SWP's analysis of the current radicalization, and the opportunities opening up for building the mass movement and the revolutionary party.

This radicalization, the resolution stated, is the broadest and deepest of any in U. S. history. Sparked by the Cuban revolution, the civil-rights movement of the 1950s and early 60s, accelerated by the movement against U. S. aggression in Indochina, it now has brought millions of people into motion.

The radicalization is characterized by the emergence of new mass movements,

with each new struggle spurring forward already existing ones, and in turn triggering still others.

The development of mass struggles around democratic and transitional demands, such as those of the women's movement and the movements of oppressed national minorities, has shaken the power of the ruling class even before the entry of the working class as a conscious force into the political arena.

When the workers move, as they will under the impact of the consequences of the war and the deepening crisis of capitalism, great new potentialities will appear for the revolutionary movement. The forms that the future motion of the working class will take will be conditioned by the present radicalization.

One of the major features that has distinguished the Socialist Workers party from other forces on the left, Barnes pointed out, has been its ability to recognize the depth of the radicalization, to learn from the new forms of struggle developed by it, to assimilate the lessons of these new struggles and forms, and to creatively apply the program of Marxism to the changing situation.

This process represents the key to the construction of a revolutionary Leninist party.

Barnes stressed that although the SWP had experienced major expansion over the last several years, it was still in the stage of assembling the nucleus of the future mass Leninist party, and that the crucial problem confronting the American Trotskyist movement is the allocation of relatively small resources to a rapidly growing field of opportunities for expansion.

These resources must be directed at the forces presently in motion, the student, Black, Chicano, and women's movements—movements which are important not solely as sources of recruits for the revolutionary party, but as components of the coming socialist revolution in America.

The preconvention discussion, which was the most thorough of any to date, revealed the existence of four minorities. Three of these sought representation on the basis of counterresolutions to the political resolution submitted by the Political Committee, two of them succeeding in winning delegates. (The minority on the Middle East Resolution supported the majority political resolution and did not call for the election of delegates on the basis of its resolution on this special question.)

The largest of the minority groupings maintained that the influx of students into the party over the past decade had created a dangerous social composition in the party; that the party had not directed itself toward the recruitment of workers and third-world youth, and that this had re-

sulted in the party adapting to the milieu in which it has been working.

This grouping, in a counter political resolution reported to the convention by Ralph Levitt, recommended that the party make a major reorientation of its arena of work, shifting the emphasis to the trade-union movement, and carrying out its women's liberation and third-world work largely through activities in the unions. Unless this were done, the minority reporter maintained, the party was in danger of major degeneration.

These views were rejected by the majority of the delegates. They held that the recruitment of large numbers of student youth, already tested in struggle against the ruling class, represented not a danger, but one of the most important assets of the party.

The resolution presented by this grouping received six votes.

Another minority grouping, represented at the convention by David Fender, held that the party and the entire international Trotskyist movement had progressively degenerated since the death of Trotsky. Fender called for a total reassessment of the history of the revolutionary movement since 1940.

The next several days of the convention were spent analyzing the dynamics of the women's liberation movement, the Black struggle, the newly arisen Chicano liberation movement, and the youth and student movements.

The resolution on the women's liberation movement was the first one of this nature to be adopted by the party. The report on the resolution, given by Betsy Stone, dealt with the major issues confronting the new movement. She outlined a series of democratic demands capable of mobilizing masses of women in struggle.

The report on Black liberation, presented by Derrick Morrison, a staff writer of the *Militant*, analyzed the current stage of the Black struggle. Morrison pointed to the increasing nationalist sentiment in the Black community, in the army, the prisons and the high schools. At the same time, he said, the crisis of leadership in the Black community has not abated. The leadership vacuum has prevented major new steps forward from being taken.

The discussion on the report centered on the importance of drawing Black youth into action through the antiwar and women's liberation movements.

The resolution on the Chicano movement was, like the women's liberation resolution, the first on this struggle ever adopted by the SWP. The report, by Antonio Camejo, stressed the importance of the *Raza* independent Chicano political parties, the Chicano antiwar movement, and the growing Chicana liberation movement.

The youth report, presented by Cindy Jaquith, outlined the encouraging growth of the Young Socialist Alliance during the past two years. She said that the YSA expects to double its size within the next year.

The organizational report, given by Barry Sheppard, projected four major campaigns as axes of party activity during the coming months.

