

Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 10, No. 12

©1972 Intercontinental Press

March 27, 1972

50c



USS CONSTELLATION sailing for Vietnam last September as Nixon prepared escalation of Indochina air war. Recent poll

shows that despite propaganda, U. S. public is increasingly aware of extent of bombing and wants it stopped.

British Police Raid Homes of Leftists
Protests Continue Against Mandel Ban
Uproar Over Death of Italian Publisher

Abortion Report Is Setback for Nixon

The U. S. Commission of Population Growth and the American Future, which was empaneled by Nixon last April, issued a report March 16 calling for the legalization of abortion in the United States. The twenty-four-member commission also recommended that public and private forces join together to make high-quality day care available to all families who desire it, that states should actively encourage teen-agers to receive contraceptive services, that responsible sex education be available to all, and that prohibitions on voluntary sterilization be dropped. The report added that financial rewards for sterilization should be eliminated, on the ground that the poor would be especially vulnerable to such bonuses.

The commission is chaired by John D. Rockefeller 3d. Its report was careful to avoid characterizing abortion as a population-control measure, stressing instead that prohibitions on the right to abortion are "obstacles to the exercise of individual freedom."

"The objective for American society should be to make the child-bearing decision as free as possible of unintended societal pressures," the report said.

The authors were "impressed that the availability of abortion on request causes a reduction in the number of illegal abortions, maternal and infant deaths, and out-of-wedlock births, thereby greatly improving the health of women and children."

Four Catholic members of the commission expressed varying degrees of dissent from the report's conclusions.

One week before the U. S. report was issued, the East German parliament passed a law allowing free abortion on demand within the first twelve weeks of pregnancy.

To the ossified bureaucrats in the German workers state, this step was viewed as a controversial one. Fourteen members of Parliament actually voted against it—the first time in history that the rubber-stamp outfit has recorded a negative vote. □

In This Issue

FEATURES		The Fourth International—by Pierre Frank
	336	Chapter 4: 1933-1938
U. S. A.	314	Abortion Report Is Setback for Nixon
	324	Socialist Party Heals Thirty-Year Split
	324	"England—Get Out of Ireland"
INDOCHINA WAR	315	Poll Shows Support for Troop Withdrawal, End of Bombing
	332	"Aid" for the CIA
CHINA	316	Malraux Reports Mao-Chiang Deal
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	316	Balaguer's Troops Rounding Up Peasants
	316	Student Murdered by "Mistake"
ARGENTINA	317	The Real Meaning of 48-Hour Strike
		—by Jose Ricardo Eliashev
MEXICO	318	Rico Galan Calls for Anti-Imperialist Front
CYPRUS	319	Athens Keeps Pressure on Makarios
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	320	International Committee Formed Against Political Trials
FRANCE	321	Left in Campaign Against Repression
		—by David Thorstad
	322	Bernadette Devlin Barred
IRELAND	322	Republican Leaders Dragged Into Court
	324	British Use of Torture Scored by Amnesty
GREAT BRITAIN	323	Political Police Raid Homes of Socialists
ITALY	325	"Political Storm" Over Death of Publisher
WEST GERMANY	326	Students, Professors, Politicians Protest Ban on Ernest Mandel
	327	Mandel Interviewed by "Der Spiegel"
IRAN	330	Brandt Bargains With Shah on Price of Oil
		—by Javad Sadeeg
SUDAN	331	Pact Runs Into Obstacles
MIDDLE EAST	332	Split Reported in Fedayeen Group
	333	Hussein's Peace Plan a Bust—by Jon Rothschild
BAHREIN	332	Government Bans Strikes
SWEDEN	334	Thousands Protest Rising Food Prices
SPAIN	335	Strikes, Demonstrations Protest Killing of Two Workers
DOCUMENTS	340	For the Right of Marxists to Teach in Germany!
	341	German Trotskyists Ask Solidarity With Mandel
	341	Israeli Socialists for Leninist Party
	342	Fourth International Backs April 22 Actions Against Indochina War
	343	Australian CP Paper Discusses Trotsky and Lenin
	344	U. S. Professors Ask Release of Bukovsky
	344	Solzhenitsyn's Memorial for Tvardovsky
PHOTOS	313	U. S. S. Constellation—by Jim Smith
	325	Giangiacoimo Feltrinelli
DRAWINGS	319	Archbishop Makarios; 326, Herbert Wehner; 330, Willy Brandt—by Copain

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.

COPY EDITOR: Ruth Schein.

EDITORIAL STAFF: Gerry Foley, Jon Rothschild, George Saunders, David Thorstad.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.

ASSISTANT BUSINESS MANAGER: Steven Warshell.

TECHNICAL STAFF: H. Massey, James M. Morgan, Lawrence Rand.

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

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

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

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 10 Impasse Guemenee, Paris 4, France.

TO SUBSCRIBE: For one year send \$15 to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Village Post Office Station, New York, N. Y. 10014. Write for rates on first class and airmail. Special rates available for subscriptions to colonial and semicolonial countries.

Subscription correspondence should be addressed to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Village Post Office Station, New York, N. Y. 10014. Because of the continuing deterioration of the U. S. postal system, please allow five weeks for change of address. Include your old address as well as your new address, and, if possible, an address label from a recent issue.

Copyright © 1972 by Intercontinental Press.

Poll Shows U.S. Public Support for Troop Withdrawal, End of Bombing

One Cambodian in seven is now officially classified as a war victim by the puppet regime in Pnompenh. The estimate is that 1,000,000 persons have been killed or wounded or had their homes damaged by military action in the last two years.

"The 1 million figure," Daniel South-erland wrote in the March 17 *Christian Science Monitor*, "issued by Tiam Kim Chieng, Cambodian Commissioner General for War Victims, shows an increase of 300,000 war victims over an estimate that he made about a year ago.

"Shocking though these figures are, they fall far short of those issued recently by Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, who estimates that some 2 million refugees have fled their homes at one time or another since the war began."

In a March 13 editorial, the *Washington Post* provided statistics showing that in South Vietnam the destruction continues at a similar pace. The paper provided the following figures on the *monthly* average of civilian casualties: 1967—4,060; 1968—7,296; 1969—5,647; 1970—4,240; first eight months of 1971—3,508.

These statistics, it should be noted, covered only civilians who were admitted to Vietnamese or American hospitals. They omitted those treated as outpatients and those who received no treatment at all.

The figures, the paper commented, "demonstrate that, however greatly American casualties have been reduced, for the people of Vietnam the war remained up until late last year, at least, practically as cruel as it was in what were—for Americans—the 'peak years.' And it is safe to assume that this is still the case; major combat engagements, inevitably touching civilians, still are conducted; the American air war goes on; mines explode."

Nixon's air war not only "goes on"; it is being expanded, particularly over North Vietnam. During the course of last year—up until the last week in December—there were 101 admitted "protective reaction" bombing raids on the North. Then came five days of

massive strikes, involving more than 1,000 sorties.

Since the beginning of this year, raids on North Vietnam have continued at well over the rate of one a day. On March 18, the U.S. command in Saigon acknowledged the *ninety-seventh* "protective reaction" attack of 1972—that is, nearly as many as in all of 1971.

The fact that such an escalation could occur while Mao and Chou were wining and dining Nixon in Peking, and while the Kremlin bureaucrats were preparing to receive the imperialist chief with similar hospitality, is a glaring exposure of the hollowness of the fine words about "support" for the Indochinese peoples that are periodically mouthed by the rulers of the two largest workers states.

The Communist party of North Vietnam offered a thinly-veiled comment on this situation in the March 2 issue of the Hanoi party daily *Nhan Dan*. In an editorial marking the fifty-third anniversary of the founding of the Third International, Agence-France Presse reported, the paper observed:

"The communists who are faithful to Marxism-Leninism are those who in all places and under all circumstances devote all their energies to strengthening the unity of the socialist camp in order to defeat imperialism and to hasten the march of humanity toward socialism."

Nhan Dan went on to call for a "world front of revolutionary and progressive forces against American aggression"—a call to which there has been no public response from either Moscow or Peking.

The willingness of the two bureaucracies to permit Nixon to use his diplomatic travels to create illusions about ending the war is all the more reprehensible in view of the widespread opposition to the war within the United States—an opposition that would be even more widespread were it not for Peking and Moscow's tacit backing of Nixon's propaganda claims.

A Louis Harris poll, published in

two installments March 13 and 16, demonstrated how badly Nixon needs such backing. Harris found that an absolute majority of the American public—53 percent—thought Nixon was not telling them the truth about the war. Only 35 percent believed him.

On the question of U.S. troop withdrawals, 45 percent said they were too slow, 44 percent said the pace was about right, and only 4 percent thought them too fast. Of these figures, Harris commented:

"Ever since the President announced his troop withdrawal and an unwinding of American involvement in Vietnam in November, 1969, it is apparent that the impatience of the public to liquidate the American presence in Indochina has outstripped the pace of bringing troops home.

"Each time the President has announced a step-up in the withdrawal rate, the number expressing the view that the removal of American forces was 'too slow' would diminish some. But then, a month or two later, sentiment for accelerating the withdrawal rate would once again rise."

The Harris poll also found that Nixon's 1968 promise to end the war is likely to haunt him in this election year. By a majority of 44 to 28 percent, those questioned said Nixon "will not have kept his promise" even "if the only real involvement of the U.S. is providing bombing support for South Vietnamese troops."

Perhaps most significantly of all, by a margin of more than two-to-one—57 to 25 percent—Americans said they would oppose a "U.S. policy in Vietnam which brought home all U.S. combat troops but left American bombers and planes piloted by the U.S. Air Force and Navy."

The National Peace Action Coalition is moving to mobilize this massive sentiment in the streets of New York and Los Angeles on April 22. At its March 11 meeting, the NPAC steering committee decided to suggest that local areas conduct building actions on March 26, the beginning of what Nixon has declared as a "national week of concern for Americans who are prisoners of war or missing in action." The actions would point out that the way to free the prisoners of war is to withdraw all U.S. forces and matériel from Indochina. The steering committee also voted to endorse and build an April 1 demonstration in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania,

in support of the seven persons being tried on trumped-up charges of "conspiracy" to kidnap Nixon's adviser Henry Kissinger. □

Malraux Reports Mao-Chiang Deal

In its March 4 issue, the Paris daily *Le Monde* published an interview with André Malraux by Agence France-Presse. Malraux's observation on President Nixon's trip to China was particularly interesting for what it revealed about Nixon's vaguely worded promise of an eventual U.S. withdrawal from Taiwan.

"Were you surprised by the Sino-American communiqué?" Malraux was asked. "By President Nixon's concessions on Taiwan?"

"I was not because Nixon was not," Malraux replied. ". . . I think that Nixon did not abandon anything regarding Taiwan because there has been an agreement between Peking and Taipei for at least five years connected to the death of Chiang Kai-shek. But they did not believe that Chiang Kai-shek would live to be so old. I am convinced of this agreement, according to which nationalist China will again become Chinese after the death of Chiang Kai-shek—in a form that will be subtle, to be sure. But we can count on the Chinese to be subtle. All this I told Nixon. In the final analysis, the Americans have a treaty. Fine. Let's not get all worked up over it. It's subtle. They know that they won't fight for Taiwan and the Chinese know it too. All this is incidental. To what extent is Taiwan an aircraft carrier for the United States? It is obvious that, in time, Taiwan will no longer be an aircraft carrier. Once this is established, what does the rest matter? □

Maddox Worried

After candidates he favored were defeated in an election of delegates to the Democratic party national convention, Georgia Lieutenant Governor Lester Maddox complained: "The socialists, the civil rights agitators, and those who think the world owes them a living have moved in and taken over the Democratic party machinery."

Dominican Republic

Balaguer's Troops Rounding Up Peasants

The Dominican Federation of Christian Agrarian Leagues (FEDELAC—Federación Dominicana de Ligas Agrarias Cristianas) announced March 1 the arrest of twenty-three peasants by military troops. Some of the peasants, it said, were beaten "in a merciless way" by the troops.

The arrests occurred in the Hoja Ancha section of the Moca district, according to a report by Bolívar Díaz Gómez in the March 1 issue of the Santo Domingo daily *El Nacional de Ahora*. FEDELAC did not say when the peasants were seized. They are thought to be imprisoned in the 2nd of May fortress in Moca.

FEDELAC charged that the arrests were "a new attempt by the Brugal company to expel the peasants" from the lands they have worked for many years. The peasants maintain that the land is state property, but Brugal claims that it belongs to the company.

FEDELAC also charged that nine peasant homes had been burned down recently. And, according to Díaz Gómez, it also asserted that "on more than two occasions, peasants have been arrested and burros, horses, and other animals have been turned loose on their property, destroying the fields

that they have sown."

The organization appealed to President Joaquín Balaguer to intercede on behalf of the imprisoned peasants, "whose only crime was to have worked."

On February 29 *El Nacional de Ahora* reported from Azua, in another part of the country, that peasants there were in danger of being arrested for harboring "criminals." The police are hunting for Plinio Matos Moquete and a lawyer whom they claim was a co-conspirator with him in an alleged attack on a branch of the Royal Bank of Canada in Naco last November 8. Plinio has denied taking part in it.

According to the report in *El Nacional*, political organizations maintain that the police motive for linking Plinio to the raid is "to eliminate one of the most radical opponents of the regime." The other persons whom the police had declared "fugitives" in the case were killed on February 12 by a special unit of troops outside Santiago.

Four persons have already been charged with having sheltered Matos Moquete. They are José Ramón Borges, Luis Rolando Ruiz, Angel Julio Rosario, and José Dolores Beltré. □

Gunned Down by Police

Dominican Student Murdered by 'Mistake'

Secret police agents shot and killed an innocent student in Nizao, not far from Santo Domingo, on February 27. According to a report in the February 28 issue of the Santo Domingo daily *El Nacional de Ahora*, the agents mistook the student, nineteen-year-old Andrés María Paulino Valdez, for an activist in the MPD (Movimiento Popular Dominicano—Dominican Popular Movement), Manuel Antonio Lora Araújo.

At the time he was shot, Paulino Valdez was playing with a top in a park. According to a witness, four secret agents drove up in a Ford Galaxy. "The four men called Paulino

Valdez over to the vehicle they were riding in. They ordered him to put up his hands and then they shot him point blank." The victim died shortly afterwards.

When the chief of the national police, General Neit Rafael Nivar Seijas, was questioned by reporters about the incident, he said he knew nothing about it. He formed a commission to look into the matter and announced the next day that the four secret agents had been suspended. At that time he also admitted that "it is possible that the members of the patrol had gone out looking for [Lora Araújo] with the intention of killing him; I don't

deny it." According to the February 29 *El Nacional*, he also expressed the idea that "many times precise orders are given and the agents who are sent out on a mission do the exact opposite."

The patrol was found in this case to have violated "precise orders" to use weapons only in self-defense. Not only had they shot a young man armed only with a top, but he was not even the right man.

The mistaken identity was only one

of several contradictory elements in the case, however. Not only was the name of Lora Araújo—and not that of the real victim—entered in the official police report on the incident, but the reason the police gave for wanting to find Lora Araújo in the first place conflicted with a previous police report. Lora Araújo was said to be linked to an alleged attack on a police patrol on Saturday, February 26. In the supposed attack, Mario de Jesús Rosario was killed by police. The police report on this inci-

dent, however, said De Jesús Rosario had been alone.

To make matters even more suspicious, reported *El Nacional*, the incident in which Lora Araújo actually is alleged to have participated did not take place on Saturday at all but on the previous Wednesday, February 23, and at a location different not only from the scene of the De Jesús Rosario killing but different even from the location given in the official police report of the Wednesday incident. □

Treacherous Role of the Union Bureaucracy

The Real Meaning of Argentina's 48-Hour Strike

By Jose Ricardo Eliashev

Buenos Aires

There are few countries in the world with organized workers' movements capable, as in Argentina, of paralyzing the entire country with a general strike. But there are also few countries in the world with a union structure whose links with the bourgeois state apparatus so thoroughly subordinate it to the capitalist system.

Argentina is a country in which a call for a general strike by the General Confederation of Labor [CGT—Confederación General de Trabajo] is followed from the northern border with Bolivia and Paraguay to the southern tip of Tierra del Fuego. But in this country, the unionized workers' movement is absolutely controlled by a heavy bureaucracy that clearly supports the notion of "participation" and "dialogue" with the present military government—itsself only a conjunctural variant of a system with which this privileged caste of corrupted labor skates never ceases to share power.

The general strike that brought Argentina to a halt from Tuesday, February 29, to Thursday, March 2, showed the real and powerful control this bureaucracy, sitting atop the big unions created by Peronism, enjoys over the working class as a whole. Nonetheless, no one can deny the fact that the vertical, antidemocratic, and negotiations-oriented structure of the Argentinian unions is only the de-

formed reflection of a vast, combative, and exploited proletariat that, with amazing discipline, demonstrates its total unity in struggle by walking out of factories, shops, shipyards, quarries, mines, and fields.

The CGT called the general strike after several months of fruitless negotiations with the government of Lieutenant General Alejandro A. Lanusse, during which it was unable to win elementary concessions regarding wage demands from the military government. Lanusse's statement at the end of 1971 that the wage increase for all of 1972 would amount to only 15 percent—while at the same time admitting that during the year just ended the cost of living had gone up by 37 percent—was an indication that the "collective labor agreements" would remain suspended. These agreements are a machinery set up by the state through which the bosses and the unions on an annual basis negotiate and determine salary increases, as well as other gains for the workers.

By annulling the collective agreements, the government was assuming its role as the top representative of capital. Its doing so was a concrete indication that the bourgeoisie is not presently able to engage in negotiations with the proletariat over higher wages as a result of the deep structural crisis through which the country is going.

