

Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 11, No. 10

© 1973 Intercontinental Press

March 19, 1973

50c

Chile Election Shows Increasing Polarization



***Ernest Mandel
on the
Second Fall
of the Dollar***

***Ceylon
and the
Healy School
of Falsification***

Civilized Barbarism Paraguayan Style

In the jungles of northeastern Paraguay, a virtual manhunt is being waged against the Ache Indians by "civilized" slave-hunters and killers. During the past year, the campaign has reduced the size of the tribe by about one-third.

Those Indians who are not murdered outright are being placed in a national "Guayaki" colony — "Guayaki" is the official, and derogatory, term for Indians. Those who are brought to this camp, reported Alfred Hopkins from Asunción in the February 17-18 issue of the Danish daily *Information*, "fall victim to a more refined form of extermination: undernourishment, a breaking of their spirit, and unhealthy living conditions."

It is feared that a new hunting expedition is being organized against the tribe, which once inhabited a wide stretch of the Brazilian and Paraguayan jungle. This one could drive the tribe's birth rate down to a point of no return.

In one expedition, Hopkins reported, a group of around twenty Indians was killed and the bodies of some hacked into pieces with machetes. "The Ache Indians' children are taken alive on such hunts. They are usually sold to farmers, who raise them and 'civilize' them."

Father Bartolome Melia of the Paraguayan Bishops' Conference termed the policy toward the Ache Indians "true genocide." Even during the Spanish colonial period, he asserted, the aim was not to wipe out the native population but rather to "save their souls" and "civilize them."

In 1971, some members of Paraguayan high society formed a committee ostensibly to aid the Indians. Yet, according to West German anthropologist Mark Münzel, since the committee was formed, the drive to exterminate the Indians has been stepped up remarkably. More were killed in the previous ten months than in the preceding six years. And a committee doctor sent to inspect conditions in the colony left after being there less than one day.

In This Issue

FEATURES	302	The Second Fall of the Dollar —by Ernest Mandel
PARAGUAY	290	Civilized Barbarism Paraguayan Style
CHILE	291	Election Reflects Increasing Polarization —by David Thorstad
INDOCHINA WAR	293	The U.S. War Against Vietnam's Ecology
	295	U.S. Liberals Oppose Aid to North Vietnam —by Fred Feldman
BANGLADESH	296	First National Elections in Bangladesh
FRANCE	297	First Round Vote Sets Back Gaullists
IRELAND	298	Irish Fighters Denounce U.S. Aid to Britain —by Gerry Foley
NEW ZEALAND	300	How to Oppose Racist Sports Tour —by Keith Locke
AUSTRALIA	301	Australia Tries to Keep Singapore Spy Base
NORWAY	301	Tariq Ali Addresses Meeting in Oslo
SWITZERLAND	304	Ban Against Mandel Upheld
U.S.A.	306	Wounded Knee Seized by Indian Militants
REVIEWS	305	Bukharin-Luxemburg Debate Reprinted —by Geoff Hodgson
DOCUMENTS	307	Ceylon and the Healy School of Falsification —by Jaya Vithana
	315	Open Letter to Left Wing of Parti Quebecois —by Alain Beiner
	318	U.S. Irish Oppose Nixon's Support to Britain —by Fred Burns O'Brien
	319	Soviet Political Prisoners in Tribute to Galanskov
DRAWINGS	295	George McGovern—by Copain

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

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.

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

COPY EDITOR: Lawrence Rand.

EDITORIAL STAFF: Candida Barberena, Fred Feldman, Gerry Foley, Jon Rothschild, George Saunders, David Thorstad.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.

ASSISTANT BUSINESS MANAGER: Steven Warshell.

TECHNICAL STAFF: H. Massey, James M. Morgan, Ruth Schein.

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 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 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 © 1973 by Intercontinental Press.

Chile Election Reflects Increasing Polarization

By David Thorstad

The social polarization that has been developing in Chile since the Unidad Popular (UP—Popular Unity) coalition came to power in November 1970 was clearly reflected in the electoral arena March 4. The results of the first legislative election since Allende's six-year presidential term began to show that the electoral base of his coalition has not only held firm but has expanded.

At stake were all the 150 seats in the Chamber of Deputies and half the fifty seats in the Senate. The final returns indicate that the Popular Unity coalition won 43.4% of the vote and the opposition CODE (Confederación Democrática—Democratic Confederation), a bloc between the Christian Democrats and the right-wing National party, 54.7%. The remainder were either blank ballots or went to the independent socialist group USOPO (Unión Socialista Popular—Popular Socialist Union).