First, the building of the November 6 regional mass demonstrations against the

Indochina war that have been called by the National Peace Action Coalition.

The continued centrality of the Indochina war in the world political situation, the Pentagon revelations, and the increasing depth of antiwar sentiment give the November 6 actions the potential of being the most important yet staged.

Second, the building of the November 20 national demonstrations in Washington and San Francisco for repeal of all abortion laws. The action against the reactionary laws on abortion was called by a national conference of women held in New York City on July 16-18. (See *Intercontinental Press*, July 26, p. 707.)

The November 20 demonstrations, if enthusiastically supported, could be the starting point of a well-organized national movement that would have the power to force the ruling class to yield on this issue.

Third, Sheppard projected the greatest expansion of the circulation of the revolutionary-socialist press ever attempted in the history of the party. He proposed a goal of 30,000 new subscriptions to the *Militant*, during an eleven-week period beginning September 1.

The largest such campaign in the past took place during the postwar strike upsurge in 1946. During that campaign, 19,000 new subscriptions were sold.

The fourth campaign was actually initiated at the convention itself: the fielding of a SWP ticket in the presidential election of 1972.

The campaign was launched at a rally held in Cleveland, Ohio, on the last day of the convention. It was attended by more than 1,000 persons.

The featured speakers were the two candidates: Linda Jenness for president and Andrew Pulley for vice president. Both candidates symbolize the new radicalization and the activities of the SWP.

Jenness has been an activist in the antiwar movement for more than four years; she has been a leading spokeswoman for the women's liberation movement, and was the SWP candidate for governor of the state of Georgia in 1970. She was one of the party leaders who first established branches of the SWP in the South.

Pulley was a founder of the Fort Jackson GIs United Against the War and was imprisoned, along with seven other GIs, for his organizing activities in the army.

He has been active in the Black liberation struggle, and was the SWP candidate for Congress in Berkeley, California, during the 1970 elections.

The central theme of the rally, and of the campaign itself, was set by Jenness: "We are speaking for the majority of people in this country, who are against the war; we are speaking for the majority of women, who want the abortion laws repealed; we are speaking for the majority of high-school and college students, who want to control their own education; for the majority of Black and Brown Americans, who want to control their own communities; for the majority of working people, whose standard of living is being eaten away by inflation and unemployment; for the gay people, who are refusing to bow to reactionary laws."

Other speakers at the rally included Cindy Jaquith, national coordinator of Young Socialists for Jenness and Pulley; and Jerry Gordon, coordinator of the National Peace Action Coalition.

Jaquith described the coming campaign as "a battle—between us and the Democrats and the Republicans—for the allegiance of young people in this country. We're going to compete with the capitalist candidates to win as many young people as possible to a total break with capitalist politics."

Gordon praised the SWP and YSA's work in building the antiwar movement as "second to none."

The 1972 election campaign promises to have the biggest impact of any in the history of the SWP, especially due to the passage of the Constitutional amendment granting suffrage to eighteen-year-olds. At the rally itself, more than \$6,600 was raised to initiate the propaganda activities of the campaign.

In addition to the formal convention proceedings, panels and workshops on the practical activities of the party were held. These included discussions of educational work, distribution of revolutionary literature, defense of Latin American political prisoners, the gay liberation movement, the defense of the radical movement against right-wing terrorist attacks in Houston, Texas, and support for the right of Ernest Mandel to visit the United States.

The convention was followed by three days of classes. Some of the topics covered were the Leninist position on the national question, the nature of the transitional program, the history of Trotskyism in Great Britain, the current situation in France, the dynamics of the revolution in the Middle East, the history of the struggle for Irish national liberation, and the fundamentals of Marxist economic theory.

The participants generally agreed that because of its size, the thoroughness of the discussions, and the ambitious campaigns projected, the convention represented a significant step forward in the construction of the American revolutionary combat party.

## Now You Know

If you've ever wondered how the FBI manages to maintain its high moral standards, director J. Edgar Hoover explained in the July issue of *Decision*, published by the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association, that it's all due to his and his men's Christian convictions.

"For me Jesus is a living reality," Hoover said. He went on to describe the Christian purity of his agents:

"The FBI plays a critical role in American society. Our investigations affect the lives, reputations and status of many citizens. For that reason we must have special agents of unimpeachable personal character, integrity and honesty. Their investigations must be scrupulously fair and impartial, reporting the facts without prejudice or error. They must be above the temptations of bribery and dishonesty. We carefully investigate the backgrounds of applicants for FBI employment to determine their reputation, character and ability. The success of the FBI stems in large part from the high moral standards required of all our personnel."