The authoritarian nature of the de-

cision reminded some who had forgotten it that Lanusse is acting on behalf of a power bloc of interests consisting of the bourgeoisie, the armed forces, the authorized political parties, and the Catholic church.

This should surprise no one, for the process whereby the big monopolies and the capitalist interests as a whole subject the proletariat to an enormous expropriation of the wealth it produces can be seen from the simple fact that the working class's share in the national income in 1971 (37 percent) was the lowest in twenty-five years. This meant a sharp decline in the *real wages* of the Argentinian workers.

The picture that can be drawn from all this is the following:

1. A constant and uncontrollable rise in the cost of living.
2. A decline in the proletariat's share of the national income.
3. A continuing decline in real wages.
4. A state authoritarianism that cannot be appealed, which is used to the advantage of the bourgeoisie during any negotiations with the proletariat.

The CGT had no alternative but to fall back on the classical weapon it holds in reserve for moments when it temporarily disagrees with the system. As soon as enough pressure is built up in the ranks through exploitation, high prices, and repression,

the bureaucracy turns to the dictatorship to let it know that, because of the pent-up rage among the masses, it will "have" to show some sign of struggle. Thus, the union bureaucracy is much more an ambassador of the bourgeoisie within the working class than a genuine proletarian leadership.

In the case of Argentina, this bureaucracy cannot be characterized as "reformist" because ideologically it is clearly even more regressive and its role more pernicious.

This system was put together over the years, making it possible to perfect a well-oiled machine for carrying out the orders and fulfilling the mutual needs of the regime and the bureaucracy. "Participation" is a strong tendency in the Argentinian trade-union bureaucracy, and it is reflected in a complex network of interests that serves as a shock absorber for social explosions.

But this bureaucracy can exist only because it sits astride a working class that is numerically large, historically mature, and politically advanced, and because it can count on the explicit backing of the Peronist hierarchy, and of Perón himself, who never attacks it.

By the end of February, the accumulation of social and economic problems had reached such a point that a general strike could surprise no one. By declaring the strike, the bureaucracy was "doing its duty," showing the military regime the massive support for the demands, and thereby indicating that it should give in now, before it is "too late." This warning is a reference to the fact that within the CGT there is a "combative" sector that calls for a program of workers' struggle that is both more agitational and aimed at mobilizing the masses. But as long as these combative unions do not go beyond the character stamped on the CGT by the chieftains who control it, and as long as they do not demonstrate any ability to mobilize on their own, their clamoring for change will not break through the negotiations-oriented strategy of the bureaucracy. Until then, the bureaucracy will be able to present itself to the system for what it really is—backing for the military government.

None of the demands raised by the CGT can be granted by Lanusse and his team. Rather, the cost of living

will continue to rise, the real wages of the workers will continue to decline, elementary democratic freedoms will continue to be curtailed, and the fascistlike authoritarianism of the state and the armed forces will continue in accord with the wishes of the ruling classes.

The government is using an old and effective technique. It takes an extraordinarily hard line toward popular demands, in order to then give in just a little, thus appearing "generous" to the union bureaucracy, which is always willing to sell itself at a low price. Trade unionism in Argentina acquires its statist character from the "law of professional associations." The provisions of this law include a guaranteed annual payment of \$1,000,000 to the workers' federation by the official apparatus. This sum, which is used to finance the activities of the bureaucracy, is drawn from workers' salaries every May 1.

This, and other concessions of lesser value—such as a limited and paltry sharing in certain of the benefits of bourgeois power—are the only concessions the system grants in exchange for a tamed and "sensible" workers' federation.

When this "sensitivity" disappears and class-conscious, socialist trade-union formations appear, the bourgeois state acts in perfect harmony with the bureaucracy to destroy them by force. This was the case with the organizations of the FIAT workers in the province of Córdoba, whose legal status was canceled by the government with the scandalous approval of the bureaucrats.

The regime did not suppress the

February 29-March 2 strike because it was fully aware that the strike was serving its own ends. This safety valve allowed it to offer a period of toleration and negotiation, thereby frightening away the specter of more violent and uncompromising popular mobilizations.

The system's radio and television stations carried out a routine forty-eight-hour "psychological" campaign against the strike, attacking the supposed downturn in labor productivity it would entail, but no one was taken in by this.

Argentina witnessed the unusual spectacle of a general strike that paralyzed this country of 24,000,000 inhabitants for forty-eight hours, but that was indispensable both for Lanusse's military regime and for the corrupt clique of unionists headed by José Rucci, who control the CGT the way it was controlled by Augusto Vandor, José Alenso, or Francisco Prado in previous years.

The alternative for the popular organizations lies in overcoming this tragic dilemma represented by a bureaucracy that is by nature a class-collaborationist expression of the more general phenomenon embodied in Peronist populism throughout the country.

To the extent that the left and the popular organizations are not yet in a position to take up the battle against the bureaucratic apparatus, it seems inevitable that there will continue to be new installments in the game the bourgeoisie and the participationist unions have been playing.

This is an inescapable challenge facing any genuine revolutionary strategy for Argentina. □

Interviewed on Release From Mexico City Prison

Rico Galan Calls for Anti-Imperialist Front

An interview with the Mexican writer and journalist Víctor Rico Galán appeared in the March 3 issue of the Mexico City daily *Excelsior*, the day following his release, along with a number of other political prisoners, from jail. The release came as the result of a ruling by the Supreme Court.

Rico Galán had been in prison since

1966, charged with incitement to rebellion and having "plotted" a subversive action against the government.

Now that he was free, he told the newspaper, his coming activities would be devoted to forming a new political party. He said he would help "organize the people independently in the struggle against imperialism and for socialism. Of course I will not be do-

ing it alone. There are many people who want to get organized."

Asked to describe the objectives of the Frente Socialista (Socialist Front), a group to which he belongs, he replied: "To endeavor to contribute to the organization of a workers' political party and of a national anti-imperialist front."

Did he feel the left could ever be united? "Of course. But this unification is not going to come from the left as it is presently constituted. It is the people who are going to unite. A section of the left understands this situation and is making progress toward this goal. But there are others who do not understand it. I repeat, it must be the masses who decide."

The present liberalizing trend of the Echeverría regime was actually a concession to the masses, he said. The regime "is not doing what it wants, but what it has to," he explained. "Freedom is imposing itself on the basis of struggles in which much blood was shed. Today they come to us and show us the door is open, but it was actually the people who kicked it open."

He asserted that Mexico was currently "in a prerevolutionary situation. The masses are obviously inclined toward organizing themselves independently of the government." The process through which the country is going is difficult to explain, he said, but "it will go through a nationalist stage and will end in socialism, as happened in Cuba."

He was asked his opinion of the guerrilla leader Genaro Vázquez Rojas, whose death was announced a few weeks before Rico Galán's release. "In spite of all the slanders heaped upon him, I believe that he was an honest revolutionist. I did not have the honor of knowing him, but he deserves respect. Nonetheless, I believe his activity was mistaken."

"His activities can be explained as part of a social phenomenon, as part of the barbaric reprisals of the system; the responsibility for kidnappings and bank raids also rests with a system that keeps itself in power through the use of *halcones* [hawks—fascistlike goons], acts of genocide (like Tlatelolco and last June 10), and by shooting down young men who raid banks. . . ."

He said he thought the tactics of guerrilla groups like the MAR (Mo-

vimiento de Acción Revolucionaria—Revolutionary Action Movement) and the CAP (Comandos Armados del Pueblo—Armed Commandos of the People) "are a mistake. Within these groups there are honest revolutionists who are responding to thirty years of political oppression in a country where discussion is not allowed. This explains the upsurge in these terrorist groups."

Czech Arms Were Just a Pretext

Athens Keeps Pressure on Makarios

"The tempers of the population have nothing to do with us. The rules of the church, the authority of the holy synod, are clear. We believe that our archbishop is bringing dishonor upon



MAKARIOS: Threatened not so much by holy canon as Athenian cannons.

the church by surrounding himself with armed guards and the political tensions in which he moves. Because of the delicate internal situation, his very life seems to be in danger, and we want him to save himself and the

"Do you think violence is the way to bring about a change of social structures?" asked *Excelsior*.

"Revolutionary violence is necessary," he replied. "No class ever surrenders power peacefully. But it is not possible to pose the necessity for resorting to violence without the masses being organized. When it is practiced by small groups, the results are negative." □

church by resigning."

The concern of the two Cypriot bishops, Anthimos and Gennadios, for President and Archbishop Makarios's personal welfare must be viewed with a certain suspicion. Their expressed disdain for the wishes of the Cypriot people was perhaps the only truly candid remark in the above assertion, made to Western journalists on March 9, one week after the meeting of the holy synod at which they asked Makarios to resign his post as president.

It has become increasingly apparent that the bishops are more concerned with Athenian artillery than with holy canon. On February 11, the Greek junta demanded that Makarios relinquish a clandestinely imported shipment of Czechoslovak arms and reorganize his government to include supporters of the anticommunist ex-General George Grivas, who is living underground in Cyprus. Grivas advocates annexation of Cyprus by Greece.

It has since been revealed that the colonels knew about the arms all along and that their publicly expressed surprise about them was the opening move in a carefully planned scheme to oust Makarios.

The junta claimed that Makarios had imported the arms for use against Grivas and that the shipment had been hidden from them for that reason. Makarios, they asserted, should turn the arms over to the Greek-controlled Cyprus National Guard or to the United Nations "peace-keeping" force on the island.

On March 11 Makarios yielded to this demand. According to an agreement negotiated with the UN special

representative to Cyprus, Bibiano F. Osorio-Tafall (of Mexico), UN personnel will check the arms against invoices to make sure none have been hidden away or distributed illegally. Later, UN forces will take direct possession of firing pins and other vital parts.

But the Greek government was not satisfied and reiterated its demand that Makarios alter his government.

An article in the March 18 *New York Times* explained this action. The Czechoslovak arms were actually ordered more than a year ago *with the consent of the Greek government*, months before Grivas returned to Cyprus from Greece. In fact, Lieutenant General Haralambos Haralambopoulos, National Guard commandant, personally drafted the order. The Athens regime itself wanted the shipment brought in clandestinely, in order to avoid appearing to be interfering in communal fighting that was going on last October between Greek and Turkish Cypriots.

On February 9, according to the *Times* report, a strategy meeting of top-level Greek officials was held in Athens. Present were George Papadopoulos, who is premier as well as foreign and defense minister; General Odysseus Anghens, chief of the armed forces; Stylianos Patakos and Nikolaos Makarezos, both deputy premiers; and Christian Xanthopoulos-Palamas, deputy foreign minister. It was decided to "put pressure" on Makarios, "ostensibly over the arms, but more importantly with the aim of reshuffling his government. . . ."

The ultimatum was issued two days later, and it was accompanied by verbal threats that were even more exacting.

"By the end of February," the *Times* wrote, "the Archbishop—by not replying to the ultimatum—appeared to be taking the steam out of the Greek initiative. On March 2 the Greek contingency plan was set in motion."

It was then that the bishops of the holy synod suddenly noticed that holy canon prohibits churchmen holding temporal office, a fact that has eluded the holy fathers since Makarios took office in 1959.

The deadline the bishops had set for Makarios's decision ran out on March 17, and the archbishop had not responded. But the *New York Times* has suggested that the ethnarch is more worried about the

synod's stand than about the Czechoslovak arms, and he may yet accede to their demands. This despite the fact that Cypriots have held the largest rallies in the country's history to urge Makarios to resist the junta.

The archbishop may consider that he is up against international forces too powerful to defy. On March 10 it was revealed that the Turkish government had informed the United States and other "interested countries" that it was prepared to intervene militarily in Cyprus if the Turkish Cypriot community's security is threatened by the present crisis. Since the Turks have not been involved at all in the activities of the past few weeks, Ankara's statement must be regarded purely as an anti-Makarios gesture.

Cypriot leftists charge that the moves against Makarios were actually planned at a NATO conference held last year in Lisbon. In an effort to settle the Cyprus conflict—which has more than once brought the ostensible NATO allies Greece and Turkey to the brink of war—the Western alliance decided to arrange a settlement, without, of course, consulting the Cypriots themselves.

International Committee Formed Against Czechoslovak Political Trials

An international committee of writers and intellectuals has been formed in Western Europe to draw attention to the wave of political arrests that has swept Czechoslovakia in recent months, according to a report in the March 10 issue of the London *Times*.

"Prominent writers, scholars, and journalists, known for their work in the interest of the reform movement in the year 1968, have been either arrested or are frequently being seen by the police," the committee stated. "They are all now facing trial on political charges.

"The purpose of the present action by the Czechoslovak authorities is to intimidate citizens who insist on their rights guaranteed by the Czechoslovak constitution. . . ."

"Should there be criminal proceedings in Prague, the committee will call for an open and fair trial. It will request that the Czechoslovak author-

The deal, Cypriots assert, is to give Cyprus to Greece in exchange for territorial concessions to Turkey. The whole package is part of the expansion of U.S. naval power in the eastern Mediterranean. That explanation acquired increased credibility when Nixon announced during the Cyprus crisis that he was reinstating military aid to Greece despite a Congressional prohibition.

The Soviet bureaucracy, which is in large part the target of the entire scheme, has warned the Athens regime—three times so far—not to interfere in Cyprus. But if Makarios is counting on support from that quarter, he should think again. The March 8 *Washington Post* noted:

"Despite Moscow's protestations on behalf of Makarios, Greek sources in Athens say the Soviet Union has demonstrated it is interested in maintaining good relations with Greece. As a result it is likely to move with caution. Soviet Ambassador [to Greece] Kliment Levitchkine has reminded former local politicians that Moscow has worked well with military regimes elsewhere in the past." □

ities allow international observers to be present at such a trial. The Government in Prague has been informed of the formation of the committee.

"We are of course concerned with the fate of those people who have been arrested; equally we are concerned with the good name of the Czechoslovak Republic. It would be most seriously hurt by new miscarriages of justice similar to those committed in the fifties and later denounced by men like Dr Husak as a perversion of socialist legality."

The members of the committee include Dame Peggy Ashcroft, David Carver, Countess Marion Dönhoff, Pierre Emmanuel, Günter Grass, Graham Greene, Rudolf Hagelstange, Friedrich Heer, Christopher Hill, Thilo Koch, Siegfried Lenz, Angelo Maria Ripellino, Denis de Rougemont, Hilde Spiel, Vercors, Giancarlo Vigorelli, Per Wästberg, and Angus Wilson. □

French Left in Campaign Against Repression

By David Thorstad

In the wake of the murder of René-Pierre Overney February 25, virtually all the trade unions and political organizations of the French left agreed that some kind of campaign against repression was called for. But there have been considerable differences over the lines along which this campaign should be conducted.

Thirteen far-left organizations called for a "national day of explanation" March 17. This was to be a kind of mass teach-out in which the participating organizations would "go to plant gates, subway stops, train depots, bus stops, intersections . . ." in order to demand "the abolition of the armed bands of capital, the rehiring of all the workers fired from their jobs at Renault after the murder of Overney, and the immediate freeing of seven Renault workers imprisoned in total contempt for justice."

The participating groups noted that theirs was a "joint undertaking of thirteen organizations who have important differences in their assessment of the kidnapping of Robert Nogrette but who have maintained their unity in order to assert that those who are really responsible for acts of violence are the ruling powers and the bosses."

[The organizations calling the "national day of explanation" were the following:

[Alliance Marxiste Révolutionnaire (AMR—Revolutionary Marxist Alliance), the French Pabloite organization.

[*La Cause du Peuple* (People's Cause), a Maoist weekly whose supporters include many former members of the banned Gauche Prolétarienne (Proletarian Left) headed by Alain Geismar.

[Centres d'Initiative Communiste (Communist Initiative Centers), founded in November 1970 by members, and especially former members, of the Communist party, among them Roger Garaudy, Charles Tillon, and Jean-Pierre Vigier.

[*L'Humanité Rouge*, supported by former militants of the banned PCMLF (Parti Communiste Marxiste

Léniniste de France—Marxist-Leninist Communist party of France), a Maoist split-off from the French Communist party, founded in December 1967.

[Ligue Communiste (Communist League), French section of the Fourth International.

[Ligne Rouge (Red Line), a small Maoist group.

[Lutte Ouvrière (Workers Struggle), a group that split from the Fourth International in 1940. Recently efforts have been made to heal the split but without success as yet.

[Objectif Socialiste (Socialist Objective), led by Robert Buron, a former minister, and André Jeanson, former president of the CFDT (Confédération Française et Démocratique du Travail—French Democratic Confederation of Labor).

[Organisation Communiste Libertaire (OCL—Libertarian Communist Organization), an anarchist tendency including, among others, Daniel Guérin.

[Organisation Révolutionnaire Anarchiste (ORA—Revolutionary Anarchist Organization), formed in 1967.

[Parti Socialiste Unifié (United Socialist party), a centrist group headed by Michel Rocard.

[Révolution, a tendency that split from the Ligue Communiste in February 1971.

[Secours Rouge (Red Aid), an anti-repression organization.]

The Lambertist organization, the AJS (Alliance des Jeunes pour le Socialisme—Alliance of Youth for Socialism), was virtually the only far-left group not to sign the call. The reason for this abstention, according to the March 15 *Le Monde*, was that the "AJS is for a workers' united front with the CP and the Socialist party."

The Political Bureau of the CP, however, followed the line the Stalinists have taken since Overney was murdered. This consists of branding any action by the far left as "ultraleftist" and "provocative." "The 'explanation' effort Messrs. Geismar, Krivine, and others want to engage in on Friday

at factory gates, in university departments, and in various public places, can do nothing but once again promote provocations," the Political Bureau asserted.