The vote gave the UP an additional six seats in the Chamber and three in the Senate (one of which was won away from the USOPO), but, as anticipated, it left the control of both in the hands of the opposition. The breakdown of seats in the Chamber is now 87-63 and in the Senate 30-19, with the USOPO retaining one seat.

Supporters of both sides took to the streets following the vote to claim victory—the UP because of its definite gain over the 36.6% of the vote it won in the September 1970 presidential elections, and the opposition because it clearly retained its majority position in the legislature.

Yet in terms of what each side was predicting prior to the vote, the results were pretty much what the UP expected, while they fell short of what the opposition was hoping for. The opposition, which campaigned on the idea that the election would be a "morally binding plebiscite," had set its sights on winning at least two more seats, thus giving it a two-thirds majority and the power not

only to veto all major legislative bills but even to impeach President Allende. Instead, however, it lost seats in both houses. Everett Martin wrote from Santiago on the March 6 *Wall Street Journal*: "As a rule of thumb, political observers here said before the elections, anything less than 60% would be considered a disappointing performance by the opposition."

"My Government will be the only one in Chilean history that will increase its percentage over its presidential election," Allende predicted on the eve of the vote, belittling the opposition's chances of gaining seats. "They are dreaming with their eyes open." In 1969, he observed in rebuttal to the opposition's viewing the election as a plebiscite, the then ruling Christian Democratic party headed by Eduardo Frei Montalva, currently the most prominent figure in the opposition, won only 29.8% of the vote in the legislative elections.

The increase in the UP's voter support is not only a reflection of the mounting polarization in Chilean society but also of the fact that the issue of economic difficulties was not the big vote-catcher the opposition had hoped it would be. Indeed, the economic problems—caused in no small part by the imperialist credit squeeze and by deliberate economic sabotage at home by the bourgeois backers of the opposition—failed to win votes for CODE among the poor and the working people.

"Despite the hardships of the middle class," noted Jonathan Kandell in the February 9 *New York Times*, "Government officials and other sources contend that in terms of general welfare—the quality and quantity of goods and services—lower-income groups are better off than they were two years ago." In Santiago, for instance, where half the electorate lives, unemployment dropped to around 3% from a pre-Popular Unity level of 9%. "A blue-collar worker knows that this Government has done more for him

than any previous one," a foreign economist living in Santiago told Kandell.

The UP's showing would seem to be part of a general trend. Since it came to power, eight provincial elections have been held. Of these, the UP won half. The total popular vote in the eight provinces gave it 49% to 51% for the opposition. And the UP won all but two of the elections held in 1972 in the ten major trade-union and student organizations. In the view of the editors of *Le Monde*, the March 4 results "confirmed the thrust to the left that has been going on in Chile for half a century."

Both the Popular Unity and the opposition regarded the election as a continuation in the electoral arena of last October's three-week confrontation aptly dubbed the "capitalist strike." And the results confirmed the continuation of the polarization that came to the fore in October. "Splinter parties on both sides lost heavily as Chileans cast their votes for the big parties in the two electoral alliances—the Christian Democrats and Nationals, and the Socialists and Communists," wrote Kandell in the March 6 *New York Times*.

This phenomenon was also noted by Pierre Kalfon, writing in the March 3 *Le Monde*: "Despite the attempts at moderation on the part of the more cautious sectors on both the right and the left, the economic and social order established by the bourgeoisie is being increasingly called into question. It is no longer possible to be neutral or to take a wait-and-see attitude. One is either for or against—without nuances." This polarization, of course, is reflected in the very fact that most of the political spectrum is allied into two opposing camps.

Also indicative of the increasing polarization is the fact that the right-wing National party won an additional three seats in the Senate and a substantial number in the Chamber—partly at the expense of its ally, the

Christian Democrats. The National party consistently proclaimed throughout the campaign that it wants "Allende's head" and the elimination of the Communist party ("A new parliament is not enough—what we need is a new government"). The Christian Democrats, on the other hand, claim that they don't want to overthrow Allende, but only hope that he will "rectify his errors."

The crack in the opposition bloc that this difference in emphasis reflects has its counterpart in the UP coalition. Indeed, the elections increasingly drew into the open the differences over strategy that exist within the coalition.