# The Deepening Crisis of the Imperialist System

[The following editorial has been translated from the July issue of *Quatrième Internationale*, a revolutionary socialist bimonthly published in Paris.]

\* \* \*

## I.

*The main symptom today of the worsening of the general crisis of the world imperialist system is the serious deterioration in the position of the international capitalist economy. Of the seven principal imperialist powers, three—the United States, Italy, and Great Britain—are at grips with a recession. That is, there has been a decline in industrial production in these countries by comparison with the same period last year. In Canada the recession may be over after the second quarter of 1971. A fifth power, West Germany, is on an uncertain course. Since the fall of 1970, signs pointing to a recession have multiplied. But, in part, these symptoms have been neutralized by a new spurt in production, especially of consumer goods for the domestic market. For the moment it is hard to predict whether this spurt represents a temporary interruption in a declining movement, or whether, to the contrary, it will develop into a new general upturn. And the economic situation in France and the Benelux countries hinges in the immediate future on what happens in Germany.*

In the case of Japan, although its economy is still in a phase of expansion, its rate of growth has been in a marked decline since the fall of 1970. Excess capacity and accumulating inventories have appeared above all in the electronics industry (1.5 million unsold color TV sets!), electrical appliances, and petrochemicals. In 1970, the number of business failures rose to the record figure of 9,500.

The deterioration in the capitalist international economic situation can be gauged by two phenomena that have appeared on a scale unprecedented in the entire period since the "Korean-war boom": the spread of unemployment, and the prolonged re-

fusal of the big monopolistic concerns to resume investing in response to monetary "incentives."

The total number of unemployed workers in the seven main imperialist powers must approach 10 million today, a figure never attained since the second world war (5 million in the U.S., 1.5 million in Italy, 1 million in Japan, 800,000 in Great Britain, 700,000 in Canada, 500,000 in France; there is no unemployment in West Germany).<sup>1</sup> The rate of unemployment is much higher than the average in some regions (the northwest of the United States, southern Italy, Scotland, Québec and British Columbia in Canada, etc.), where it easily reaches 8% or more of the total work force. It is much higher most of all among the youth. The United States is now experiencing an unemployed rate of 17.2% in the youth as a whole and 35% among Black youth.

To combat recession, the capitalist governments are continuing to resort to Keynesian and neo-Keynesian techniques. All these techniques come down in the last analysis to a single factor—creating inflationary buying power. This method makes it possible to prevent a recession from snowballing through a chain reaction of effects. The downturn is halted at a certain plateau (by paying the price of a new inflationary thrust, and of a new deterioration of the international monetary system when the dollar—the reserve currency of this system—is swept into the whirlwind). But creating inflationary buying power does not bring an automatic revival of industrial production. This is the second weakness of the Keynesian practices, besides their inflationary character.

In the United States, the monetary volume rose by 6% in 1970. Industrial

production declined or hovered at its old level. During the first quarter of 1971, the volume of money even increased at a rate that would average 11% annually. Industrial production stagnated and then fell. The reasons for this lag in production responding to monetary "stimuli" are, however, not mysterious. The volume of industrial production depends essentially on productive investment. Under the capitalist system, productive investment by the big monopolies is determined both by market trends and fluctuations in the rate of profit. In order to induce the big concerns to increase their investments, both an expanding market and prospects for a rise in the rate of profit are needed. When the rate of profit is falling, when industry shows excess productive capacity in many areas, even a major expansion of the market offers no incentive for an upturn in productive investments, insofar as no trend appears toward a change in the factors cited above.

It must be added that this deterioration in the international economic situation of capitalism is occurring at a time when military expenditures have reached an unprecedented total and when even Japan—which up till now had stayed largely outside the arms race—has thrown itself into accelerated rearmament. It is therefore unlikely that a new increase in these expenditures can extricate the capitalist economy from its immediate difficulties. In order to achieve this, military spending would have to be raised to a level that even the United States could not sustain in "peacetime."

The capitalists will thus follow a different tack. Their response will be concentrated in two areas. They will try to increase their foreign markets and to boost the rate of profit at the expense of the working class.