"For workers, teachers, and working-class and student youth, the greatest vigilance is called for."

The unions have not been able to reach a common position on anti-repression action. A major stumbling block has been the insistence of the CP-dominated CGT (Confédération Générale du Travail—General Confederation of Labor) that any actions against repression be linked to the alleged "provocations" of the far left. It has called for workplace gatherings on March 22 "for freedoms, and against repression and provocations."

The CFDT has refused to lump the far left together with the bourgeoisie and the government. It has called for work stoppages and workplace meetings throughout the week of March 20-25. "Only mass action, based on class consciousness and unity in action by all currents and all categories of workers," stated the union's executive committee, "can check the intransigence and repression of the bosses, and open up the way for meeting the demands and extending the freedoms of the workers."

The FEN (Fédération de l'Éducation Nationale—National Education Federation) was to decide March 16 how it would relate to the actions called for by the CGT and the CFDT.

A meeting of the four main unions at Renault on March 13 failed to produce agreement on joint action in the factory. Besides the CGT and the CFDT, the unions participating in the meeting were FO (Force Ouvrière) and the CGC (Confédération Générale des Cadres—General Confederation of Personnel).

From the very outset the CP has termed not only the protest against the killing of Overney but even the killing itself "provocations" by leftist groups working in collusion with the government and the bosses. It has

repeatedly sounded this false note, and André Laurens, writing in the March 17 *Le Monde*, predicted that the Communist youth demonstration, scheduled for quite some time to take place March 18 in fifty-three cities on the theme of the right to education, jobs, and professional training, would in reality take on the character of "a response to leftism."

No matter how blatantly dishonest the CP's amalgam of the far left and the ruling power is, still the adventurist kidnapping of Robert Nogrette gave the CP just what it needed to assume an "I-told-you-so" stance. Then, on March 18, according to a United Press International dispatch from Paris, the same group that performed the kidnapping, the "Pierre Overney Group" of the New Popular Resistance (Nouvelle Résistance Populaire—NRP), was alleged to have sent a letter to the Soviet embassy in Paris in which it "threatened to blow up Soviet Aeroflot jetliners unless the airline paid a ransom of two million Swiss francs, about \$525,000." It was not clear whether the letter was genuine or a fabrication.

Le Monde reported March 16 that another threatening letter was sent to Jacques Duclos, a member of the Political Bureau of the CP by "a group of Maoists," though there was speculation that it was phony.

The Paris daily also reported on March 17 that more than twenty intellectuals addressed an open letter to members of the Communist party calling on them to break with it. "When the leaders of the PCF [Parti Communiste Français—French Communist party] see in the murder of a worker militant only an opportunity to slander the revolutionary movement that is in the process of being reborn—only the latest of a long series of murderous falsifications, lies, and repudiations—the members of the PCF can no longer hide from themselves the fact that they are being abused and lied to, nor can they once again seek refuge and consolation in traditional loyalty to their party. . . .

"The true struggle against the sys-

When You Move...

Don't count on the post office forwarding your Intercontinental Press! It's against their rules.

Send us your new address. And in plenty of time, please.

tem of capitalist servitude is henceforth inseparable from the struggle against the PCF and its efforts to pervert the idea of communism. Today this struggle is being led by the movement that grew out of May 1968."

Signers of the letter included Simone de Beauvoir, Mariane Bourgeois,

François Chatelet, Claude Courtot, Marguerite Duras, Louis-René des Forêts, Daniel Guérin, Pierre Guyotat, Georges Lapassade, Robert Lapoujade, Henri Lefebvre, Michel Leiris, Eric Losfeld, Dionys Mascolo, Georges Michel, Maurice Nadeau, Gilles Sandier, Jean-Paul Sartre, Georges Sebac, and Philippe Sollers. □

Ireland

Republican Leaders Dragged Into Court

The Irish Republic, after having arrested a number of republicans near the end of February, has now decided to bring at least two leaders of the movement to trial. On March 13, according to a report in the *New York Times*, Cathal Goulding Sr., chief of staff of the Official IRA, went on trial in Dublin on charges of "inciting a crowd at a funeral in Cork to cause explosions and shoot at people with intent to cause grievous bodily harm." He pleaded not guilty.

Then a March 15 Associated Press dispatch from Dublin reported that Tomás Mac Giolla, president of the Official Sinn Féin, the political arm of the republican movement, "was ordered to face trial here on charges of membership in an illegal organi-

zation." He was also accused of "possession of illegal documents" on February 25, the day after a bomb killed seven persons at the Aldershot paratrooper base near London. The nature of the "illegal documents" was not stated.

The tribunal investigating the murder by British troops of thirteen demonstrators in Derry on January 30 ended seventeen days of hearings on March 14. On March 13, a British army lawyer, Brian Gibbens, admitted before the tribunal that an army assertion that four of the thirteen victims had been on a "wanted" list of IRA members was false. "I am now happy [sic] to tell the tribunal that none of the deceased was on a wanted list," he said. □

The 'Ultraleftist,' Not the MP

Bernadette Devlin Barred From France

Bernadette Devlin was refused entry into France on March 14 when she arrived by plane for a meeting she was scheduled to address in Bordeaux. The meeting on the Irish resistance struggle was sponsored by the local group around the publication *Politique-Hebdomadaire* and the Institut Aquitain d'Etudes Sociales (Aquitaine Institute for Social Studies).

Devlin's plane was met, according to the March 16 *Le Monde*, by "several dozen young people, a number of journalists, and many CRS [special police]." Devlin's French lawyer, Michel Touzet, was not allowed to

board the plane to consult with his client. In little more than an hour, she was on another plane, forced to return to London.

The organizers of the meeting Devlin was supposed to address made a statement to the press protesting the action of the French authorities. They charged that it was connected with President Pompidou's scheduled visit to England and that it was proof of complicity between the governments of the two countries over the struggle in Northern Ireland.

Le Monde noted on March 14 that Bernadette Devlin has been banned from France since May 12, 1971. She

had been invited to participate on that date in a meeting organized in Brittany by the Association des Druides Bretons (Association of Breton Druids). The decision by the minister of the interior, Raymond Marcellin, to ban her from the country was taken following a meeting in November 1970 in Paris organized by Secours Rouge, an antirepression group. The reason given for the ban was that in the course of the meeting, Devlin gave a speech in which she gave the impression of being a "revolutionary-socialist activist."

Le Monde wryly observed that whatever her attitudes may be toward the

French left, "since April 1969 Miss Devlin also happens to be an 'honorable member' of Her Majesty the Queen of England's Parliament. Could it be that Mr. Marcellin is less good-natured than his British colleague, Mr. Maudling, who did not get upset when the young parliamentarian slapped him in the face the day after the Londonderry shootings on January 30?"

One newspaper, *La Nation*, offered by way of clarification the idea that the object of the ban was not the Member of Parliament, but the "ultraleftist" activist who might take positions in France of such a nature as to disturb law and order." □

Maudling Gives England a Taste of Ireland

Political Police Raid Homes of Socialists

Armed Special Branch (political police) detectives raided more than sixty homes in England early in the morning of March 15. The government claimed that the raids were part of a search for the persons who exploded a bomb at a military camp in Aldershot February 22. The Official wing of the Irish Republican Army (IRA) has admitted responsibility for the bombing.

In reality, the police raids were more an attack on leftist ideas than a search for bombs or bombers. Clive Borrell and Hugh Noyes wrote in the March 16 London *Times*:

"Many of those roused from their beds are known to hold extreme political views. Large quantities of documents were taken away for further examination, including passports, diaries, notes and magazines.

"The raids, all synchronized for 5.30 am, were conducted under warrants issued by magistrates under the Explosives Act."

Prime Minister Edward Heath's political police appear not to have found any explosive passports or diaries, for no one was arrested.

Among those raided were several members of the International Socialists (IS), a group that had publicly dissociated itself from the Aldershot bombing and that has frequently criticized the tactics of the IRA. In a letter published in the March 16

Times, IS member Paul Foot described the raids:

"Shortly after 5 o'clock this morning three leading members of the International Socialists in London were 'visited' by large squads of plain clothes policemen. The police said they had a warrant to search for explosives and proceeded to search the houses of the IS members over a period of several hours. In one instance they left shortly before midday.

"In every instance the police took away large cases full of private letters, back numbers of all kinds of socialist papers and pamphlets, diaries, address lists, bills, receipts, passports, family photographs and in one case the cardboard on the inside of a toilet roll, a partly made dress and the contents of the carpet sweeper."

The IS members, Foot wrote, were denied the right to call lawyers during the search and questioning.

"The implication of the police questioning appears to have been that the searches and seizures were in connexion with the recent IRA bombing in Aldershot.

"Since no one in his right mind would consider that the IS was in any way responsible for that explosion, what was the purpose of these extraordinary visits? Could it be that the main intention was to seize as much information as possible about a socialist organization for the gen-

eral background information of the Special Branch?"

Borrell and Noyes reported that "The raids caused an outcry in the Commons, where Mr Heffer, Labour MP for Liverpool, Walton, demanded an emergency debate. That sort of police action, he said, could have an effect on the 'fundamental political liberties of the British public'.

"He demanded a statement from Mr Maudling, the Home Secretary, but Mr Whitelaw, Leader of the House, said he could give no assurance that there would be a statement.

"The Speaker refused the request for an emergency debate."

It is not surprising that Maudling was in no hurry to make a public statement on the raids. As he demonstrated last year when he had German socialist Rudi Dutschke deported by a secret tribunal, Maudling prefers to go about suppressing civil liberties behind closed doors.

The raids were also a sharp reminder that the attempt to retain imperialist control over Ireland necessarily has its effects in England as well. In his request for a debate, Eric Heffer commented:

"We should not because we are involved in a struggle against the IRA, resort to policies which are totally alien to basic democratic rights, principles and liberties."

The Labour party MP did not explain, however, how it was possible to confine the suppression of "democratic rights, principles and liberties" to only one shore of the Irish Sea. □

to:

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

from:

Name _____
Street _____
City _____
State _____ Zip _____
Country _____

[] \$15 enclosed for one year.
[] \$7.50 enclosed for six months.

U.S. Socialist Party Heals 30-Year Split

The moribund Socialist party, U.S.A., has healed a split of more than thirty-five years by merging with a right-wing offshoot known—to those who knew of it—as the Democratic Socialist Federation (DSF). The healing operation took place in New York City and was pronounced a success on March 11.

According to a report by Peter Kihss in the March 12 *New York Times*, Socialist party chairman Michael Harrington "had wanted delay, seeking first to get his party to advocate withdrawal from Vietnam 'by a date certain.'" This timid proposal appears to have been too radical for some of the participants in the discussions, for Harrington was specifically given "the right to organize an opposition" as one of three chairmen for the new merged group.

From the very start, the SP has opposed the U.S. antiwar movement and supported the imperialist aggression against the Vietnamese people.

Besides Harrington, the new chairmen are Bayard Rustin, the Black civil-rights figure of the SP, and Charles S. Zimmerman, vice president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and a DSF member.

"The new Socialist Party-Democratic Socialist Federation," wrote Kihss, "approved a constitution guaranteeing 'proportional representation' to minorities within it—'not to invite, but to make unnecessary, destructive factionalism.' The constitution said this differed from 'totalitarian Communist' views of dissidence as treason."

The merger also brought two other groups into the new organization, the Young People's Socialist League and the Jewish Socialist Verband. Kihss said the YPSL had been "revitalized since 1966," a generous characteriza-

tion of an organization that is virtually without influence on the radical youth movements.

The DSF originated in a split at the 1936 convention of the Socialist party when the party's old guard walked out, charging that the party was soft on Communists, and formed the Social Democratic Federation (SDF). "The SDF allied in New York

with the new American Labor party," noted Kihss, "supporting President Roosevelt in 1936 and 1940, only to split from that group, too, as Communist-infiltrated, and to help form the Liberal party in 1944."

In 1957, the Social Democratic Federation became the Democratic Socialist Federation, but the change of name reflected no change in politics—unless, perhaps, a continuation of the rightward drift that began decades ago.

The priority for the new group in 1972 will be "the defeat of President Nixon by rallying labor and liberals in the Democratic party." □

British Use of Torture in Northern Ireland Scored by Amnesty International

Amnesty International, an organization formed more than a decade ago to help political prisoners, issued a report in London on March 12 accusing the British occupation forces in Northern Ireland of using psychological torture and physical brutality on internees. "These techniques constitute a grave assault on the human mind," the report stated.

"The methods used were deliberately designed to disorientate and break down the resistance of the prisoners, in order to induce them to supply information. It is very likely that the combination of sensory deprivation and deprivation of sleep and food caused a pathological state of passive obedience, or of extreme anxiety."

The techniques included the use of

black hoods, subjecting prisoners to a continuous noise, deprivation of sleep, and a diet of bread and water.

"The fact that some of the prisoners refused food and water, urinated in inappropriate situations, refused to urinate when appropriate facilities were available, and kept the hood on when it could have been removed supports our finding that this treatment had serious mental effects," said the Amnesty International report.

The British government, reacting to mounting criticism of the use of torture since internment began last August, announced on March 2 that British forces would no longer use such techniques. The Amnesty report was compiled prior to March 2. □

'England—Get Out of Ireland'

The theme of the St. Patrick's Day parade in New York City March 17 was "England—Get Out of Ireland." Many New York political figures joined the 120,000 persons who marched up Fifth Avenue. The marchers included a contingent from the Irish Republican Clubs of the United States and Canada.

"At mid-afternoon," according to a report in the *New York Post*, "about 500 men, women, and children of the

National Assn. for Irish Freedom began chanting in chorus: 'British troops must go.'"

At the last minute, the Pentagon even backed down from a previous decision and let a military band take part. "Disturbed at the parade's 'political' theme of mourning for the 13 civilians shot and killed by British troopers on 'Bloody Sunday,' Jan. 30, in Londonderry, Northern Ireland, the Pentagon had said the military would not take part." □

It's Easy to Subscribe

For 26 issues send \$7.50 with your name and address to:

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

'Political Storm' Over Death of Publisher

On the morning of March 16, two peasants from the outskirts of Milan were disturbed by the loud barking of a dog. They investigated and, at the bottom of a power-line pylon, found a mutilated body.

The corpse bore an identity card and driver's license, both in the name of Vincenzo Maggioni. These documents were later found to be forgeries. That afternoon, the police announced that the dead man was Giangiacomo Feltrinelli, a forty-five-year-old publisher sympathetic to the far left. The identification was later confirmed by Feltrinelli's third wife as well as by a number of his friends.

The police claimed that Feltrinelli had been blown up by six to eight sticks of dynamite while he was trying to destroy the power line that supplies electricity to Milan's streetcars and street lights. Forty-three unexploded sticks of dynamite were found near the body.

The police announcement, reported Paul Hoffman in the March 17 *New York Times*, "created a political storm in Italy. . . ." The Paris daily *Le Monde* characterized the reaction in the Italian press and in political circles as a mixture of "incredulity and the greatest caution." A large number of far-left groups charged that Feltrinelli had been murdered.

The publisher was widely known in both Italian and European politics. He was born in Milan on June 19, 1926, to one of the richest families in Italy. His father was a principal shareholder in several major steel and insurance companies.

At the age of nine, Feltrinelli inherited several million dollars. During the second world war, he served with U. S. forces in southern Italy.

At the end of the war, he joined the Socialist party, but in 1948 switched his allegiance to the Communist party.

During the early 1950s, Feltrinelli founded a publishing house and created the Feltrinelli Institute, which is devoted to studies of social and political history. It contains one of the most complete archives in Europe on those subjects.

Feltrinelli broke with the CP in the 1950s. He opposed the Soviet invasion of Hungary, and in 1957 became the first person in the West to publish Boris Pasternak's novel *Dr. Zhivago*. The Soviet bureaucracy tried to prevent its publication, and in 1958 Feltrinelli left the Communist party.

Subsequently, he moved further left. He visited Latin America and kept in



GIANGIACOMO FELTRINELLI

touch with many Latin American revolutionists. His publishing company held an option on the as yet unwritten memoirs of Fidel Castro.

After 1967 Feltrinelli participated in many of the activities of the far left, for which he was persecuted by the government. In April 1969 he was accused of providing false alibis for anarchists who allegedly had carried out a series of bombings. He was later acquitted of that charge.

In 1970, after having been indicted for defaming the police, Feltrinelli disappeared from Italy. He was rumored to be in Austria, then in France. In

April 1971, his name came up in connection with the assassination of the Bolivian consul in Hamburg, West Germany. Since then, he has been sought by Interpol.

Most of the left in Italy has challenged the police version of the affair. Spokesmen for the far-left Milan Student Movement charged that Feltrinelli had been murdered. Feltrinelli's wife, other officials of the publishing company, and many intellectuals have endorsed the Student Movement statement.

L'Avanti, the newspaper of the Socialist party, called the police story "astounding," and asked: "Is it believable that this billionaire publisher would cut his mustache and falsify personal papers, but keep in his pocket pictures of his wife and daughter, things that would put investigators on his trail?"

An exception to this approach was the Italian Communist party, whose newspaper, *l'Unità*, referred to Feltrinelli's supposed "touristlike ideological vagabondage, his ideological and political confusion." Addressing a congress of the CP being held in Milan at the time, Senator Umberto Terracini said that members should use "utmost vigilance against any attempted provocation and any criminal adventure, regardless of its origin." This was apparently a reference to the far left.

On March 17 an inquiry into the Feltrinelli affair was launched by the Italian government. According to a report in the March 18 *New York Times*, Italian police were investigating the possibility that Feltrinelli had been killed elsewhere and then carried to the electric line to create the impression he had blown himself up.