The differences between the two largest parties in the UP coalition, the Socialists and the Communists, had already begun to surface during the October crisis. At the time, for instance, Carlos Altamirano, secretary general of the Socialist party, supported a Socialist statement denouncing as "a victory for the reactionaries" the decision of Allende and the Communist party to bring three military officers into the cabinet. But the differences erupted into a sharp public debate in January.

The immediate cause of the division was a proposal submitted to the legislature by Economics Minister Orlando Millas, a Communist, that would officially define the "social sector" of the economy and that entertains the possibility of returning to private ownership some industries that have been intervened. In an interview with Kandell prior to the elections, CP theoretician Volodia Teitelboim discussed the idea in terms that the *Times* correspondent found "quite businesslike":

"There must be a severe readjustment in economic planning, self-financing, quality of production, and salary demands. State-owned industries must justify themselves economically and not weigh down on the Government."

The proposed law, which was submitted without prior consultation with either the Socialist undersecretary of the economy, Armando Arancibia, or the SP leadership, was strongly opposed by the SP. Altamirano denounced it as a "step backwards in the revolutionary process." And on January 29, the Political Bureau of the SP delivered a sharp statement to Allende—himself a Socialist—voic-



CORVALAN: Thinks a more moderate approach would increase Popular Unity's popularity.

ing indignation at being slighted, and condemning the proposed law. The statement was published in the bourgeois press.

Allende responded immediately with a statement reiterating the government proposal that the "social sector" be fixed at ninety state-owned factories and that a commission study what should be done with other industries already intervened but not on the list of those destined for the "social sector." This decision would be made, Allende said, by "taking into account the interests of the workers in these plants and of the national economy." He sought to downplay the number that might be returned to their capitalist owners.

The left-wing forces in the UP coalition do not want these plants—some of which were occupied by the workers against the wishes of the more reformist forces in the UP—returned to the private sector. The success of any postelection effort on the part of these reformist forces in the UP—headed by the Communists and the Radicals—to reach some "understanding" with the more "moderate" forces in the Christian Democratic opposition may very well hinge on this question.

Will the UP attempt such a rap-

prochement? And if so, will it require some kind of showdown with leftist forces in the UP? A number of things besides the Millas proposal would seem to point in this direction.

On March 7, for instance, as meetings among the UP parties were getting under way to analyze the election results, one of the parties that has seen an important layer of its membership move toward the left, the MAPU (Movimiento de Acción Popular Unitaria—Movement for United Popular Action), announced the expulsion of fifteen of its top leaders for "ultraleftism." Of those expelled, nine were members of the Central Committee and six of the Political Committee of the organization. They were charged with "divisionist activities within the party" and with having contacts with "ultraleftist sectors that do not belong to the Popular Unity."

The expulsion came less than a week after the MAPU's Political Committee issued a public statement criticizing the Millas proposal. The MAPU statement brought a severe reprimand from Allende. The statement, he said, "seems to be conceived and drawn up as if the MAPU were *outside* the government and the Popular Unity."

The CP, moreover, has apparently decided to step up its campaign against "ultraleftism." "In a recent published letter," reported Kandell from Santiago March 3, "Luis Corvalán, secretary general of the Communist party, criticized the growing influence of M. I. R. [Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria—Movement of the Revolutionary Left] among the Socialists. He suggested that through a more moderate approach, as many as 90 per cent of Chileans might eventually support the Government."

Altamirano replied in a letter to the press that such an approach would involve unacceptable compromises with "parties that serve the bourgeoisie and capitalism."

The military members of the cabinet are known to be pressing for a law that would, along the lines of the Millas proposal, clarify the status of the some 250 concerns that have been taken over or intervened by the government. "The generals want the law to detail which companies would become a permanent part of the state

and which would be returned to the private sector," reported Everett Martin in the March 6 *Wall Street Journal*.

During a television appearance on February 25, the minister of the interior, General Carlos Prats, lumped the revolutionary forces together with the right-wing reactionary forces as extremists and characterized the remaining political forces as the "progressives." Such observations lend

substance to speculation that the "neutral" armed forces conceive of their present role as one of translating their concern for "social peace" and "respect for the constitution" into a blessing upon any rapprochement among "progressives." Any such understanding would, of course, be so fraught with contradictions that it would of necessity strengthen the role of the military as an "objective" arbiter. □

The 'Green Devolution' of Indochina

The U.S. War Against Vietnam's Ecology

During the second world war the American armed forces established a reputation for declining (wherever possible) to fight in the jungles of the Pacific theater. Instead, they would bulldoze the jungle out of existence, and then fight.