Increasing international markets means expanding East-West trade, with the U.S. joining in the game (relaxing embargoes against the USSR, resuming exports to China). Likewise, it means stepped-up penetration of the markets of semicolonial countries and a new sharpening of interimperialist competition. The attempt to raise the

1. These figures understate the reality because they take into account the partially unemployed only in Italy, Japan, and France, and not in the USA, Great Britain, and Canada. Nor do they include the millions of people who, as the bourgeois economists put it so elegantly, "have withdrawn from the labor market" because they were convinced that they could not find a job.

rate of profit at the expense of the working class involves trying to limit or abolish the only substantial right the workers have under the capitalist system, the right of collective bargaining. The means for this are "incomes policies," which virtually all tendencies in the international bourgeoisie have begun to demand. From the standpoint of the capitalists, increased unemployment serves the specific function of inducing the workers to accept such a policy more or less passively. Accelerated cooption of the trade-union leaderships into the bourgeois state is to aid in bringing about the same result. If the unions prove too recalcitrant—that is, if growing militancy on the part of their memberships forces the union bureaucracies to put up a fight—then antiunion and antistrike laws must deal with this lack of understanding.

It follows from this that the deterioration in the economic situation of capitalism must be reflected in an aggravation of class contradictions in the imperialist as well as in the colonial and semicolonial countries. This sharpening, which has been in progress since May 1968, will rise to a new level. The general crisis of the imperialist system must not, moreover, be understood as an economic crisis of overproduction (this is only one of its periodic aspects). It must be seen rather as a general breakdown of stability in which revolutionary explosions, liberation movements of oppressed peoples, the class struggle of the proletariat, the tensions between the imperialist powers, monetary crises, so-called cultural crises, and conflicts with the bureaucratized workers states all merge in a unified process that is increasingly undermining the cohesiveness of the system.

## II.

*The main peculiarity exhibited by the current deepening of the general crisis of the imperialist system is that all the forces present are tending to focus on precipitating a major social crisis in the United States itself.*

American imperialism came out of the second world war as the absolute master of the capitalist world, enjoying marked economic and military superiority over the "socialist camp." The enormous superprofits it accumulated during and after the war, and its great reserves, enabled it to hold

the undisputed leadership of the bourgeois world for twenty years, albeit with growing difficulties. It vigorously pursued its domestic accumulation of capital, modernizing its industry. It "revived" capitalism in West Europe and Japan, aided by the Stalinist and reformist bureaucracies who betrayed the postwar revolutionary upsurge. It set out to conquer the old colonial empires that were breaking up and the internal markets of its principal allies and competitors, exporting six billion dollars in capital for this purpose. It served as the world policeman of the capitalist system, surrounding the USSR and the "people's democracies" with a network of military bases, maintaining a historically unprecedented military establishment at home and abroad, dotting the world with counterrevolutionary "relay stations" that it financed and equipped. It prevented a sharpening of social contradictions in the U.S., assuring an important part of the American working class a rising standard of living. It bought off the trade-union bureaucracy, while limiting the latter's power by the Taft-Hartley Act and integrating the unions into its policy of worldwide expansion (the cold war, McCarthyism, etc.).

For several years now the limits to the power of American imperialism have been revealing themselves very clearly. It has begun to suffer repeated defeats. It has proved incapable of checking the rise of the permanent revolution in Latin America, after failing to crush the victorious Cuban revolution. It has been unable to defeat the heroic resistance of the Vietnamese masses, who are determined to continue their revolution and carry it through to victory. American imperialism has been unable to prevent a deterioration in the relationship of forces with its principal competitors, especially those in the Common Market dominated by West German imperialism. It has been unable to prevent the awakening of Black youth, which has resulted on the one hand in the ghetto rebellions and on the other in a growing radicalization of the entire student youth. It has been unable to prevent the rise of a powerful antiwar movement, the most powerful yet seen in the history of colonial wars. The permanent deficit in the U.S. balance of payments and the resulting chronic crisis of the international monetary system and of the dollar

are concentrated expressions of all these failures. *These developments reflect the growing incapacity of American imperialism to meet simultaneously all the tasks imposed on it in the post-1945 period by its predominance over the capitalist world.* They mark the beginning of the decline of this supremacy.

The expenditure of enormous amounts of capital to finance the war in Vietnam, to maintain a constantly expanding military establishment, to finance the counterrevolutionary relay stations around the world, and to buy up the property of capitalist enterprises in foreign countries have all resulted finally in holding back steady modernization in some important industries. In these branches (steel, naval construction, electrical appliances, and even automobile production in part), the U.S.'s main competitors now have the most advanced technology. In particular, capital has been lacking for reducing the social contradictions in the U.S., for raising real wages, for building schools, cheap housing, and hospitals.