That appears to be a possibility worth looking into. The peasants who were drawn to the body by a dog's barking heard no explosion, and the victim's face was unaccountably unmarked.

But the investigation, in which the Italian military intelligence service is participating, seems much more likely to be concerned with the activities of the far left. *New York Times* correspondent Paul Hoffman wrote in a March 17 dispatch from Rome: "The inquiry . . . aims at exploring the revolutionary underground in which Mr. Feltrinelli, a partisan of far-left causes, is believed to have moved." □

Students, Professors, Politicians Protest West German Ban on Ernest Mandel

Frankfurt am Main

The denial of the right of Belgian Marxist economist Ernest Mandel to enter West Germany and to lecture in its universities free from political interference has become the focus of a growing range of protests across West Germany and in West Berlin.

Mandel, a prominent leader of the Fourth International, was denied entry into West Germany on February 28 on the grounds that he is a "revolutionist who aims to overthrow the established order," and that his presence would pose a "threat to public safety." He was turned back by border guards in Frankfurt while on his way to a teach-in in West Berlin organized to protest the February 22 decision of the West Berlin Senate denying him a professorship at the Free University of Berlin because of his socialist convictions.

Timed to coincide with German university vacations, the actions of the Berlin and Bonn regimes have nonetheless provoked a widening protest in university circles. Faculty councils of the universities of Frankfurt and Constance have increased the pressure on Bonn to permit Mandel's entry by offering him guest professorships. The Free University of Berlin has backed up its recommendation of Mandel with a twelve-page refutation of the Senate's decision. The University of Heidelberg has invited Mandel to participate in its prestigious "studium generale" (interfaculty studies) lecture program.

Eleven prominent figures in academic and left circles, including Gert Schäfer, Oskar Negt, Michael Vester, and Arno Klönne, have initiated a petition demanding an end to discrimination against socialists in the public service, the right of Marxists to teach at German universities, and an end to the ban against Ernest Mandel's entry into West Germany. [The text of this petition appears on p. 340.]

In Frankfurt, the Sozialistisches Büro (Socialist Bureau), an independent left-wing information service, has invited Mandel to a teach-in against

repression in West Germany to be held March 21, and has formally requested the federal government to permit Mandel to attend this meeting. Similar initiatives are under way in several other cities.

A statement by the Sozialistisches Büro denouncing the ban pointed to its contradiction of the much publi-



WEHNER: Doesn't like precedent.

cized moves toward European integration: "The territory of the European Common Market is economically and, increasingly, politically integrated. Freedom of travel is assured—for capital. But for individuals, ideas, and opinions, freedom of travel is granted only so long as it pleases those who currently hold power."

"We hold this arbitrary action to be all the more shameful," the statement continues, "because it strikes a man who has shown through his life that for him democracy is not just a political formality. For that reason he was driven out of his native city, Frankfurt am Main, and, as a Jew and a socialist, was thrown into German prisons and concentration camps, from which he was freed only in April 1945. In a country where complete magnanimity is shown to

the fascists, including the mass murderers, and where the lackeys and social allies of German fascism are almost completely reintegrated into the economic, administrative, and communications power structures, the Mandel case is more than an important symptom—it is a political alarm bell."

Government circles are now considering how to meet the broad student protest expected when lectures resume in mid-April. At the Free University, a student strike has been called in three faculties for the opening of lectures, and a "tribunal against the police state" is being prepared as a public inquiry into the current repressive measures against socialists in West Germany and West Berlin. United fronts against the repression and in defense of Mandel have been formed in several other cities.

Considerable uneasiness about the measures against Mandel has been evident in circles of the Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands [SPD—Social Democratic party of Germany], the major government party in Bonn and West Berlin. While Hans-Dietrich Genscher, the federal minister of the interior, is a member of the bourgeois Freie Demokratische Partei [FDP—Free Democratic party], the federal coalition is dominated by SPD ministers and led by SPD member Willy Brandt. Genscher's equivalent as minister of the interior in West Berlin, Kurt Neubauer, is also an SPD member.

This uneasiness was typified by the reaction of the SPD's parliamentary leader in Bonn, Herbert Wehner, to Genscher's justification to the Bundestag (federal parliament) of the ban on Mandel. Wehner was quoted in the March 13 issue of *Spiegel* as saying that Genscher's "sermon was simply unbearable. . . . The federal minister of the interior's lecture in effect nailed up a wanted poster with concepts that I'm familiar with only from the Third Reich. I'll have to settle this with him personally."

Some more left-wing circles of the SPD have not been content with private remonstrances and have joined the wave of public protest. The Jungsozialisten [Young Socialists—the official youth group of the SPD] spoke out in defense of Mandel's right to enter the Federal Republic, as did Jochen Steffen, the well-known parliamentary leader of the SPD in Schles-

wig-Holstein. The Berlin SPD has begun expulsion proceedings against Uwe Wesel, vice president of the Free University, because he signed a disputed resolution defending Mandel. Harry Ristock, school director in the Berlin government and prominent left-wing SPD leader, has also sharply attacked the refusal to appoint Mandel, as has the executive of the SPD's regional organization in Kreuzberg, West Berlin.

Some circles of ruling-class opinion have shown concern at the outburst of protest and have suggested that the SDP-FDP regime in Bonn may have gone too far. Thus a March 1 editorial in the influential liberal daily *Frankfurter Rundschau* termed the ban against Mandel "politically unwise."

"Once the appointment of Mandel

at the Free University had been refused," the paper commented, "freedom of travel could have been generously guaranteed him, all the more so in that there were no concrete grievances against him. . . . We do not want to give any encouragement to those forces in our country who, whenever they sight a Marxist, imagine democracy to be falling in ruins."

The French Ministry of the Interior, in its own manner, has furnished evidence of the international significance of the Mandel case. The March 14 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde* reports the ministry's decision to refuse to allow Bernadette Devlin to enter France to participate in a meeting on the resistance movement in Ireland. Mandel, himself now banned from three West European countries, the United States, and Australia, is

only one of a growing number of socialists subject to travel bans, increasingly used in advanced capitalist countries to hinder free expression of radical political ideas.

A strong international protest against the West German ban is a vital factor in the movement to force withdrawal of this action. It can also help to turn the tide against these repressive measures in general, and to reestablish the right of travel and the right to speak for socialists in Western Europe.

Protests against the West German government's refusal to admit Mandel can be addressed to Hans-Dietrich Genscher, Minister of the Interior, Bonn, Federal Republic of Germany. Copies should be sent to Helmut Fleischer, 1000 Berlin 37, Stubenrauchstr. 22, Germany. □

Interviewed by 'Der Spiegel'

Mandel Explains Ideas Berlin Senate Tried to Ban

[The following interview with Belgian Marxist economist Ernest Mandel was conducted by the West German weekly *Der Spiegel*, following the West Berlin Senate's refusal to allow Mandel to accept a professorship offered to him by the Free University of Berlin. The interview appears to have been given prior to the February 28 decision of the federal government barring Mandel from West Germany.

[The interview was published in *Spiegel's* March 6 issue. Translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Spiegel. Mr. Mandel, are you a revolutionary?

Mandel. Yes.

Spiegel. And yet as a revolutionary you wanted to become a professor, and consequently a lifetime functionary, in Germany?

Mandel. I didn't want anything. The Berlin students and assistants in economic sciences approached me and invited me. I accepted their offer. The West Berlin Senate's rejection of my

professorship testifies to their renunciation of the principles of constitutional government.

Spiegel. You were rejected on the basis of the German regulations for officials because of your political activities. Can Marxist science be carried out only from the lecture podium? A Marxist professor would certainly not be just a faculty hack but would also use his teaching for political practice.

Mandel. Neither can a Marxist physician separate his profession from his political convictions. Nevertheless, in the operating theater he does not practice the permanent revolution. It was not my intention to give lectures on the permanent revolution at the Berlin university. There is a certain difference between teaching and political activity. . . .

Spiegel. For a physician, of course. There is no such thing as a Marxist, as opposed to a bourgeois, appendectomy. But you wanted to teach social politics, in which for a Marxist there is a unity of theory and practice.

Mandel. No, a Marxist realizes no

political practice through teaching school. I am no utopian. A socialist revolution cannot be made by college students. It was also not my intention to lecture on the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary party at the Free University.

Spiegel. Then wherein lies the revolutionary practice of a Marxist scholar?

Mandel. Simply in the merciless criticism of reality. Unlike bourgeois scholars, we have no need to defend or protect the existing society. For Marx and all real Marxists, the severe, objective, scientific analysis of society is a precondition for conscious revolutionary action. We do not deny facts just because they may not fit into our models.

For that reason I am also in favor of plurality of opinion at the university. Neither bourgeois nor revolutionary scholars should be excluded. Beyond that, I have my political convictions. I belong to a revolutionary organization, and along with my professional activities I want to extend my political action—the two are not identical.

Spiegel. Which organization?

Mandel. I work for the building of the Fourth International.

Spiegel. You are a member of the Secretariat, the highest body of this Trotskyist Fourth International. What are your activities?

Mandel. I write articles, take part in meetings, draft resolutions and submit them for votes. I hold open meetings and educational classes. The Fourth International is not a conspiratorial organization. I am not a weapons-dealer; I am not a bomb-carrier; nor am I a counterfeiter. Our activity is not secret.

Spiegel. Doesn't the Fourth International also work secretly?

Mandel. Only in countries where there is no democratic freedom for the workers' movement.

Spiegel. In the Federal Republic . . .

Mandel. . . . our work is absolutely open, because this freedom for the workers' movement exists.

Spiegel. The Federal Ministry of the Interior, which declared you a dangerous subversive and barred your entry into German territory, charges that you have worked in conspiracies. For example, that you have been repeatedly active in Germany under fictitious names.

Mandel. This is complete nonsense. Until now I was allowed to enter legally. For several years I wrote some newspaper articles under the name Pierre Gousset, that's all.

Spiegel. Just a pen name?

Mandel. That's all.

Spiegel. That was not the only one. You also published under another name . . .

Mandel. Not any more.

Spiegel. Germain?

Mandel. Yes, yes. Also a pen name. But in any case, I never traveled under this name.

Spiegel. Did you intend to transfer

the Secretariat of the Fourth International to Berlin after your appointment?

Mandel. No. That is a fabrication from start to finish. The Secretariat is composed of many people, not just me. I did not even intend to move to Germany myself.

Spiegel. When you wanted to give a speech to the business managers of the Duttweiler-Gesellschaft in Switzerland last year . . .

Mandel. . . . even former Chancellor Erhard was invited . . .

Spiegel. . . . you were not allowed into Switzerland on the grounds that in classes you gave earlier in Lausanne you had called for revolution.

Mandel. Nonsense. The official charge was that I had held a closed lecture that had not been previously announced. I replied that I did not realize that the innumerable bankers, for example, report to the police before they come to Switzerland to hold their evening chats about important political questions. The themes of my lectures were purely historical.

Spiegel. Mr. Mandel, in your books you claim that "the bourgeois state must be overthrown through centralized political action . . . and replaced by a workers state." Is that still analysis, or is it practical direction?

Mandel. Naturally I don't confine myself solely to scientific analysis.

Spiegel. As a scholar, or are you now a political activist again?

Mandel. Those are two completely different things.

Spiegel. This schizophrenia . . .

Mandel. . . . this is not schizophrenia, but a question of method. You cannot equate the moon-landing with astrophysics, which created the scientific prerequisites for it. If you analyze the universe, it doesn't mean you have the conspiratorial intention of landing on the moon.

Spiegel. Back to the earth. What does Mandel the revolutionary do in order to bring down bourgeois society?

Mandel. An interesting question. Now we come to the neurotic attitude of defenders of the present society toward people like me. The socialist revolution will not be set in motion by conspiracy or agitation, but is possible only through the conscious participation of the masses of wage-earners, who in the Federal Republic are the absolute majority of the population.

Unless neocapitalist society is crisis-free. In that case the activities of people like me, whether in education, propaganda, or daily political action, will be limited, and could not go beyond the framework of this society.

Spiegel. Then the revolutionary would be a Social Democrat.

Mandel. No, Social Democracy is the attempt to strengthen the existing society through reforms. We want to alter society fundamentally, even if in the far future. Thus, when objective revolutionary crises break out, like May 1968 in France, or fall 1969 in Italy, the revolutionary organization must create the preconditions for the workers to use this crisis to alter society.

Spiegel. And you want to lead the proletariat as a vanguard?

Mandel. We cannot set the workers in motion to change society or the state. We see ourselves as the yeast in a dough that must be there to start with . . .

Spiegel. . . . but you hope to stir it a little. As a member of the conscious vanguard, how do you prepare for the overturn?

Mandel. Given an existing mass revolutionary movement, our task is only to lead it to success. Thus, in the factories, in the universities, we must broaden consciousness, so that the masses will be prepared for the decisive act.

Spiegel. And then what should the masses do?

Mandel. In the midst of a broad mass movement, hold general meetings and elect democratic collective bodies, like councils, to take state power.

Spiegel. Employing parliamentary democracy?

Mandel. Ah, you know I am a more consistent democrat than the advocates of the bourgeois-parliamentary state order. There is a contradiction in the bourgeois constitution between the guarantee of private property and the general rights and freedoms—freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of opinion, freedom of movement, freedom to organize. So long as private property in the means of production exists, the majority of people can exercise these rights only in a limited way. Therefore, I am indeed for bringing down capitalist property . . .

Spiegel. Private property is not a constituent element of the constitution of the Federal Republic. If anything, even full socialization is compatible with the basic law.

Mandel. Well in that case my political activity is not in contradiction with the basic law.

Spiegel. Doesn't the soviet republic for which you propagandize mean a restriction of political freedom?

Mandel. On the contrary. For the masses of people, only then would these rights become really meaningful.

Spiegel. Would you say that the soviet system is compatible with the liberal-democratic basic order, being even more free and democratic? In the soviet republic, for example, would the principle of division of power still hold?

Mandel. Sure, that is in our program.

Spiegel. Not at all. Your program calls for the unity of the executive and the legislature.

Mandel. That has nothing to do with the principle of division of power. We think of it much more broadly.

Spiegel. It is not a question of breadth. Division of power means separation. Should judges be independent or—as in the model of the Paris Commune—be subject to recall on any occasion, if they make an unpopular decision, for example?

Mandel. Not on every occasion, but from time to time.

Spiegel. Over what intervals?

March 27, 1972

Mandel. Not every ten days, but also not every ten years. We would rather let that be determined by the practical work of the German soviet republic. We have worked out a model for the division of powers in a soviet republic. We are, to give just one example, in favor of written, as opposed to arbitrary law.

Spiegel. Who isn't?

Mandel. We are for the independence of the unions, and naturally for the right to strike, even in a workers state; and we are for full separation between party and state institutions.

Spiegel. Should the people's representation flow from general, equal, free, secret, and direct choice?

Mandel. On that we are agreed. The question is how this choice should be carried through, how this representation should be put together.

Spiegel. Indeed it is. Should only workers have voice?

Mandel. In the Western European countries it would be senseless to exclude the bourgeoisie from elections.

Spiegel. In your soviet utopia . . .

Mandel. . . . in the soviet model . . .

Spiegel. . . . is there room for democratic essentials like people's sovereignty, accountability of the regime, legality of the administration . . .

Mandel. . . . all granted.

Spiegel. Are you for a multiparty system?

Mandel. Absolutely.

Spiegel. Would nonsocialist parties be permitted in your soviet republic?

Mandel. No party would be banned because of its views. But if we could prove in court proceedings that people had violated the law, that conspiracies had been organized, weapon-stores accumulated, and alliances made with foreign powers, then we would ban such a party.

Spiegel. That's just how Husak argues in Czechoslovakia.

Mandel. And also just how the constitutional court of the German Federal Republic argued when it banned the Communist party.

Spiegel. You make it sound like the Trotskyists have become completely domesticated—they no longer want a conscious overturn, but a parliamentary majority.

Mandel. We have always held the view that under the existing socioeconomic relations, parliamentary bodies cannot (or can only in exceptional cases) give expression to the interests of the wage-earning population. The possibilities of choice are small, the differences between the big parties that support this state have lessened so much that parliamentarism increasingly degenerates into an empty formal mechanism. Real democracy is direct decision-making by the masses, and thereby is nearly identical with what I mean by revolution.

Spiegel. Revolution is the application of violence.

Mandel. What do you mean by violence?

Spiegel. Doors broken down, people beaten, barricades built, machine guns posted.

Mandel. For a long time now there has not been a revolutionary mass mobilization in a Western country that did not begin peacefully. Violence has come from the other side, being used to suppress the movement. Against this we must protect ourselves.

Spiegel. As counterviolence you consider violence legitimate?

Mandel. If by violence you mean the occupation of factories—good, then I say, right on, I'm for violence. Only I call it something else: the workers taking their own rightful property—that which they have built themselves. That is the affair of the workers themselves. We will not lead a revolution behind the workers' backs, and we will also not make them happy against their will. We are not conspirators. I am not a putschist. But my ideas are feared. I am not allowed to present them to Berlin students.

Spiegel. As a champion of a soviet republic could you take the official

oath of the liberal-democratic order?

Mandel. I would probably make an additional statement. Never in my life have I disavowed my convictions.

Spiegel. Either you take an oath or you cannot be a professor in Berlin.

You can't attach a letter containing reservations to the oath.

Mandel. Must I then read the basic law before I can be a professor?