The Indochina war has bolstered the U.S. reputation on this score. But twenty-five years of technical progress has provided military commanders with vastly more efficient tools for jungle clearance than bulldozers. The old method of pushing down trees and underbrush with ungainly machinery operated by individual soldiers who run the risk of being shot at has been replaced by techniques that are more destructive (immediately as well as over time) than the old bulldozer and have the additional advantage of being applied from far away by soldiers removed from the battlefield itself.

In the March 5 issue of the Hong Kong weekly *Far Eastern Economic Review*, Thomas Brindley, associate professor at the College of Education, University of Arizona, described the long-term effects of American-style jungle clearing in an article entitled "A legacy of poison."

"This war," Brindley wrote, "has been a war against the environment. The militarists and sceptics who declare that 'all wars are alike' ignore the overriding differences in the misuse of technology which policy-makers have directed in this conflict compared with previous wars. The nature of the Vietnam War is horren-

dously different from that of even the two technological world wars. The bombed-out cities of Western Europe such as London, Rotterdam, Hamburg and Berlin were nearly completely rebuilt by 1954, and even the devastated cities of Tokyo, Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Dresden had been restored by 1964. Cities are rebuilt by resources brought from outside. It is unlikely, however, that deforested and denuded areas can regrow in the same time span, nor can they be regenerated as previously. Soils and land-forms that have been poisoned and torn up may take decades to be restored in even approximate fashion—if it is possible at all."

Brindley details the basic forms of destruction caused by military action, mostly by American airpower: "removal of the vegetation cover and the actual physical displacement and alteration of the land itself; pollution and poisoning; and the destruction of habitat and living communities. The combined effect has been to destroy the existing ecosystems in widespread and extensive areas of South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, and perhaps North Vietnam."

Many people have pointed to the above-ground devastation caused by U.S. bombing. By the end of 1972, there were about 26 million craters in Indochina. But Brindley notes that the cratering of Indochina has done more than just make holes. He cites the example of a small strip of south-eastern Laos along the "Ho Chi Minh

trail" where 973,000 tons of bombs were dropped between 1968 and 1971.

Most of these bombs were of the 500-pound or 750-pound variety. Brindley writes: "A 500 lb bomb will make a crater 30 ft long, 6 ft deep, and will impact the soil below as hard as concrete. Thus, within an area about the size of the state of Maryland [about 12,300 square miles], American bombs have blasted nearly 4 million craters, turning the area into a moonscape."

But still worse than the blast damage caused by bombs is the disruption of ecological chains by defoliants, herbicides, and poisons. From 1961 to 1970, about 7,500 square miles in South Vietnam alone were sprayed at least once by herbicides. The Defense Department refuses to release information on the extent of similar activities in Laos and Cambodia.

The use of herbicides on such a scale sets off a chain of destruction that biologists believe may be irreversible. Brindley explains:

"The denuding of the vegetation leaves the soil exposed and unprotected, leading to its rapid and continuing drying. The sun in the dry season will tend to burn out the upper-root systems of remaining plants, causing the soil to erode easily during the monsoon rains. Much of the tropical forest soil is lateritic, which bakes into brick-like hardpan when exposed too long to the sun. The rains will force their way speedily through the recently exposed soil, washing out nutrients and minerals.

"With the rapid loss of water (due to the increased rate of evaporation, run-off, and running through) the exposed layers of soil will in effect be sterilised by the heat and glare of the sun, by the poisons from the herbicides, and by the removal of topsoil by bombing. The plant-food value will be destroyed along with the killing of the micro-organisms and small animal life that give nutrients to the soil and keep the ground porous and soft. With the nutrients draining from the soil, the process of nitrogen fixation in the soil will be reduced. Important minerals such as calcium, sodium, phosphorous and iron, which act as fertilisers, will be bleached and lost.

"The barren hillsides and rockslides



caused by defoliation and bombing tend to erode rapidly and extensively, further weathering the surface and causing serious run-offs. Increased flood danger is imminent. The extensive floods in the central coastal provinces of Vietnam in 1970 have been attributed to the extreme bombing and defoliation in the First Military Region, where the rivers have their sources."

The toxic pesticides and herbicides that have been sprayed over Vietnam, Brindley writes, "will eventually find their way as unbroken compounds into the waterways.