The results of this are visible to the naked eye. Under the combined pressure of inflation and rising taxes, the real wages of the American workers have not increased in four years. The big cities are literally rotting. Entire layers of the American population—youth, Blacks, Chicanos, women—have gone into open rebellion against the structure of a society that condemns them to second-class citizenship. It is now only a question of time until the mass of the industrial workers join in this rebellion and transform it into an anticapitalist revolutionary force of potentially irresistible power.

The most perceptive layers of the American bourgeoisie are perfectly aware of this prospect and the dangers it holds for the survival of their system. The crisis of leadership now agitating this bourgeoisie reflects the need they feel for a reorientation. It also reflects the internal contradictions (determined in part by conflicting material interests and in part by differing judgments and political choices) that must be resolved before such a reorientation can be achieved. From now until the presidential elections at the end of 1972, the political life of the U.S. will be dominated by the bourgeoisie's exertions to dam up the terrifying social crisis that is ripening

in the United States. In this it will endeavor to "reintegrate" into the system at least a part of the rebel forces that have revealed themselves, to reduce American imperialism's share of the costs of defending the world capitalist system, and to reinforce its competitive position, which has deteriorated vis-à-vis its allies and commercial rivals. Essentially, this means that American imperialism is going to export to the other capitalist powers a part of the financial, economic, and social costs imposed by the overall crisis of the imperialist system, and that it is going to try to use part of the resources freed in this way to reduce the internal social contradictions in the United States.

Washington's threat to withdraw its troops gradually from Europe and Japan will probably be sufficient to force the West European and Japanese imperialists to assume the military defense of "free enterprise" in Europe and Asia. In return, the European imperialists (the Japanese will find this more difficult) will get their autonomous nuclear "striking force." French and British nuclear arms will form the axis of this weapons system, and its development will be facilitated by the entry of Great Britain into the Common Market.

Likewise, in order to strengthen the dollar, American imperialism will combine increased protectionism with a slowdown in real capital outflows and a new effort to retool American industry aimed at regaining a margin of technological and productive superiority over its main European and Japanese competitors. The European bourgeoisie will respond by redoubling its efforts to form its own "multinational corporations." Only such international combines have any chance of successfully opposing the multinational corporations dominated by U. S. capital (which explains why the French bourgeoisie finally abandoned the Gaullist veto against Great Britain's entry into the Common Market).

Sensing this danger, the Soviet bureaucracy has gone into high gear in its fight to get a "conference on European security" and to encourage all the capitalist forces in Europe that are hesitating in the face of this formidable endeavor (an endeavor that cannot fail to provoke sharper class struggles). In this, the Kremlin has gotten a more favorable response than in the past, not only in the European

Social Democratic parties but even in NATO. American imperialism is not opposed a priori to seeing the military and political strength of the European imperialist powers temporarily weakened so that it can reinforce its position for blackmailing and pressuring these countries. But the logic of the class struggle will ultimately prove stronger than all these diplomatic maneuvers.

While the crisis American imperialism is now experiencing reflects the fact that its reserves are becoming depleted by comparison with the demands of the enormous tasks it is required to carry out simultaneously, it must not be deduced from this that these reserves have completely disappeared. Although American predominance is on the wane, U. S. imperialism still retains an important margin of superiority over all its main competitors. No force outside the country can prevent the American bourgeoisie from regaining a new temporary equilibrium, at the cost, essentially, of its main competitors. The most formidable obstacle in the way of achieving this equilibrium lies in the United States itself.

The present radicalization is much deeper than the one in the 1930s. It embraces the most exploited and oppressed sectors of bourgeois society — above all the Blacks and Chicanos — whose demands cannot be met without turning this society completely upside down. The reserves of American imperialism are smaller than they were forty years ago; American society is more profoundly integrated into the worldwide economy and class struggle. This means that the bourgeoisie has less leeway for making concessions to the workers than it had during the last radicalization. The Roosevelt coalition was built on granting concessions to the unions, to the aristocracy of the working class and the trade-union bureaucracy. By means of these concessions, and above all thanks to the treacherous role played by the Stalinists, the mass movement was reintegrated into the two-party system.