Spiegel. Mr. Mandel, we thank you for this interview. □

While Youths Continue to Fall Before the Firing Squads

Willy Brandt Bargains With the Shah on Price of Oil

By Javad Sadeeg

Nine more Iranian revolutionists were executed on Sunday, March 12, and ten were condemned to life imprisonment. The semiofficial Teheran daily *Ettelaat* listed the executed victims as follows: Manaf Falaki Tabrizi, Mohammad Taqizadeh Charaghi, Asghar Arab Herisi, Hassan Sarkari, Akbar Moayed, Jafar Ardabilchi, Ali-Reza Nabdell, Yahya Amini Nia, and Ali Taqi Arash.

A drumhead military court tried them in complete secrecy. The dates of arrest and conviction were never reported. The charges against them were made public only after their execution. They were said to have killed one policeman in Tabriz and another in Golhak, near Teheran. They were also charged with conspiring to overthrow the regime and with holding membership in a "communist" organization.

On March 6, four days after the execution of ten other martyrs, students in the agricultural college in Karaj went on strike to protest the death sentences handed down by the military, according to the March 11 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde*.

(Karaj is a town near Teheran where eleven workers were killed last April when they demonstrated for higher pay.)

On March 7 students at Teheran University demonstrated in solidarity with Karaj students and in opposition to the death sentences. The shah's press did not report the demonstrations, but printed a threatening statement issued March 8 by the president of Teheran University condemning a bomb explosion on the lawn of the

Faculty of Sciences. The statement said that while the bomb did no damage, it interrupted classes and caused disorder. The authorities do not dare give publicity to the demonstrations



BRANDT: For "friendly relations" as long as the oil and blood flow.

indicating the student opposition to the regime of terror but want to use the alleged bomb explosion to suppress the movement.

Le Monde reported that the demonstrations, and a partial strike at Teheran University, were continuing as of March 9 and that tension was high on that day.

The series of executions in Iran continues to cause revulsion abroad. Following the latest murders, seven prominent figures in France—C. Bourdet, J. Debù-Bridel, V. Jankélévitch, A. Kastler, G. Montaron, V. Monteil, and J. Rostand—issued a protest statement.

As quoted by *Le Monde* (March 14), they said in part:

"Information gathered by judicial observers officially mandated by international associations enjoying consultative status with the United Nations no longer leaves room for any doubt about the numerous and repeated violations of the Universal Declaration [of the Rights of Man]: torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading punishment and treatment, lack of any guarantee of effective recourse to the courts of the country, arrests, detentions, arbitrary exile, the use of secret or semisecret trials, the lack of independence and impartiality of the tribunals, lack of proof of guilt, violation of defendants' rights, violation of the right to freedom of opinion and expression (articles 5, 8, 10, 11, and 19 of the Universal Declaration). . . . The French Friends of Iran want to point out that in the present heart-rending conditions, they share the dismay and indignation of one of the finest and longest-civilized peoples on earth."

If students and intellectuals the world over are appalled at the shah's reign of terror, not so the Social Democratic Chancellor Willy Brandt, whose government, in the name of preserving the "liberal-democratic basic order," is barring the well-known Belgian Marxist Ernest Mandel from entering West Germany.

Willy Brandt came to Iran on March 5 for a four-day visit.

Ettelaat in its air edition of March 7 reported that a high-level German official told the press that Brandt promised the shah that "an appropriate method will be found to prevent anti-Iran demonstrations in Germany."

The head of the West German government admitted that a major topic in the discussions had been oil, but he refused to elaborate except to say that West Germany would be buying 10,000,000 tons of Iranian oil to complete its strategic reserves. The Teheran daily *Kayhan* reported in its air edition of March 8 that West Germany was buying Iranian oil to the

tune of \$200,000,000. The same issue contained the text of an interview the shah had given to a group of German reporters the day before.

The monarch foresaw good economic relations with West Germany, especially in regard to the oil needed by German industries. But he hinted that these relations hinged on how well the West German government would succeed in putting an end to the activities of the Iranian students there. This demand must have amused the German reporters, since students in the universities of Iran were demonstrating that very same day. And the nineteen executions in eleven days had not decreased, but increased, the agitation.

The shah devoted most of the interview to defending his firing squads, saying that they were necessary to insure the stability he needs for economic development. He singled out *Le Monde* for special attack, because the paper publicized the executions and asked that clemency be extended to those sentenced to die.

The shah ruled out the possibility of establishing diplomatic relations with the German Democratic Republic (East Germany), because, he said, people resided there whose activities were inimical to the security of Iran. The reference was to the Central Committee of the Tudeh party—the Iranian Communist party—which has its headquarters in East Germany and operates a Persian-language radio station there. He held out bait to the East German bureaucracy by saying he believed "future developments could reverse this situation."

One day before the nine revolutionists were executed, *Ettelaat* assured the ruling class in a front-page article in bold-face type that Willy Brandt had made it clear that "Germany will not allow the foreigners residing on its territory either to disrupt the internal security of the state or to damage its external relations with friendly countries."

All reports hint at a deal between the shah and Brandt to move against the Confederation of Iranian Students. The Confederation has active chapters in West Germany, where there are more than 6,000 Iranian students.

The military, which announced the execution of the nine martyrs, also gave the names of ten revolutionists condemned to life imprisonment. Five of these revolutionists belong to a

group of twenty-three prisoners, six of whom were shot on March 1. The five are: Ali-Asghar Izadi, Bahram Gobadi, Javad Oskoui, Mohammad-Ali Partovi, and Abdul-Raheem Sabouri.

The following three belong to a group of twenty prisoners, four of whom were shot on March 2: Ali-Reza Shokouhi, Hussein Hashemi, and Mohammad Ahmadian.

Two others condemned to life imprisonment were Mohammad-Taqi Afshani Nagdeh and Abdul-Ali Tavassoli. Their names have not previously appeared in the Iranian press.

The military announced that the ten prisoners had faced the same charges as the nine who were executed and

they had also been condemned to death. But the shah commuted their sentences because they were young and had been misled by "subversives."

The shah did not in fact commute any death sentences. Instead he changed some life terms to the death penalty. Eight of the ten prisoners were given life terms in the first trials that ended on February 2 and February 8. The shah merely confirmed those sentences. On the other hand, four of the ten revolutionists executed on March 1 and March 2 were given life terms in the February 2 trials. They were executed along with the other six within forty-eight hours of the shah's return from a vacation in Switzerland. □

Rebel Chief Stalls for Time

Sudan Pact Runs Into Obstacles

The agreement initialed by representatives of the central government and Southern Sudanese autonomists on February 27, which supposedly ended a ten-year-long war between the regime and the Southern population (see *Intercontinental Press*, March 20, p. 302), appears to be already on the road to extinction.

The truce, which granted a largely problematical autonomy to the non-Arab people of the South, was supposed to be formally signed on March 27 by President Jaafar el-Nimeiry and Joseph Lagu, commander of Anyanya (the major Southern resistance group).

But Lagu has asked for a delay of from six to eight weeks in the ratification ceremony. The Paris daily *Le Monde* suggested in its March 15 issue that Anyanya may be divided about the settlement terms and that Lagu may be stalling for time in an attempt to unify his organization.

The March 14 *Washington Post* published an interview Lagu granted two U.S. correspondents in an unnamed East African country. The Anyanya chief told the reporters that in his view the March 27 meeting with Nimeiry is a negotiating session, not a ratification meeting: "If it [the agreement] is not amended to my favor, I may refuse to sign it."

Lagu's reservations on the pact center on the section providing for the

stationing of 6,000 government troops in three Southern provinces, which are to be consolidated into a single "South Sudan."

"The Southern Sudanese," he told the *Post* reporters, "who are now living in the bushes and in the neighboring countries, look at the Arab forces in the South as enemies, as beasts. They will not return and live in their homes if these troops are still at large in the countryside."

Lagu's reservations about the agreement clearly represent a change of position for him and indicate that he must be under strong pressure, both from other tendencies in Anyanya and from the Southern population itself. Nevertheless, in the interview he "spoke warmly" of Nimeiry and carefully avoided calling for Southern independence: "The country is still one. We cannot separate the army completely. The only thing we want to do is to insure to our people that now they have security." He said he did not object to the government stationing troops in Juba, the largest city in the South.

Le Monde provided some information on the source of the pressures on Lagu. Some persons close to the Southern delegation to the talks that drafted the agreement, the Paris daily reported, have publicly criticized the

pact, calling instead for the right of the Southerners to self-determination and for a South-wide referendum on the agreement, to be supervised by the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity.

The Sudan regime, these persons say, must be replaced by a "democratic government based on free elections."

Gordon Mayen, a leader of the African National Front, a group that calls for the independence of the South, has charged that the Southern delegation at the negotiations did not represent the Southern people, who, he said, consider the agreement null and void.

Mayen, who calls himself chief of a "provisional government in exile," refused to join the "revolutionary cabinet" set up by Anyanya in July 1969.

It is not clear what the relationship of forces is between Mayen and Lagu. But it is clear that Anyanya has less control than it pretends over the scattered armed partisans throughout the South.

Since the initial announcement of

the truce, more of its details have been disclosed. First reports indicated that besides the 6,000 government troops to be stationed in the South, Anyanya forces would be incorporated into the regular army in separate divisions of equal strength. It has now been revealed, however, that the Southern troops would not be composed solely of Anyanya soldiers, but of those people considered militarily competent by the central government. In addition, the process of establishing parity in numbers would be stretched over a five-year period. It is doubtful that the Southern population will accept this arrangement. Wrote *Le Monde*:

"It is clear that such a solution offers only a weak guarantee to people who have been fighting the central government for about fifteen years and feel a deep distrust toward it. Many of the guerrillas are convinced that in the absence of a democratic regime in Khartoum, the Sudanese chief of state, who holds all power in his own hands, can with a stroke of the pen annul the autonomy decrees he has signed." □

Middle East

Split Reported in Fedayeen Group

The Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) has undergone its second major split in four years, according to the March 12-13 *Le Monde*. Rumors of division in the organization had been current for some time. On March 10, at a Beirut press conference, Abu Shehab announced that a new organization, the Revolutionary Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (RPFLP), had been formed and was "completely independent" of the PFLP.

Without explicitly naming him, Abu Shehab accused PFLP leader George Habash "and his rightist clique" of having "torpedoed" attempts to unify the resistance movement.

The PFLP leadership, Abu Shehab said, contents itself with taking only "verbal revolutionary positions" toward the Hussein regime in Jordan.

The RPFLP apparently is composed of those members of the PFLP who had opposed the tactic of airplane-hijackings, the use of which was a hallmark of the PFLP. At the press

conference Abu Shehab noted that the PFLP Central Committee had decided in November 1970 to "suspend" such operations. He claimed that despite that decision, the group had been responsible for the recent hijacking of a Lufthansa jet to Aden, Southern Yemen. Abu Shehab said the new group opposes "splitting acts like bank robberies" and hijackings.

More serious than the tactical disagreement was the new RPFLP's charge that the Habash leadership had established close relations with the "petty-bourgeois Arab regimes" rather than with the people of the countries concerned.

Habash, who had reportedly been maintaining neutrality in the PFLP, appears to have now taken sides. At the third national conference of the organization, which was concluded March 9 in Tripoli, Libya, he was reelected to the post of general secretary. Abu Shehab challenged the legitimacy of the conference. □

Unionists Arrested

Bahrein Government Bans Strikes

In the wake of a militant demonstration on March 13 by workers in the capital city of Manama, the pro-British government of the oil-rich Bahrein islands has forbidden the right to strike and has banned all assemblies of more than two persons. Security forces have been instructed to suppress any further demonstrations and to arrest all "troublemakers."

Manama workers were attacked by police on the morning of March 13 when they tried to show their solidarity with striking airport workers. They were assaulted by police and defended themselves, breaking the windows of several banks and hotels and damaging a few stores. There was no report on the number wounded.

According to an Iraqi press agency, the regime had arrested the members of the provisional secretariat of the trade-union federation the previous day.

The government blamed foreign "agitators" for the trouble. □

'Aid' for the CIA

A study conducted by the U. S. General Accounting Office (GAO) reveals that nearly one-half of the money budgeted to aid civilian war victims in Laos actually goes to the Central Intelligence Agency. The CIA uses the money to finance its hired armies fighting in Laos.

A summary of the GAO study was made public March 18 by Senator Edward Kennedy. Much of the actual detail in the report is classified secret.

The funds diverted to the CIA—some \$2,500,000 a year, according to the study—had been officially listed as Agency for International Development (AID) appropriations for "public health." Another GAO study now nearing completion reportedly discloses that AID funds for "refugee assistance" were similarly transferred to the CIA.

When members of Congress raised the question of such diversions last May, the Nixon administration gave assurances that they would be stopped.

Hussein's Peace Plan a Bust

By Jon Rothschild

The *New York Times* called it "Hussein's dream," a plan "surely worth considering as a possible opening toward peace in the Middle East." Egyptian journalist Mohammed Heykal, close confidant of President Anwar el-Sadat, said it appeared that 1972 was to be "the year of betrayal." U. S. Secretary of State William Rogers was afraid to comment, lest "we [the Nixon administration] kill it with our embrace."

On March 15 Jordanian King Hussein announced that he had a bold new plan for peace in the Arab East. In a grandstand play for world public attention, he let news of it be leaked the preceding day, and even seemed to imply that he had already made a deal with the Israeli government. Before a single day had passed, and in some cases even before the plan was officially announced, denunciations had come from nearly every Arab regime, as well as from the Palestinian resistance movement. But the Amman butcher had stolen the headlines from Anwar el-Sadat.

The essence of the "Hussein plan," as it soon came to be called, was that a new United Arab Kingdom (UAK) be formed, composed of what is presently the kingdom of Jordan plus the now Israeli-occupied West Bank of the Jordan River.

The UAK would have, according to the plan, a federal structure. A national assembly would be composed of equal representation from the two regions. Legislative authority for the kingdom as a whole would rest with Hussein and the assembly, judicial authority with a federal supreme court.

In addition, each region would have a local assembly with autonomous powers, a local governor-general appointed by those assemblies, a local cabinet, and an independent regional court system. Capitals were selected: Amman for the East Bank (and for the seat of the federal apparatus) and Jerusalem for the West Bank. There was even a provision for expansion: "liberated territories" (an apparent reference to the Gaza Strip) would be

invited to join up.

Hussein's announcement did not mention the trivial fact that the entire West Bank is now occupied by Israel. In fact, the plan made no mention of Israel at all. The statement has a certain pathological tone; it reads as if the Israeli troops had already withdrawn and the natural monarch were describing what will happen next week. The lack of any mention of Israel, combined with the immediate Israeli rejection of the plan, demolished any notion that a prior agreement had been made.

Reaction among the Arab regimes was immediate. The Egyptian-Syrian-Libyan federation charged that the CIA was behind the whole thing and that Hussein was preparing to make a separate peace with the Zionist state. The Iraqi Baath party took the occasion to propose "immediate union" with the federation, in order to reinforce Arab unity against the "capitulation" of Hussein. The Algerian government said the plan represented a recognition of the Zionist *fait accompli*. King Faisal of Saudi Arabia was the only Arab ruler to support his royal Jordanian counterpart explicitly.

The response of the Palestinian leaders in the West Bank was nearly universally negative. "Too little, too late" was a common comment. And the Israeli Knesset (parliament) responded by passing a resolution that virtually declared the West Bank annexed to Israel.

The universal condemnation the plan received and the air of unreality that pervades its formulations make one wonder whether even Hussein considered it a serious proposal. What was the king's intent?

The roots of the proposal must be sought in the developing situation in the West Bank and the progressive destruction of the power of the Palestinian fedayeen.

From the end of the first world war until 1948, the West Bank was part of the British mandate of Palestine, and contained about half its inhabi-

tants. When the United Nations handed most of Palestine over to the Zionist movement in 1947, the West Bank was supposed to become an Arab Palestinian state. But during the 1947-48 war, Jordanian King Abdullah, Hussein's grandfather, occupied the West Bank. As part of the armistice agreement with Israel, it was annexed to Jordan. It remained part of Jordan until 1967, when it was taken over by the Israeli armed forces.

Shortly thereafter, it became clear that at least a considerable sector of the Israeli ruling class favored permanent absorption of the West Bank. Jewish settlements multiplied, and the trappings of permanence (as opposed to temporary military occupation) began to appear.

The major division in the Israeli ruling class was between those who feared annexing a region with such a large Arab population—mistakenly, they were referred to as "doves" in the U. S. press—and those who felt the several hundred thousand Arabs of the West Bank could be either physically dominated or peacefully integrated into the Israeli state.

At the height of the power of the Palestinian fedayeen, some Zionist political forces even suggested that it would be in Israel's interest to let the Palestinians form an independent or autonomous state on the West Bank. This, these forces hoped, would derail the Palestinian struggle for the destruction of the Zionist state.

In the midst of this political debate, the colonization of the West Bank continued. Concurrently, the occupiers sought out petty-bourgeois layers of the West Bank Arab population, granted them certain economic and political concessions, and tried to integrate them.

This process gave rise to frequent articles in the Western press about the allegedly "liberal" (unprecedented in history) character of the West Bank occupation. In fact, the "liberal" facade of the occupation arose from the fact that in this case the occupier was aiming at absorbing the occupied territory.

The only force that could have seriously interrupted this process was the Palestinian resistance movement, which, for various reasons, was never able to develop a solid organization in the area.

At the end of 1971, the Israeli gov-

ernment announced a new step in its absorption program. According to the Jordanian constitution, theoretically still in force in the West Bank, municipal elections are to be held every four years. The last race was in 1963. The 1967 elections never took place because of the Israeli occupation. In December the Israeli government announced that municipal elections would be held March 28 in ten towns in the southern part of the West Bank.