"Poisons—picloram, cacodylic acid, CS and 2:4:5T—may have raised the toxicity levels in streams and soils to the extent of setting the stage for the population's future sickness and ill-health, wherever people live. The poisonous substances will tend to accelerate the growth of algae and bacteria, depleting the oxygen. Thus the high toxicity may lead to the poisoning and deadening of the rivers and estuaries.

"With the destruction of the primary producers or plants, the flow of energy from the sun to the higher animals

and man will be altered. The process in which nourishment is cycled and recycled throughout the entire ecosystem will have been changed so that it malfunctions, greatly wasting energy and upsetting the food chain. Apart from the simple effects caused by defoliation and bombing, the long-term consequences will affect such basic bio-geo-chemical processes as the water cycle, the nitrogen cycle and the mineral cycles. All such processes are interdependent. Their effects are apparent in the chemistry of each individual organism, which may alter the genetic endowment of singular species; the effects are also apparent in the inter-relationships of one organism with another in the plant and animal communities."

The widespread presence of water mines and antipersonnel bombs and traps that may not yet have exploded must be added to the long-term destructive effects of the American war on the land and people of Indochina. And besides the new sophisticated forms of jungle-clearing, the old U.S. bulldozer has also not been put in mothballs. During 1972 more than 350,000 acres in South Vietnam were cleared by special giant bulldozers.

"The overriding effect of all this," Brindley writes, "has been the destruction of mature, rich and highly diverse biological formations. These climax ecosystems, as they are called, have existed for many years in a state of balance. The bomb craters, clearings, ploughing and hillside erosion have so significantly altered the land forms in many areas that quite different species of plants and animals will be permitted to grow. Thus, nature must

begin all over again and the early stages of regrowth will feature a very simple environment which will have animal and plant species that are reduced in variety, quality—and often—in numbers. As biologists have shown, the simpler an environment, the more dangerous becomes the maintenance of such a fragile community. Lewallen calls the destruction of large land areas by defoliation and bombing the Green Devolution, to signify the reduction by war of the quantity and diversity of green plants. 'Complex, life-rich ecosystems are being succeeded by environments poorer in life and more hostile to humanity.'

Specifically, termites and ants are expected to be two of the main beneficiaries of Vietnam's new ecology. The millions of water-filled craters will be breeding grounds for mosquitos. Bamboo and imperata grass are invading what used to be forests. Seedling trees will be choked out by vines.

"The rate of revegetation of secondary forest following physical destruction in the tropics is generally very rapid, but only when the topsoil has not been severely poisoned or denuded," Brindley notes.

"On the other hand, several authorities on tropical succession have indicated that restoration of mature or climax forest is very slow, often taking decades or even centuries."

The United States, Brindley concludes (granting Washington an entirely unjustified possibility of unjustified possibility of unconsciousness), "wittingly or errantly, engaged in a policy to destroy the lands and waters of Indochina." □

You Can't Always Get What You Want

To believe the U.S. press, returning American prisoners of war can barely restrain their enthusiasm for god, country, Nixon, and the Indochina war. What's more, they are all moved to poetic heights by the ceremonies attending their homecoming.

But at least one prisoner has been overlooked by U.S. newshounds. Congratulations are therefore in order for the *Far Eastern Economic Review* for publicizing the case of Richard Waldhaus, "unemployed world traveller, hippie, drop-out and civilian POW" who was captured by the NLF in 1971.

Waldhaus was released by the NLF in February. He was duly conveyed by U.S. helicopter to Tan Son Nhut airbase for the special medevac flight to Manila,

and thence home. As Waldhaus disembarked from the helicopter, he took a glance at the movie cameras on hand to record the moving event and informed reporters that he wanted none of "this homecoming hero shit."

The military tried to isolate him for "medical treatment," but Waldhaus gave them the slip and ran off to seek out a woman friend of his. What's worse, the U.S. embassy turned up the fact that he had entered Vietnam illegally in the first place. One embassy man expressed the hope that Waldhaus would "disappear into the underground with the addicts." But alas, he was captured again, this time by Saigon, and sent back to San Francisco. There were no welcoming crowds there.

U.S. Liberals Oppose Aid to North Vietnam

By Fred Feldman

The Vietnam cease-fire agreement commits the United States to contributing "to healing the wounds of war and to postwar reconstruction" of North Vietnam. The Vietnamese view this assistance as reparations for the destruction inflicted on the North by U. S. bombers.