Today such concessions are harder to give. The influence of reformist tendencies like the Communist party is much more restricted than in the time of Roosevelt. Thus, it will be all the more difficult to reintegrate this powerful movement of rebellion into the two-party system. In the last analysis,

the American bourgeoisie's ability to halt the ripening social crisis before it reaches the point of shaking the foundations of the capitalist structure will depend on the outcome of the struggle for leadership of these rebel forces. In this, the contest between those elements striving to reintegrate these forces into the bourgeois political system and those centering their activity on mobilizing the workers, the exploited, and the oppressed in independent, anticapitalist mass action will be decisive. Only a victory by the former can enable the American bourgeoisie to repeat its achievement of the 1930s.

### III.

Over the past several years the Vietnam war has constituted the most important international confrontation between the imperialist and the anti-imperialist and anticapitalist forces in the world. In the same period, the struggle against this war has been the main force uniting the movement of radical opposition to the capitalist state in America. Within the framework of this movement, students, national and racial minorities, unionists, feminists, and radicalized workers have been able to come together in the struggle for a common objective, a struggle clearly directed against the interests of capital and of the bourgeois government of the United States. The breadth attained by the April 24, 1971, demonstrations showed the American bourgeoisie clearly that it could pursue the war in Vietnam only at the cost of broadening — and what is worse from its point of view — of increasingly *politicalizing* the antiwar movement, which has become the driving force in politicalizing a growing section of the American working class. Such a possibility runs counter to the whole fundamental strategy of this bourgeoisie for the coming period. Ending the Vietnam war has become an urgent political objective for an entire wing of this bourgeoisie. This was clearly indicated by the recent conflict between the *New York Times* and the Nixon administration over the publication of documents that starkly revealed the cynical way in which the American government, under the successive administrations of Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon, has lied and

is continuing to lie to the masses in order to justify its bloody counter-revolutionary campaign in Southeast Asia.

The deep division that persists in the U. S. bourgeoisie over the conditions for ending the war in Vietnam reflects the dilemma with which imperialism is confronted on a world scale, the dilemma which we have analyzed on numerous occasions.<sup>2</sup> Immediate withdrawal of U. S. troops from Vietnam in exchange for the release of U. S. prisoners by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam would be seen by the masses in Vietnam, as well as Southeast and Southern Asia, as a colossal military, political, and social defeat for imperialism. The spread of the revolutionary process that has become visible on the Indian peninsula would receive a powerful boost. The imperialists, therefore, are concentrating on trying to achieve this withdrawal under conditions that would smother, mask, or at least limit this encouragement to the revolutionary masses. Since the Soviet bureaucracy does not have sufficient prestige in the eyes of Asian revolutionists for it to be able to exercise an effective brake on their struggle, a wing of the American bourgeoisie wants to draw the Maoist bureaucracy into performing this task. This is the meaning of the Ping-Pong diplomacy initiated between Washington and Peking.

Since the start of the Sino-Soviet conflict, we have explained that the fundamental source of these differences does not lie in the intrinsic qualities of Mao, nor the relative poverty or affluence of one or another wing of the bureaucracy, and still less in Mao's more "Stalinist" character vis-à-vis that of the leaders of the Soviet bureaucracy. The essential source of these differences lies in the fact that *imperialism accepted peaceful coexistence with the Kremlin but refused to accept such a relationship with Peking. The fundamental factor was the relationship of the Maoist bureaucracy to*

*imperialism* on the one hand and to the masses over which it ruled on the other. It is obvious that during the entire decade of the 1960s, this two-fold relationship was different for the Peking leadership—quantitatively and not qualitatively different, of course—than for Stalin, Khrushchev, and Brezhnev. Manifold tests have confirmed this analysis, from the Sino-Indian conflict, the Vietnam war, and the armed struggle in Latin America to May 1968 in France, the intervention of the Warsaw Pact armies in Czechoslovakia, and the struggle of the Palestinian masses.