That Prime Minister Golda Meir would permit elections was a significant indication of how far the process of bolstering the political power of the Palestinian collaborators had gone. The West Bank petty-bourgeoisie, almost universally more hostile to the Jordanian regime than to the Israeli occupation, had produced some political leaders. Many of these tend to favor an extensive Palestinian autonomy in the long term, but have shown their willingness to cooperate with the occupiers.

Hussein immediately called for a boycott of the elections, and the "old notables," the pro-Hussein forces of the West Bank, refused to stand as candidates.

But the boycott was a failure. Hussein's West Bank allies quickly realized that the Palestinian autonomists would win by default, and the boycott fell apart. By March 15, only days after the official opening of the campaign, more than 140 persons had declared themselves candidates.

Then came Hussein's announcement of the United Arab Kingdom. There is no evidence that it was anything more than an attempt to recoup his political losses on the West Bank, an attempt to undercut the appeal of the Palestinian candidates by showing his willingness to grant concessions to the West Bank population, should he ever again gain control of the area.

This maneuver was more important for what it indicates about the relationship of forces in the Arab East than for the substance of the plan itself. The major conflict among the West Bank Palestinians now appears to be between pro-Hussein forces and pro-Palestinian-autonomy forces — and not between supporters of the struggle to liberate Palestine and collaborators with the occupation.

This fact is reflected in the disappearance of proposals of Palestinian mini-statehood from Israeli "left" Zion-

ists — and by the Knesset response to the Hussein plan.

On March 15 Golda Meir told the Knesset that the proposal "negates the cause of peace." Then she got a bit more specific: "The king is treating as his own property territories which are not his and not under his control."

Despite the forthright rejection, her statement was greeted by a counter-motion from the Gahal party, the right wing of the Knesset, which is led by Menachem Beigin. The Gahal motion demanded the formal annexation of the West Bank. Mapam, the increasingly small "left" opposition, urged that the Knesset not "bury" the Hussein plan.

On March 16, a so-called compromise resolution was passed. It rejected the Hussein plan and affirmed that "the rights of the Jewish people in the land of Israel are inalienable." Then it was added that the Israeli government is willing to engage in direct negotiations with Hussein.

This "compromise" resolution, which implicitly declared the West Bank to be Israeli territory — a claim that has not been made in regard to the Sinai peninsula, except by Gahal — clearly demonstrated that the annexationists have attained a dominant position in the ruling Labor party.

Anwar el-Khatib, a former mayor of the Arab section of Jerusalem, wrote in the Israeli daily *Yediot Aharonot* that schemes like Hussein's bring to mind the "redskin windbags who sought to determine which among them would retake New York from the white occupants."

There could hardly be a clearer statement. There is no force today strong enough to compel Israel to give up the West Bank in any "peace" settlement. And the Israeli ruling class has no intention of doing so.

The fulminations of Egypt, Syria, and Libya had nothing to do with fear of a separate peace between Israel and Hussein, but were purely a response to domestic sentiments, especially in the case of Egypt.

More significant was the response of the fedayeen. After a special meeting March 14 (the eve of Hussein's official announcement), the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) declared its opposition to the proposal. "Only the Palestinian revolution is entitled to decide the fate of the Palestinian people," the PLO declared.

But the statement apparently failed to reiterate the fedayeen call for the liberation of all Palestine, and in that sense represented a retreat from their advanced positions of a year ago. Rumors were current that the PLO would counter Hussein by establishing a Palestinian government-in-exile. But the following day the PLO announced that this plan had been "abandoned, at least temporarily, to avoid antagonizing certain Arab regimes."

Hussein's proposal, the answer of the Israeli government, and the apparent inability of the fedayeen to give a clear and decisive response are ominous signs for the Palestinian people. The Israeli invasion of Lebanon and the Lebanese army's subsequent occupation of fedayeen-controlled areas dealt the resistance movement a heavy blow. (See *Intercontinental Press*, March 13, p. 253.) In the next several months, and especially after Nixon's trip to Moscow, further attacks — aimed at eliminating whatever is left — can be expected.

The next step for U. S. imperialism and the Israeli ruling class will likely be an attempt at a deal with Egypt. This may not be easily gained, whatever Anwar el-Sadat's inclinations may be. The Egyptian workers and students have been the central force opposing the recent counterrevolutionary tide in the Arab East. In them the Arab regimes, the Israeli government, U. S. imperialism, and the Soviet bureaucracy may find an obstacle hard to surmount. □

Sweden

Thousands Protest Rising Food Prices

Six thousand persons marched through Stockholm February 26, according to the February 27 *Dagens Nyheter*, chanting "We want the right to eat!" The purpose of the spontaneous demonstration was to protest rising food prices.

"It was a demonstration demanding more food for one's money," reported the Stockholm daily, "and such a demonstration had not been seen in Sweden for decades."

All ages were represented, it said,

though most of the participants were women. One elderly woman carried a sign reading "Even a pensioner wants to have a little beef now and then!"

"This was a popular demonstration. Many onlookers along the march picked up the slogans and joined the demonstrators." The paper said that "many had never demonstrated before. . . ."

The leader of the movement, Ann-Marie Norman, a housewife from the Stockholm suburb of Skärholmen, told the protesters that "Sweden's farmers are backing us," and demanded that the Swedish government "put on the mantle of responsibility and fulfill its obligations."

The broad protest movement grew up very rapidly. According to a report by Guy de Faramond in the Paris daily *Le Monde* on March 8, it occurred barely a week after the Skärholmen housewife was interviewed on television on February 17. In the interview, which lasted only two minutes, she called on Swedes to boycott beef and milk.

Within one week, reported *Dagens Nyheter*, "sales of milk in Stockholm declined by hundreds of thousands of liters." Guy de Faramond said the decline amounted to 6 percent in Stockholm and 35 percent in Skärholmen. Figures on the decline in meat sales were not available, but he said there appeared to be a "definite decrease."

"That a 'wildcat' movement, launched by a housewife with no political connections, could have met with such a response in Sweden, is indicative of the climate created by the rise in prices and taxes at the very moment the country is undergoing the worst unemployment since 1948," wrote Guy de Faramond. "For a long time now, Stockholm has been the most expensive capital in the world after Tokyo as far as the cost of food products is concerned."

The ruling Social Democrats, he said, "who have made full employment one of the cornerstones of their policy," find themselves confronted with such widespread unemployment that it "recalls the bad memories of the thirties."

"Depending on one's method of computation, between 3 and 5 percent of the active population is unemployed, which in any case is very high for Sweden." □

Strikes, Demonstrations Protest Killing of Two Spanish Workers

The police killing of two workers in the Bazán shipyard in the northwestern Spanish port of El Ferrol, Galicia, on March 10 sparked solidarity strikes and demonstrations in other parts of the country. In addition to the two workers killed, thirty-six others were wounded—two seriously—along with twenty police. Fifteen workers were arrested.

Businesses and public buildings in El Ferrol, the hometown of Generalissimo Francisco Franco, closed their doors in mourning and protest of the killings.

The incidents began March 9 when six worker-activists were fired for their role in a struggle to obtain a separate contract for the 5,500 Bazán shipyard workers. According to José-Antonio Novais in the March 14 *Le Monde*, the management of the shipyards, which are nationalized, had succeeded in getting the official government-sponsored union to sign a national contract for all Spanish shipyards. The El Ferrol workers rejected the conditions set down in this contract.

As soon as the six workers had been dismissed, the workers inside the shipyard staged a sit-down strike. "When the police tried to dislodge them," reported the *New York Times* on March 11, "the 3,000 workers inside put up a stiff battle with stones and iron bars."

The management announced that the shipyard would be closed indefinitely. But the following morning, the workers shut themselves in again. "As detachments of police approached the gates, the workers charged out," said the *Times*. "According to witnesses, the workers pushed the police back and appeared for a time to control the whole area adjacent to the shipyard. But the police re-formed and opened fire."

In Sestao, near Bilbao in the Basque region, 3,000 shipyard workers demonstrated March 11, reported *Le Monde*. They carried signs stating "We ask for bread, they give us bullets." In Valladolid about 200 persons demonstrated to chants of "Socialist Spain" and anti-Franco slogans.

In Galicia, most of the metalworkers went on strike, as did the workers in the Astano shipyard in El Ferrol.

By Monday, March 13, the protests

had intensified. By then, according to José-Antonio Novais, 10,000 metalworkers were on strike in Biscay, 8,000 others in Vigo, and 9,000 in El Ferrol. In addition, student groups demonstrated in Barcelona, and in Madrid there were clashes between students and police. Fifty persons were arrested.

On Sunday, March 12, television coverage of a soccer match in La Coruña, just across the bay from El Ferrol, had to be interrupted for several minutes because spectators were hurling cushions at the policemen guarding the stadium and shouting "Murderers! Hired killers!"

Mimeographed copies of a homily read in all the parishes of El Ferrol on Sunday were circulating clandestinely. The Spanish press refused to publish the statement. In it the priests declared: "It is the duty of the authorities to open up a way that will make dialogue and participation possible—something they have thus far refused to do. . . . A purely professional problem cannot be gotten rid of simply by calling it subversion. . . . In order to reestablish public order, methods prevailing in modern societies must be used, without resorting to weapons as a way of subjugating unarmed crowds."

The priests also warned that "the privileged classes must get used to the new conditions in society. In the face of the death of two of our brothers, all we can do is listen to the voice of the commandment 'Thou shalt not kill.'"

The current workers' struggles show dramatically how discredited the official government union is, as well as the growing influence of the illegal "workers' commissions." *Le Monde* made the following observation in an editorial in its March 12-13 edition: "This 'aggressiveness' on the part of the workers, as the civilian governor of the province put it, shows how vain is the fiction kept alive by the Spanish leaders, which maintains that the only representative union organization is the one set up thirty-two years ago." In some cities, such as Barcelona and Pamplona, it noted, factory heads have preferred "to negotiate with the illegal representatives of the workers rather than with the official delegates."

The Fourth International

By Pierre Frank

[This is the third installment of our translation of Pierre Frank's *The Fourth International: A Contribution to the History of the Trotskyist Movement*.

[This translation appears through the courtesy of the Paris publishing house of François Maspero. Copyright © 1969 by François Maspero.]

* * *

Chapter 4: From 1933 to 1938. Preparing for the Fourth International

A slight economic recovery occurred from 1933 to 1938, due largely to preparations for a new world war. The spread of fascism in Europe was barely held in check by the mass movements in France (June 1936) and in Spain, where fascism unleashed a civil war that was to end in tragedy for the laboring masses.

In the Far East, Japan embarked on what was to prove a hopeless war against China. In the Soviet Union, execution of the five-year plans was accompanied by a monstrous lowering of the standard of living and suppression of the rights of the working masses, by the extermination of the Bolshevik cadres and the entire revolutionary vanguard.

The dissension of the previous years between Socialist and Communist parties was replaced by a policy of "unity" in order to build "popular fronts." This class collaboration with sections of the bourgeoisie had results as disastrous for the cause of socialism as those of the preceding period.

* * *

The economic crisis of 1929 had important political consequences, beginning in 1932-33.

At the end of 1932, Franklin D. Roosevelt became president of the United States. In an effort to revive the economy, he inaugurated the New Deal, which proved favorable to development of the trade-union movement in the United States—in a proletariat hitherto under the sway of craft unionism, where workers in the huge plants had not been organized. (The rise of the CIO would take care of that.) But aside from the United States, this change had no immediate repercussions, the American proletariat's big step forward on the political level still remaining to be taken. No doubt this will be the result of the next great crisis, which in the United States will not necessarily be exclusively economic in-origin.

Hitler came to power in Germany early in 1933 as a result of the combined consequences of the policies of the two working-class leaderships, reformist and Stalin-

ist. For different reasons and in different ways, both were opposed to united action by the workers. Both engendered inertia, passivity, and lack of resistance in the German proletariat as a whole, in face of the growing Nazi movement. Both acted like competing shopkeepers and placed their interests as opposing cliques above the interests of the class they claimed to represent.

A turn in our general orientation took place when Hitler came to power. We abandoned the struggle to reform the Third International and set our sights on building a Fourth International and new revolutionary parties.

This decision was not taken at once. We began in the early months of 1933 by abandoning the struggle to reform the German CP, because it was obvious that a party which had failed in so serious a situation was historically doomed. (See Trotsky's article, "The German Workers Will Rise Again—Stalinism, Never!"¹¹) We were waiting to learn the reactions in the other CPs and in the Communist International. These reactions were negligible, and the Executive Committee of the Communist International unanimously approved a report by Heckert endorsing the whole previous Stalinist policy in Germany—even though, in their heart of hearts, most of the leaderships of the CPs were hostile to those policies. Stalinism had definitively triumphed in the Communist International. As the revolutionary International of the proletariat, the Comintern was dead.

Following this vote of the ECCI, an International Plenum of our movement during the summer of 1933 almost unanimously decided on the change in our international orientation.

Until then we had spoken in terms of reforming the Communist International, reforming the Bolshevik party, and reforming the Soviet state, without always making a distinction among them in our statements. The orientation towards building new revolutionary parties and, by extension, a new party in the USSR, called for a clarification of our position vis-à-vis the Soviet state. At that time we made a careful distinction between reforming the Bolshevik party, henceforth an impossibility, and the still possible reform of the Soviet state, which remained a proletarian state. Later, in 1935, our point of view developed on this question, too, and led to our affirming the necessity of a political revolution in the USSR, a degenerated workers state—a political, not a social, revolution, because what was needed was not a fundamental change in the Soviet Union's relationships of production but the destruction of the omnipotence of the bu-

11. Available in *The Struggle Against Fascism in Germany*, by Leon Trotsky. Pathfinder Press, Inc., New York.—Translator

reaucracy and the reestablishment of workers' democracy.

* * *

The preceding period of our history had been chiefly characterized by the grounding of our movement in the bedrock of principle. In the new period, we added a large measure of *organizational flexibility*. At the time of our struggle for reforming the Third International, we assiduously separated ourselves from all currents that had an equivocal attitude, no matter how tiny, on this question of reform. But declaring that the Third International was no longer capable of being reformed meant placing on record an enormous setback to revolutionary consciousness, and it was not possible to tell in advance what a new International and new revolutionary parties would be and in what ways they would be established. Certainly we intended to try to gain acceptance for our program, as being the most complete expression of the proletariat's experience to date; but we could not foresee how we would reach this goal, i.e., what organizational paths the construction of revolutionary parties would follow. Nor could we foresee what the evolution of our relationships with other revolutionary currents in the working-class movement would be.

Two experiments were made in this regard — one limited in scope, the other much larger — during this period.

The "Declaration of the Four"

From July-August of 1933, the question of regroupment of the revolutionary forces was placed before us in concrete form following the British ILP's (Independent Labour Party) calling of a conference, open to all organizations outside the Second and Third internationals, for the purpose of examining the world situation and the situation of the labor movement in light of the Nazi victory. We decided to participate in this conference to make our position known and to try to get together all the organizations that were willing to promulgate—to the working class of the world—the need for a Fourth International. This participation was somewhat similar to that of the Bolsheviks, in other circumstances, at Zimmerwald and Kienthal. The result was the "Declaration of the Four" — a document signed by our international organization, the League of Internationalist Communists; by the German SAP (Sozialistische Arbeiterpartei — Socialist Workers party); and by two Dutch organizations, the RSP (Revolutionair-Socialistische Partij — Revolutionary Socialist party) and the OSP (Onafhankelijke Socialistische Partij — Independent Socialist party).

The SAP consisted of some of the left socialists who, critical of its reformist line, had broken with German Social Democracy in 1931-32. Shortly before Hitler came to power, leadership of the SAP passed into the hands of Walcher and Froelich, two former leaders of the Communist right opposition (Brandlerites) who had broken with the latter to join the SAP.

The Dutch OSP corresponded in origin to the German SAP. The RSP was led by Henricus Sneevliet, a Communist leader for many years, who had come into conflict with the Communist International over trade-union policy in Holland, where he was an official of the NAS (Nationaal Arbeiders Syndikaat — National Workers Union),

a labor federation that included Communists and anarcho-syndicalists. In his struggle against the latter, Sneevliet had been led to organize his union faction into a political party.

The "Declaration of the Four" proclaimed the need for a new International, for new revolutionary parties, and defined the main points on which they should be built. While it did not set forth our whole program, the Declaration did contain our essential points.

On a world scale, the results of the "Declaration of the Four" were minimal. In Holland, nevertheless, the two organizations held common rallies, and then merged to form the RSAP (Revolutionair-Socialistische Arbeiderspartij — Revolutionary Socialist Workers party). Later this party joined our movement, then split with us during the Spanish revolution, when it supported the POUM (Partido Obrero de Unificación Marxista — Workers party of Marxist Unification). The opposition to this line in the RSAP was based on the youth, led by Sal Santen. During the war, it was these youth who organized the Dutch section of the Fourth International. Sneevliet, who led the RSAP and who broke with the movement for the Fourth International on the question of the war in Spain, nevertheless remained extremely close to us. He died a hero during the war, shot by the Nazis.

As for the leaders of the German SAP who lived in exile, they behaved like inveterate centrists. Shortly after having signed the "Declaration of the Four," they became the bitterest enemies of Trotskyism and were at the bottom of all the centrist groupings (the London Bureau, etc.) that spread indescribable confusion among the vanguard in the period preceding the second world war.¹² After the war, Walcher became a functionary in East Germany; Froelich, on the other hand, was a sympathizer of our movement.

The First Draft of a Transitional Program

Before going into the second experiment, by far the more important in building the revolutionary party, a few words should be said on the political situation resulting from Hitler's accession to power.

The Nazi victory cut off the prospect of revolution in Germany for an entire historical period. Throughout the rest of Europe, reaction was sharply on the rise, but not without resistance.

In Austria, where the working class was completely under the influence of the Social Democracy, the clerical reaction, led by Dollfuss, propelled the workers into armed struggle under Social Democratic leadership, and they fought for one week in February 1934. The crushing of the Austrian proletariat by Dollfuss opened the way to the Nazi victory in Austria — the fascists took power after killing Dollfuss and eliminating his party.

The center of the European working-class movement shifted to France after 1933. Hitler's victory upset the equilibrium established in Europe at Versailles in 1918; this, in turn, laid bare the most formidable crisis in government France had ever experienced — a crisis that continues to this day. For the first time, it was apparent to all that France was no longer a first-rate power. To re-

¹². See below, page 339, for the struggle against centrism.

establish its position, or rather to maintain it, French capitalism had no other recourse but to lower the standard of living of the masses—which could only be done by inaugurating a "strong state." French capitalism tried to get rid of parliamentary forms by means of the reactionary coup of February 6, 1934. But, from the point of view of the bourgeoisie, the blow was struck prematurely. The French working class, literally whipped into action by this blow, awoke to the fascist danger, and there was a great deal of political tension in the country as a result.

Against the growing fascist danger, we advocated a *united front of working-class organizations* in France. But to implement this, a *program of action* was needed on the basis of which the working masses could mobilize to extricate themselves from the situation capitalism had plunged them into. That was when (spring of 1934), with Trotsky's collaboration, the first Bolshevik-Leninist program of action was drawn up. This document is of interest mainly because it constitutes the very first draft of a transitional program. The following year, the Belgian comrades drew up a similar program (against the decree laws in their country), and comrades in other countries followed suit. Thus the *Transitional Program*¹³ adopted in 1938 by the founding congress of the International, far from being an improvisation, was the fruit of various earlier experiences in the different sections of the International.

As we said, the French Trotskyist organization, the Ligue Communiste, waged a systematic campaign for the united front. In the week after February 6, a united front was established between the Ligue and the Seine Federation of the Socialist party, which was under the influence of Marceau Pivert.

Mass pressure for united action intensified from February 1934 on. In July of the same year, the Socialist and Stalinist leaderships, forced to respond to the pressure from below, signed a pact for unity of action. This pact did not rest on any concrete revolutionary policy; but the very fact that the two leaderships, who had fought each other so violently for so many years, called on the working class to counterpose a common front to the fascist gangs, aroused enormous enthusiasm in the masses.

This pact had another result that concerned us. At the very moment that our campaign for an SP-CP united front was to a certain extent successful, paradoxically enough the consequences of this victory were unfavorable for our organization. All the sympathetic response we had met with, partly in the CP and much more in the SFIO,¹⁴ which had recruited a substantial number of workers, often former CP members—all this sympathetic response was lost to us. This was not due to hostility, but rather to a lack of political clarity on the concept of a revolutionary party and the need for such a party—especially in the united front—and to the very strong attraction exercised by the CP-SP united front.

13. See *The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International*, by Leon Trotsky. Pathfinder Press, Inc., New York. — *Translator*

14. Section Francaise de l'Internationale Ouvriere— French Section of the Second International, official name of the Socialist party. — *Translator*

Our meetings were no longer attended; our organization became very much isolated, as it had been before. Inevitably, an organizational crisis developed. We searched high and low for a way out of this isolation; for a way to establish connections with, and links to, a mass movement the likes of which had never before been seen in France and which was growing larger with each passing day; for a way to be with the masses in action.

"Entryism"

Our second big organizational experiment, aimed at building a revolutionary party, took place at this point. In our efforts to move toward a stronger organization, we were to pass through a stage in which the Trotskyist group would temporarily lose its organizational independence by entering a mass working-class party. Trotsky himself raised the question of the Ligue Communiste entering the Socialist party (SFIO). The move was decided on in September-October of 1934. This policy, called *entryism*, was subsequently extended to other countries. At first it aroused a great deal of disagreement within our international organization, even causing splits. It was with a great deal of resistance that the October 1934 International Plenum ratified the policy of the French Trotskyists' entering the SFIO. Since then the majority of the organization has considered this tactic admissible.

For an entire initial period, the activity of the Bolshevik-Leninist Group¹⁵ in the SFIO was conducted with remarkable political clarity. This attracted numerous young people, particularly the whole Jeunesses Socialistes (Socialist Youth) tendency, organized under the name Jeunesses Socialistes Révolutionnaires (Revolutionary Socialist Youth), into the organization's ranks, thus renewing its membership.

On the other hand, our exit from the SFIO while the Popular Front was being organized took place under very unfortunate circumstances, and the split among the Bolshevik-Leninists occurring at that time caused us to lose part of the benefits obtained from our entry.

In other countries, notably Belgium and the United States, entryism had better results. In Belgium, where the organization had a working-class base in the Charleroi Basin, it acquired a strong mass base in the Borinage. In the United States, the Socialist party never recovered from the blow it suffered when the Trotskyists left.¹⁶

On the contrary, Nin and Andrade in Spain, who had opposed the entry of the French Trotskyists into the SFIO, did not delay in uniting—on an incorrect programmatic basis—with the Worker-Peasant Bloc in Catalonia, thus forming the inveterately centrist POUM.

The Rise of Fascism and the War

On an international scale, this entire period was dominated by the rise of fascism and the approach of the new imperialist war, despite high peaks of workers' strug-

15. The name adopted by the Trotskyist organization when it joined the Socialist party.

16. See James P. Cannon's *History of American Trotskyism*. Pathfinder Press, Inc., New York.

gles, notably the movements of June 1936 in France and a few other countries, and the civil war in Spain.

In the course of this period, three large struggles dominated the activity of our international movement:

1. *The struggle against the Popular Front policy*, especially in reference to Spain and France. With a tenacity born of desperation, our organizations fought the class-collaborationist policy by means of which Stalinists and Social Democrats — this time united, not divided — prepared the worst of catastrophes for the working-class movement. The Popular Front constituted the first big period of class-collaboration for the Stalinists. On that occasion, however, they were not (except in a very limited fashion in Spain) seeking ministerial posts. This came later, and became widespread, in another period of class collaboration by the Stalinists — the period following the close of World War II.

2. *The struggle against centrism*. This struggle was characterized by a denunciation of the policy of the London Bureau and centrist organizations, such as the Spanish POUM, the English ILP, the German SAP, and the Norwegian NAP.¹⁷

The struggle against centrism also required entering the PSOP¹⁸ — an unhappy experience because of the French Trotskyist movement's state of disintegration at the time.

In Marxist literature, the characterization "centrist" is applied to all tendencies or groups that fluctuate between revolutionary Marxism and reformism. Some very diverse organizations are thus included in this category. There had even been some mass organizations of a centrist nature, for example, the Independent Socialist party of Germany (USPD — Unabhängige Sozialistische Partei Deutschlands), which broke with the Social Democracy during the first world war and part of which participated in forming the German Communist party in 1920.

But in the working-class movement there have always been small centrist groupings — traditionally and congenitally centrist. In the period preceding the second world war, these groupings sought to break the masses away from the old parties, without, however, developing a cohesive program as a basis for a new, revolutionary International (that's what they called the "sectarianism" of the Trotskyists!). They did not, of course, attain their objective. But they did succeed, and that was their main activity, in raising all kinds of obstacles to theoretical and political clarification among the vanguard militants who were disgusted with the old parties and disoriented by a terrible decline in the working-class movement.

During the second world war, the London Bureau showed no sign of life. The same held true for the SAP and the PSOP. In England, the ILP was nothing more than an empty husk.

3. *The struggle against the Moscow trials* was one of

physical defense, a struggle, literally, for the very existence of our movement, a struggle against an avalanche of slander, of frame-ups, of widespread brutality and Stalinist crimes against Trotskyist militants, in a whole series of countries outside the Soviet Union. (In France, Leon Sedov, Rudolf Klement; in Spain, Erwin Wolff, Moulin; in Switzerland, Ignace Reiss.)

From 1936 to 1938, three big trials took place in Moscow, in which the role of prosecuting attorney was played by the ex-Menshevik Vishinsky, who became foreign minister after the war. In the first trial, the defendants (Zinoviev, Kamenev, I. N. Smirnov, etc.) "confessed" to having plotted against Stalin out of *greed for power*. In the second trial, the defendants (among whom were Pyatakov and Yagoda, organizer of the first trial) "confessed" that they and the defendants in the preceding trial had conspired to *reestablish capitalism* in the Soviet Union. In the third trial, the accused (Bukharin, Rakovsky, etc.) "confessed" that they all, including those executed following the previous trials, had for a long time been *spies in the service of the (German) Gestapo, the (British) Intelligence Service, the Mikado*, etc. In addition to these "trials," this period saw the execution, also as plotters, of the most important heads of the Red Army (Tukhachevsky, Gamarnik, Putna, etc.).

In all these trials, the main defendants were Trotsky and his son Leon Sedov. Trotsky was pictured as a counterrevolutionary agent — from time immemorial! These trials served to prepare the groundwork for the assassination of Trotsky and Leon Sedov and for the liquidation of the Bolshevik Old Guard who, in the difficult period of the war then looming on the horizon, could have become the center of a revolutionary opposition to the Stalinist faction.

Despite our campaigns, despite the irrefutable evidence placed before the Dewey Commission¹⁹ proving that these trials were infamous political machinations, Stalin attained his objectives — with the seal of approval of representatives of American big business, such as Ambassador John E. Davies.

This period as a whole was characterized by great demoralization in the vanguard of a working class more and more on the downgrade. For our movement, the most painful example of this was the fragmentation of the French Trotskyists, which reached such a state that at one point the International declared it could no longer accept responsibility for their actions.

* * *

In 1936 an international conference of supporters of the Fourth International was held. Trotsky wanted the birth of the Fourth International announced then and there, but his proposal was not accepted by this conference, which called itself merely "Movement for the Fourth International."

[To be continued]

17. The NAP (Norsk Arbeiderpartiet — Norwegian Labor party) was a mass party that broke with the London Bureau and fulfilled the traditional social-democratic role in Norway.

18. The PSOP (Parti Socialiste Ouvrier et Paysan — Workers and Peasants Socialist party) was formed by the "revolutionary left" tendency in the SFIO, which Blum expelled when the Popular Front fell apart. The PSOP was led by Marceau Pivert, who joined the "old house" after the war and who turned out to be an assiduous anti-Trotskyist the rest of his life.

19. A commission of socialist-minded and liberal intellectuals formed to investigate the charges against Trotsky made in the Moscow trials of 1936-37. It was headed by John Dewey, the most reputable bourgeois philosopher and educator in the United States, and brought in a not-guilty verdict for Trotsky. For a transcript of Trotsky's testimony at the commission's hearings, see *The Case of Leon Trotsky*. Pathfinder Press, Inc., New York.

For the Right of Marxists to Teach in Germany!

[The following petition was initiated by eleven prominent West German academic figures following the refusal of the West Berlin Senate to permit Ernest Mandel to accept a professorship offered him by the Free University of Berlin and the decision of the Bonn government to bar Mandel from West German territory. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

All signs point to the fact that in the Federal Republic certain administrative measures—both within and outside constitutional law—are being used or are in preparation, and that these measures in effect amount to a new Anti-Socialist Law.¹ From the refusal of the Bremen Senate to permit the appointment of DKP [Deutsche Kommunistische Partei—German Communist party, which is "legal" in West Germany] member Professor Horst Holzer as a public official, to the collective decisions of the state presidents on the "principles governing employment of persons hostile to the constitution in the public service,"² to the expulsion of the Marxist theoretician and Trotskyist Ernest Mandel by the Ministry of the Interior, greater and greater repressive measures are being used against representatives of radical-democratic and socialist views. The argument that the Federal Republic must protect itself against "radicals of the right and the left" is shown to be mere camouflage: The sharp increase of neofascist propaganda successes in the case of the

NPD [Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands—National Democratic party of Germany] in their time produced no comparable measures by the state organs.

Quite unmistakably, the campaign against "radicals in the public service" is directed not against the right, but against the left. It aims not at the protection of the basic law and guaranteed liberties, but at undermining legality and liberty in order to prevent the development of progressive movements within the bounds set by the constitution and above all to intimidate the members of the coming generation from joining a radical-democratic socialist movement. Failing that, it aims to keep them from professional and political positions or to drive them from such positions.

The directors of this new persecution of socialists twist, in an anticonstitutional manner, the concept of the liberal-democratic basic order into a belief in the capitalist economic system. "Constitutional" is misinterpreted to mean acceptance of present economic and political realities, which the basic law does not in fact regard as immutable. The object is to make illegal the advocacy of socialist goals, an activity thoroughly in accord with the basic law and expressly legitimized in Article 15. Through use of the concept "hostility to the constitution," which has not been legally defined, they evade the provisions of Articles 18 and 21 of the basic law, according to which only the federal constitutional court can decide whether a party is guaranteed its basic liberties or is illegal under the constitution. They in effect suspend Article 3 of the basic law (which allows no one to suffer discrimination for their political views), Article 5 (which guarantees freedom of teaching and research), and Article 33 (which provides equal access to public offices).

The concept of "radicalism," which escapes any exact definition of its content, has no regard for legal principles, but becomes an instrument of

political terror and a means of enforcing good behavior in the interest of economic and political authority. The new persecution of socialists links up with the conventional hatred of everything leftist, which has a bloody tradition in Germany. It makes use of the resentment against "radicalism" that in Germany stems precisely from the historical deficiency of democratic radicalism.

In the face of this persecution of socialists, we affirm: Those who portray the present economic system of the Federal Republic as the *sole* legal and democratically legitimate system are themselves thinking, speaking, or writing contrary to the constitution. The basic law of the Federal Republic expressly affirms the possibility of a constitutional transformation of the economy into a socialist system. Precisely this constitutional opportunity for democratic change of the economic system belongs to the nucleus of the liberal-democratic basic order that is described in the basic law as unalterable and protected.

The new persecution of socialists aims to destroy in terms of constitutional realities the possibility of a democratic anticapitalist movement that is protected in the text of the constitution. Every democrat must oppose this violation of the constitution.

We demand:

Abolition of the "principles governing employment of persons hostile to the constitution in the public service"!

No denial of positions, no professional handicaps for socialists and communists in the public service!

Unhindered teaching by Marxists in German universities!

Lifting of the entry ban on Ernest Mandel!

Original signers: *Heiner Bremer, Andreas Buro, Heiner Halberstadt, Professor Arno Klönne, Doctor Alexander Kluge, Professor Oskar Negt, Gert Schäfer, Doctor Eberhard Schmidt, Doctor Herbert Stubenrauch, Klaus Vack, Professor Michael Vester.*

1. A reference to the Anti-Socialist laws enforced by Bismarck between 1878 and 1890.—*IP*

2. On January 28, 1972, Chancellor Willy Brandt and the West German state presidents issued a declaration stating that positions in the public service should be denied for reasons of "membership . . . in parties and organizations that oppose the constitutional order, whatever may be the other demands of such parties and organizations."—*IP*

German Trotskyists Ask Solidarity

[The following declaration on the banning of Ernest Mandel by West German authorities has been released by the Gruppe Internationale Marxisten (GIM—International Marxist Group, the German section of the Fourth International) and the Revolutionär-Kommunistische Jugend (RKJ—Revolutionary Communist Youth, a sympathizing organization of the Fourth International). The translation is by *Intercontinental Press.*]

* * *

The federal minister of the interior justified his ban on Ernest Mandel entering the country as support for the *intention* of the state of Berlin to deny the Belgian professor permission to settle there.

This was an obvious lie. Professor Mandel wanted only to travel to Berlin in order to publicly refute the arguments with which the Berlin Senate refused the clear recommendation of the departmental council that Ernest Mandel be appointed to a professorship of political science. *For this a residence permit is not necessary for a Belgian citizen.*

The entry ban cites the arguments of the Berlin Senate's February 22 decision without giving Mandel the opportunity to answer publicly—either in West Berlin or in the Federal Republic—the false assertions, the untruths, and the half-truths that it contains.

The police-detective conception of history shown by the Berlin Senate—the product of "front line" ideology coupled with abysmal ignorance—evidently assumes that "statements of Professor Mandel in which he has called for 'practical actions' to form cadres and revolutionary cells in the factories in order to destroy the existing social order and replace it with a soviet dictatorship" are sufficient to summon up a revolution in the Federal Republic.

The GIM, German section of the Fourth International, denounces this as a ridiculous distortion of the views of Ernest Mandel and the Fourth International. A revolution is possible in an industrially developed country like the Federal Republic only when the working class, to which 85 per-

cent of all the gainfully employed belong—and therefore the overwhelming majority of the entire population—are no longer willing to endure the capitalist social order because its inability to solve the social problems of our era has become evident to all, and when the ruling class shows itself unable to maintain its power.

The refusal of a position to a Marxist professor and the ban on his entry are, to be sure, the first indications of the insecurity of a ruling class that is no longer able to engage in intellectual debate with revolutionary Marxism.

The statement of the Berlin Senate, which the interior minister cites, suppressed the fact that the entry ban in France, Switzerland, and the United States loosed a worldwide wave of protest, even from bourgeois professors, politicians, and scientists—such as Professor [Kenneth] Galbraith—who, unlike the state bureaucrats, take constitutionally guaranteed liberties seriously. Moreover, a federal court in the United States has declared the ban against Mandel unconstitutional.

It is simply untrue that there was a danger Ernest Mandel would have

used his stay in West Berlin to further efforts to transfer the secretariat of the Fourth International to West Berlin or to another city of the Federal Republic—the text of Minister Genscher's declaration is that twisted.

This danger did not exist because Ernest Mandel cannot make such a decision outside the democratically elected bodies of the Fourth International, and these bodies did not even consider the possibility of such a move.