As soon as imperialism began to show a desire for establishing peaceful-coexistence-type relations with Peking, for establishing trade and good-neighbor policies similar to those that it maintains with Moscow, one of the constants determining the more radical and "leftist" behavior of the Maoist bureaucracy (and of the "orthodox" Maoist groups throughout the world) started to fade away. *The outlines of a deepgoing right-turn have appeared in Mao's foreign policy.* The cynical betrayal of the Bengali people's struggle for the right of self-determination and the no less cynical aid given to the Bandaranaike government (which brought the Peking bureaucracy into a *de facto* united front with Washington, London, Moscow, Belgrade, New Delhi, and Islamabad!) have not been isolated incidents. At the same time that courageous young Maoists were being hanged in Iran, the shah's sister was received with great ceremony in Peking, and her brother was hailed as an "anti-imperialist fighter." In order to buy diplomatic recognition from various semicolonial governments in Africa, Peking has not hesitated to grant them the title of "nonaligned" or "progressive," even the blood-stained, counterrevolutionary government of the Cameroons. According to latest reports, Peking approves of the entry of Great Britain into the Common Market in order to strengthen "Europe" against "the main enemy," American imperialism. (The fact that this "Europe" is capitalist and imperialist is a "secondary contradiction" that Mao can dismiss with a wave of the hand.) As for this "main enemy," moreover, as soon as it declares its readiness to negotiate, the Maoist bureaucracy will willingly try to make a deal with it.

There is still the second aspect of

the factors that determine the international policy of the Maoist bureaucracy—its relationship to the masses. In the beginning of the "cultural revolution," the process of politicalizing Chinese youth went deep. The way in which the revolution was ended put a brake on this process but could not eliminate all its effects. The Vietnamese revolution enjoys exceptional prestige in the eyes of the masses of youth throughout the world, and first of all in the People's Republic of China itself. This factor places a limit on the Maoist bureaucracy's possibilities for maneuver. Thus, despite its turn to the right, Peking has just granted a new military aid package to Hanoi.

When Stalin shifted from the "third period" to the popular-front policy, then to a temporary alliance with Hitler, and finally to close collaboration with the Western imperialist powers, the international working class experienced the worst phase of defeats and setbacks in its entire history. The Soviet working class was prostrated and demoralized, without any perspective for independent action. The threat of fascism cast its shadow over the entire world, obscuring the real counter-revolutionary meaning of Stalin's policy in the eyes of large sections of the proletariat. Today the right turn in Maoist policy is taking place in a completely changed world-context. We are seeing an impetuous rise and not an ebb of the world revolution. We are not seeing a temporary stabilization but rather a new sharpening of the general crisis of the imperialist system. In these conditions, the consequences of a rightist policy by Peking will be much more limited than those of the equivalent policy by Moscow in the 1930s and 1940s. This is the source of Washington's doubts about Peking's capacity for halting the progress of the revolution in Asia, even if Mao were willing to offer every guarantee in this regard.

In countries like Thailand, Burma, Malaysia, and the Philippines, where the movement is still weak and largely dependent on material, military, and political support from Peking, Mao's right turn might temporarily set the revolutionary process back. In Vietnam, India, Ceylon, and Indonesia, the anger, experience, consciousness, and—except in Indonesia—the activity of the masses have reached too high a level. In these

2. See especially the editorial in the May issue of *Quatrieme Internationale*, "La revolution permanente s'etend en Asie." One of the secret documents published by the *New York Times*, a memorandum dated March 16, 1964, sent by Secretary of Defense McNamara to President Johnson, states that the Vietnam war was considered by the entire world "a test case of U. S. capacity to help a nation meet a Communist 'war of liberation.'"

countries, Ping-Pong diplomacy has more limited chances for success.

In any case, *the defeat of imperialism in Vietnam will have objective consequences giving powerful impetus to the rise of the revolution internationally. And this momentum will be far too strong to be neutralized by the confusion that will inevitably be produced in some circles by the right turn in Chinese policy.* For a decade now, a new, broad, young vanguard has been taking form and gaining strength throughout the world in independence of the traditional leaderships of the mass movement (the Stalinists; the Social Democrats; and, in the colonial and semicolonial countries, the bourgeois nationalists). In this vanguard, the Trotskyists and Maoists have been the main organized ideological currents. If Peking's rightist course takes a clearer and more pronounced form, the result will not be severe reverses for the world revolution. The international Maoist current will disintegrate. The whole sincerely revolutionary wing will abandon it, leaving only a hard core of bureaucrats inseparably attached to the "guide state."