But even if such an intention had existed, it would still be incomprehensible why the Senate of West Berlin should forbid an international organization to construct its secretariat in this city, which claims to be free and democratic.

The Fourth International and its German section have, throughout their history, always solidarized unconditionally and without reservation with all who have been persecuted either by the repressive organs of imperialism or as revolutionists by the bureaucracies of the workers states.

Today the GIM, the German section of the Fourth International, appeals to all to solidarize with it against the attacks on constitutionally guaranteed liberties by the federal Ministry of the Interior and the Senate of West Berlin. □

Israeli Socialists for Leninist Party

[On February 5, after a national assembly of the group, a minority of members left the Israeli Socialist Organization (ISO), more commonly known as Matzpen (Compass), the name of its journal. The major issue in the split was the intention of the majority to sharpen Matzpen's ideological program and to organize the ISO on a democratic-centralist basis.

[This was opposed by the minority, which is centered mainly in Tel Aviv. The following is a communiqué issued by the ISO on March 6 explaining the split.]

* * *

After more than a year of internal discussion, a small group of comrades has just left the Israeli Socialist Organization—Matzpen. This latest split is the culmination of a pro-

cess of political clarification engendered by the consequences of the June 1967 Israeli aggression.

Until then, Matzpen was the only really anti-Zionist political force, and as such played a crucial role in demystifying Zionism. But the June 1967 aggression rocked the Israeli social and political scene and posed before the ISO a number of new tasks necessitating clear and precise tactical and strategic answers.

Moreover, it became necessary to define the organization's attitude on many international questions.

Even though the ISO has defined itself as a Marxist-Leninist organization ever since its formation, during the debate a minority of comrades increasingly leaned toward anarchist positions. This was reflected in their abandonment of some basic political

positions held in common by all members.

These comrades thus demonstrated their failure to understand the tasks of the hour: the construction of a united Leninist organization with a revolutionary Marxist program—essential for a real intervention into social reality both in Israel and the region—and the construction of a revolutionary party in the Arab East.

The minority violated organizational discipline and undertook a campaign of defamation (both inside and outside the ISO) against the Trotskyist comrades in the ISO.

By doing this they placed themselves outside the ranks of the organization.

In the checkered political field of the Israeli far-left, there is no middle ground for anarchists between Matzpen and the spontanéist-Zionist group Siah (Israeli New Left).

Our principled anti-Zionism is directly determined by the revolution-

ary-Marxist position we have adopted. Any revolutionist breaking with that position cannot help but end up making concessions to Zionism (as the Lambertists have amply shown).

The fact that this small group of comrades has left us can only accelerate the political clarification now under way in Matzpen.

From now on we will set ourselves to the task, essential for the future of the socialist revolution in the region, of bolstering our organization ideologically and increasing its capability of action. This will allow us to become active participants in building the revolutionary-Marxist organization of the Arab East.

Forward to the Socialist United States of the Arab East!

Long Live the Arab Socialist Revolution!

Long Live the World Socialist Revolution! □

less than the victory for which they have fought so long and courageously.

Thus, the goal of world imperialism remains the same as it has always been—to prevent, by any means necessary, the extension of the socialist revolution in Southeast Asia.

The combined diplomatic and military offensive being waged by U. S. imperialism poses more sharply than ever the responsibility of the international antiwar movement. Every effort must be made to mobilize massive actions in support of the Indochinese peoples' unconditional right to self-determination.

The National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC) in the United States has announced plans for massive demonstrations in New York and Los Angeles on April 22, demanding the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of U. S. forces from Vietnam. The Front Solidarité Indochine (FSI) in France has called for a week of actions, culminating in mass demonstrations on April 22, in solidarity with the Indochinese revolution. Simultaneous actions in other countries are already being planned.

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International calls on all those forces throughout the world who oppose U. S. aggression in Indochina to join the American, French, and other antiwar forces in mobilizing broad, united mass-actions on April 22.

Immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all U. S. troops, bases, and matériel from Indochina — OUT NOW!

End the bombing now!

Not a penny, not a gun for U. S. imperialism's war effort!

Solidarity with the revolutionary struggle of the Indochinese masses!

Victory to the Vietnamese revolution!

Fourth International Backs April 22 Actions Against Indochina War

[The following statement was released March 10 by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International. It is in response to an appeal from the National Peace Action Coalition in the United States, urging that April 22 be made a day of international action against U. S. aggression in Indochina.]

* * *

The Vietnamese revolution is passing through a crucial period.

Faced with a presidential election in November of 1972, the Nixon administration is engaged in a massive diplomatic offensive to try to isolate the Vietnamese revolution and to convince the American people that everything possible is being done to end direct U. S. involvement in the Vietnam war. To this end, Nixon's "eight-point program" was announced at the end of January. It was revealed that secret negotiations had taken place between presidential adviser Henry Kissinger and the revolutionary forces in Vietnam. And one of the central goals of Nixon's voyage to Peking was to win public support for the administration's Southeast Asia policies.

While massive opposition to the war in the United States has forced the government to cut back on the use of American ground troops in the Indochina fighting, the Nixon administration is stepping up the war effort in every other respect. Bombing raids have been amongst the most massive ever, and unprecedented military aid to the Saigon regime is planned for the coming year.

In other words, Nixon is trying to pacify worldwide opposition to U. S. imperialist policies as he "Vietnamizes" and prolongs the war. He is attempting to buy time, with the American people especially, to convince them that the war is inevitably "winding down." He is hoping to reduce the ever mounting pressure for withdrawal of all American troops, bases, and logistic supplies from Indochina. He still hopes to "end" the war by "winning" it.

The American rulers have at the same time taken the offensive in a diplomatic maneuver with the Stalinist bureaucracies in Peking and Moscow, trying to arrange a "peaceful coexistence" deal in order to pressure the Vietnamese people into accepting

COPIES MISSING?

Keep your files of Intercontinental Press complete and up-to-date. Missing issues for the current year may be ordered by sending 50c per copy. Write for information about previous years.

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

Australian CP Paper Discusses Trotsky and Lenin

[The Communist party of Australia (CPA) has, in recent months, been engaged in internal debate over the nature and meaning of Trotskyism. This debate has included charges of "Trotskyism" being made against party leaders by a grouping that in December broke with the CPA to form the pro-Moscow Socialist party of Australia. (The CPA leadership continues to oppose the 1968 Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia and the subsequent "normalization.")

[The December 1 issue of *Tribune*, the CPA's weekly newspaper, carried an attack on Trotsky and Trotskyism by Ted Docker. Docker's article, except for the relatively restrained tone of his epithets, was fairly typical of the anti-Trotskyist polemics that can be read in the press of any Stalinist party. What makes the CPA unusual among Communist parties is its present willingness to publish opposing views on the question.

[The article below, a reply to Docker's comments, is reprinted from the January 25-31 issue of *Tribune*. Its author is identified only by initials and the description "a young communist." The footnotes appear in the original.]

* * *

Ted Docker (*Tribune*, Dec. 1, 1971) writing on trotskyism advances the basic theses that Trotsky "in many ways never changed his Menshevik views," and that "It (trotskyism) is counter-revolutionary and should be branded and rejected as such."

True, as Docker states, Trotsky, at the second congress of the Social-Democrats, supported Martov and the Mensheviks against Lenin.¹ But scarcely a year later, Sept. 1904, Trotsky announced his break with the Mensheviks.² From this point until 1915, when he began to see Lenin "in a new light", he played the role of conciliator of the two factions, Bolshevik and Menshevik. In 1916 he stated that the groups connected with Lenin's paper "are now the only active and consistently revolutionary force . . ." and that for people like himself "there was no way out but to merge with the Leninists."³

Docker's next assertion (for there is not the slightest scrap of evidence in his article) is that "He did not understand the Leninist principle of a worker-peasant alliance and that socialism could be built in a single country"(!). For sheer stalinist fantasy the latter statement really takes the cake.

There was a Leninist principle of a worker-peasant alliance, and it was this: that an alliance between the workers and the peasantry would accomplish the *democratic* revolution and that later an alliance between the workers and the poor

er peasantry would accomplish the socialist revolution.

Trotsky's formulation differed from Lenin's in that he stressed the leading role of the proletariat and the inability of the peasantry to form an independent political grouping that would share the power with the proletariat. In both points he was in the event proved correct.

Docker claims that Trotsky did not understand that socialism could be built in one country and "Arising from this he put forward the opportunist theory of permanent revolution. This implied that unless revolution spread without delay to Europe the workers would inevitably come in conflict with the peasantry and the revolution was doomed."

Now if socialism is understood in a marxist sense (a classless society where the state has disappeared, where the level of productivity is far superior to the most advanced capitalist country) then it is obvious that socialism does not exist anywhere today.

The last-quoted sentence of Docker's makes interesting reading concerning the revolution in Europe. For on this question, and that of the nature of the Russian Revolution, Lenin adopted a more conservative position than Trotsky.

"Lenin did not, any more than Trotsky, reject the (possibility) prospect of a direct transition from the bourgeois to the socialist revolution . . . Lenin . . . held that the transition would depend on the realization of the two extraneous conditions that he laid down in 1905: the support of the peasantry and the support of a European socialist revolution. The main difference of doctrine between Trotsky and Lenin at this time was that Lenin made the *beginning* of the transition to socialism dependent on conditions which Trotsky regarded as necessary only for its final victory."⁴

In *The Third International After Lenin*, Trotsky shows that Stalin and his allies deliberately confused the possibility of the victory of a socialist *revolution* in one country, which implied the necessity of beginning the socialist organization of the economy, with the question of final victory of socialism. More and more, during the twenties and thirties, Stalin counterposed the international revolution to the (alleged) building of socialism in the USSR, resulting in such catastrophic defeats as China 1925-27; Germany 1929-33; Spain, France and the Popular Fronts of 1936.

There is no Leninist principle of socialism in one country, on the contrary, as Deutscher correctly points out,⁵ "Lenin changed his mind. In all essentials the thesis of permanent revolution . . . was adopted by his party." It was in opposition to the theory of permanent revolution that Stalin first raised the slogan of socialism in one country in 1924.

What is this so-called opportunist theory of permanent revolution?

Firstly, in the backward countries, the bourgeoisie is too weak to carry out even the democratic revolution. These democratic tasks lead directly to the dictatorship of the proletariat. Between the democratic revolution and the socialist reconstruction there is a permanent state of revolutionary development.

Secondly, the conquest of power by the proletariat does not complete the revolution but opens it up. This is the permanent character of the socialist revolution as such.

Thirdly, the socialist revolution begins on national foundations but cannot be completed on these alone. If a proletarian state is isolated for a long period, it must fall victim to external and internal contradictions.

The theory of permanent revolution elaborated by Trotsky in *Results and Prospects*, published in 1906, brilliantly foresaw the course of the Russian Revolution, and is still vital today in an understanding of the *Third World Revolution*.

It is interesting to note that "later in the year (1917) Lenin unstintingly paid tribute to Trotsky, saying that since he had broken with Menshevism there was no better Bolshevik".⁶

The Military-Revolutionary Committee of the Petrograd Soviet, the instrument of the victorious insurrection, was headed ex officio by Trotsky. On September 23, 1917, the Petrograd Soviet elected Trotsky as President. The Russian Revolution must have been remarkable indeed, to have succeeded with a "counter-revolutionary" like Trotsky in a crucial position!

The trades union proposal by Trotsky in 1921, it is generally agreed today by trotskyists, was incorrect, but Docker forgets the way it was refuted by Lenin; he said that the interests of the proletariat and the interests of the State were often at odds because the USSR was a workers' state, but with bureaucratic deformations.

A tissue of lies surrounds the struggles against bureaucracy in the USSR and Trotsky's development of marxism before being murdered by stalinist gangsters in Mexico in 1940.

This is not an ideal debate of historical interest. The policies of the CPA until recently flowed from an acceptance of the Soviet bureaucracy as the authentic vanguard of the world revolution. Thus even with the remarkable development within the CPA in the past years, unparalleled in the official Communist movement, there needs to be a thorough reappraisal of its history and policies. The party will only continue to develop if the rank and file participate in a massive debate on the question of stalinism.

Lenin's Last Struggle

Lenin's last struggle was against the monstrous bureaucracy forming in the

1. Isaac Deutscher, *The Prophet Armed*, Oxford University Press, 1970, pp. 79-81.

2. Deutscher, pp. 105-106.

3. Deutscher, p. 233.

4. E.H. Carr, *The Bolshevik Revolution*, Vol. 1, Pelican, p. 71.

5. Deutscher, *The Prophet Armed*.

6. Deutscher, *The Prophet Armed*.

Soviet Union. At the 8th Congress of the CPSU, March 1919, he returned again and again to the subject of bureaucracy: "The lack of culture in Russia . . . debases Soviet Power and recreates bureaucracy . . ." "The bureaucracy camouflage themselves as communists" . . . "The fight against bureaucracy to the end, till complete victory, is only possible if the whole population participates in the administration of the country."

On April 21, 1921: "We see this evil (bureaucratism) rise before us in a clearer, more precise and threatening way."

On January 17, 1922: "The recourse to strike struggles, in a state in which political power belongs to the working-class, can be explained and justified only by the bureaucratic deformations of the proletarian states . . ."

On March 27, 1922: "But if we consider this bureaucratic machine, this mountain, who is leading and who is being led? I doubt very much that one could say that the communists are leading that mountain. Truly they are being led."

"Bureaucracy exists in our country not only in the institutions of the Soviet but also in those of the party."

"Our state apparatus, except for the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, is to a large degree a survival from the past, which has undergone the minimum of serious modifications; it is only slightly embellished on the surface . . ."

In Vol. 36 of his collected works, in a letter to the President of the State Bank, February 28, 1922: "The State Bank is now just a bureaucratic game of paper shuffling. That's the truth, if it's the truth you want to know, and not the sugar and honey pater of the communist bureaucrats . . ." □

U.S. Professors Ask Release of Bukovsky

[The following public appeal was addressed March 6 to President Nikolai Podgorny of the Soviet Union.]

* * *

All of the undersigned are members of the faculty of the University of California, Los Angeles and have long been active in the struggle against U.S. military operations in Viet-Nam and for the liberation of Angela Davis and other political prisoners in the United States.

We are convinced, however, that the democratic principles for which we struggle know no frontiers. News has reached us of the arrest, trial and imprisonment of Vladimir Bukovsky. Based on the facts which have reached us, we are forced to conclude that Bukovsky has been incarcerated for holding and making public political

views with which the current administration of the USSR does not agree. Such a practice, on the part of any government, is a violation of fundamental principles of human rights.

We therefore insist that the competent authorities remedy the wrong which has been committed and immediately restore liberty to Bukovsky

and to all others similarly situated.

Jon Amsden, Robert Brenner, Joseph E. Emonds, David G. Epstein, Samuel Farber, Samuel R. Friedman, Donald Kalish, Nikki Keddie, David R. McCann, Henry W. McGee, Jr., Gary B. Nash, Carlos Otero, Hayden V. White

Solzhenitsyn's Memorial for Tvardovsky

[The following translation of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's tribute to the poet and editor Aleksandr Tvardovsky was done especially for *Intercontinental Press*. Although other versions exist in English, the peculiarly rough-hewn and knotty quality of the Russian original required a fresh effort.

[Tvardovsky died December 18, 1971. The "third day," then, was the day of the funeral, December 21. The "ninth day" after his death, December 27, is the date the tribute was written.

[*Tyorkin* refers to Tvardovsky's much-loved long narrative poem about an ordinary Soviet soldier during World War II. "Trifonych" is the affectionate shortening of Tvardovsky's middle name, Trifonovich.]

* * *

There are many ways to kill a poet. For Tvardovsky, the way chosen was to take away his pride and joy, his passion—his journal. It was not enough that this man of epic stature had humbly endured sixteen years of humiliation: anything so long as his journal might survive; so long as the flow of literature was not interrupted; so long as people continued to get printed and people continued to read. That wasn't enough, so they added the searing heat of disbandment and destruction [of his editorial group], of callous injustice. These blows, like hot flames, consumed him in just six months. Within half a year, he had fallen mortally ill; only because of his customary powers of endurance did he live as long as he did, conscious to the last moment—and suffering.

On the third day, a portrait hangs above the coffin, showing the deceased when he was forty, his brow as yet unfurrowed by the bitter-sweet burdens of his journal, his face illuminated by the childlike trust that he maintained

throughout his life, that stayed with him to the hour of his doom. As the finest music plays, wreath upon wreath upon wreath is brought in—all from Soviet soldiers. . . .

And that is fitting. I remember how the soldiers all along the front used to prefer the wonders of his pure-toned *Tyorkin* over all the other wartime books. But we remember, too, how army libraries have been forbidden to subscribe to *Novy Mir* and how, quite recently, just having one of these blue-covered booklets in the barracks could mean being hauled in for questioning.

And now as we watch, the whole unseemly dozen or so of the [Writers Union] Secretariat come tumbling into the limelight. Heading the honor guard are those same unhealthily fleshed-out men who made such a hullabaloo in hounding him down.

This sort of thing has been going on here for a long time—since Pushkin. The dead poet falls right into the arms of his enemies, and they quickly dispose of the body, reciting glib and skillful orations over his grave.

Around his coffin they grouped themselves in a solid block and thought that they had hemmed him in! They have broken up our only journal and think they have scored a victory!

But one would have to be ignorant of the past century of Russian history to see in this a victory rather than an irredeemable blunder. Blind fools! When the voices of the young ring out sharply, how sorry you will be that you no longer have this patient critic, with his soft exhorting voice that everyone would listen to. You will want to grub up the earth with your own bare hands to bring Trifonych back! But too late.

On the ninth day,
Solzhenitsyn

Intercontinental Press