The result of this, in turn, will be that building the Fourth International will receive a new impetus. The tasks for the Fourth International that flow from the turn shaping up in the international situation are as follows:

1. To broaden the antiwar movement in the United States so as to leave imperialism no respite and force it into an unconditional retreat, that is, force it to accept defeat.
2. To take bold initiatives in the colonial and semicolonial countries wherever it has sufficient strength to win it recognition as the only genuinely revolutionary force, as the only force genuinely and unconditionally devoted to the national and social liberation of the oppressed peoples and the exploited masses.
3. To integrate itself better into the rising struggles of the European proletariat today and the Japanese and North American proletariat tomorrow in order to orient these struggles toward transitional objectives, toward general mobilizations, toward the development of self-organization by the masses. And throughout this process the task of the Fourth International is to raise the questions of power clearly for the masses.
4. To bring an increasingly strong

light to bear on the nature of Stalinism and all its ideological by-products, from Khrushchevism to Maoism, in order to point up the fundamental difference between these various doc-

trines of the bureaucracy and Marxism-Leninism, the theory of the international working class and of the world revolution.

July 5, 1971

## The Meeting Between Nixon and Mao

[The following declaration was issued July 25 by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.]

\* \* \*

The victorious resistance of the Vietnamese people against U.S. imperialist aggression, and the impressive rise of the antiwar movement inside the United States, have forced Washington to look for ways to end its criminal adventure in Southeast Asia. It seeks to do this in such a way that this retreat would not transform itself into a rout of the propertied classes in the whole area. Neither does Washington want this withdrawal to act as a powerful stimulus for the revolutionary anti-imperialist and anticapitalist struggle throughout the world.

For a long time, U.S. imperialism has been intriguing with the Soviet bureaucracy in order to pressure the revolutionaries of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos to accept some formula whereby the Indochinese revolution could be kept from achieving full victory. However, the political influence of the Kremlin in that area has been declining rapidly.

Faced with the fact that the rotten Saigon, Vientiane, and Pnompenh regimes are tottering on the brink of total collapse, U.S. imperialism has desperately turned to Peking. It aims to enlist the aid of the Chinese bureaucracy in reestablishing "peaceful coexistence" in Southeast Asia in exchange for some diplomatic and economic concessions.

We do not condemn the fact that Chinese and American diplomats talk to each other. What we do condemn is the fact that the masses of the world are kept in the dark about the purpose and contents of the talks and that the Peking bureaucracy—followed by its supporters in other countries—adapts its analyses and actions to the needs of these negotiations, cynically betraying revolutionary struggles in Bangla Desh, Ceylon, the Cameroons, and other countries.

The Fourth International stands for the defense of all workers states—no matter how bureaucratized—against imperialism and accepts the right of governments of these states to establish diplomatic and commercial relations with capitalist states. But it refuses to accept the subordination of the interests of social revolution and national liberation struggles to the needs of the diplomatic maneuvers of either the Moscow or Peking bureaucracies. The Fourth International calls upon all workers, poor peasants, and the revolutionary masses of all countries to step up their defense of the Vietnamese revolution. No secret deals between big powers must be allowed to rob the Vietnamese people of the fruits of their victory, for which they

have fought so long and so heroically!

The Fourth International emphasizes that it is necessary for revolutionary organizations to be completely independent from the bureaucracies in Moscow and Peking, and while stressing the need for an anti-imperialist united front, whenever and wherever this is necessary and possible, the Fourth International affirms that it is essential for the masses to vigorously defend their class interests regardless of diplomatic maneuvers by Moscow and Peking.

For an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Indochina!

Against secret diplomacy!

For the victory of the Vietnamese revolution!

## Chad Regime Accuses Libya

The government of Chad broke off diplomatic relations with Libya August 27 following what it called a "foreign-directed" attempt to overthrow the government of President Francois Tombalbaye.

In a speech to the diplomatic corps, Foreign Minister Baba Hassane was reported to have accused the Libyan regime of "openly trying to interfere in the internal affairs of our young republic with the help of a major imperialist power and through a third party intermediary."

A radio broadcast from Fort Lamy, the capital, said that the leader of the unsuccessful coup, Ahmed Abdallah, had committed suicide.

The Chad government has often accused Libya of aiding the Moslem rebels against whom it has been waging war since 1965. The government army has been assisted in the civil war by French "advisers."

## Mexico City Moves Up Fast

An up and coming contender for the title of dirtiest city in the world is Mexico City. In only a couple of decades, the primitive attitude of pride in crystalline air has been overcome. Today, automobiles and factories are pouring 3,745,000 kilograms of pollutants into the atmosphere each day, it has been calculated. Analysts have identified more than 3,000 chemical products in Mexico City's smog and the count is far from complete.