Nixon has suggested a \$7.5 thousand million program spread out over five years. About \$5 thousand million of this projected sum would be spent to prop up U.S. client regimes in Indochina; no more than \$2.5 thousand million is earmarked for North Vietnam.

As might be expected, the proposal has come in for criticism from ultra-conservative legislators like Republican Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona. However, the chauvinist chorus of opposition has been led not by the right wing, but by former congressional "doves." These politicians smell a rare opportunity to go Nixon one better in appealing to superpatriotism.

Senator William Proxmire, a Wisconsin Democrat, told an interviewer for the conservative newsweekly *U. S. News and World Report* (February 19): "Large-scale aid to North Vietnam is out of the question. One or two billion [billion] dollars for Hanoi has as much chance as a billion or two for the U. S. poverty program — and that is zero. No aid at any level will come until our prisoners of war are accounted for and all military activity is ended. That could be a very long time."

Proxmire's concern for the U. S. prisoners of war is not accompanied by a word about the prisoners in Thieu's jails. He imitates Nixon by assuming that the North Vietnamese, perhaps out of some mad collector's compulsion, are anxious to hold on to some Americans.

In order to keep one foot in the liberal camp while appealing to voters who oppose "aiding the Communists," the liberals counterpose Nixon's severe cutbacks in social expenditure at home to his supposed "generosity"



MCGOVERN: Wants no aid given to "our adversary in the war."

to the Vietnamese. Although the liberals' opposition to these cutbacks has been remarkably feeble, their fight against giving aid to the North Vietnamese promises to be quite energetic.

One of the participants in the liberal anti-aid campaign is Minnesota Senator Hubert Humphrey. Humphrey, who ran for president in 1968 as a supporter of the war after helping Lyndon Johnson carry it out for four years, experienced a "change of heart" during his campaign for the U. S. Senate in 1970. After two years as a "dove," Humphrey has now experienced yet another profound inner transformation.

"How can I vote for a program of rebuilding Haiphong and Hanoi," he asked plaintively, "when we haven't cleaned up the streets here in Washington from the 1967 [1968—IP] fire and riots."

Senator J. William Fulbright, the Arkansas Democrat who was long regarded as the leader of the Senate doves, has proposed that funds im-

pounded by Nixon for agricultural subsidies and other programs must be released before a penny is given to the North Vietnamese.

The most emetic performance was given by Senator George McGovern, who was the Democrats' "peace" candidate for president in 1972. During the campaign he called for the United States to help in "repairing the wreckage left by this war."

Outflanked by Nixon on the "peace" issue, McGovern decided to attack the Republican president from the opposite direction.

"I cannot be at all sympathetic now," McGovern announced to the Senate February 21, "to a massive program of direct reconstruction aid. . . . I cannot believe we will tell the American people that they must still go without services they need, so we can give huge sums of aid to our adversary in the war."

The Nixon administration has thus far maintained a low profile in defending its commitment to assist the reconstruction of North Vietnam. When one congressman expressed his opposition to giving "one cockeyed dime by way of reparations," Secretary of State William Rogers hastened to reassure him that "no one in this administration will give them one cockeyed dime for reparations either."

The proposed aid, Rogers insists, is not "reparations" but an "investment in peace," i. e., a means of pressuring the North Vietnamese leaders into ending their support for the liberation forces in the South.

On March 5, Elliot Richardson, Nixon's secretary of defense, made this explicit. He warned that no assistance for the North would be forthcoming unless all fighting stopped in Vietnam. Since the continued fighting stems from Thieu's efforts to chip away at NLF-held territory, Richardson's statement amounts to a demand that the liberation forces cease defending themselves as the price of aid to Hanoi.

The stance adopted by the Senate doves has the side effect of providing Nixon with additional maneuvering room. If Hanoi resists his demand for new concessions, Nixon can threaten to let the liberals win this one. □

Quality Control

"Production must not be hindered for the sake of equipment maintenance."—Kim Il Sung

First National Elections in Bangladesh

"I am the boat," declared Bangladesh Prime Minister Mujibur Rahman, "and every vote for the boat will reach me." The boat is the symbol of Rahman's party, the Awami League, which has ruled Bangladesh since the surrender of the Pakistani army of occupation in December 1971. Rahman's declaration was one of the main Awami League slogans during the election campaign preceding the March 7 voting for the new national assembly.

The attempt to present every one of the Awami League candidates as the personal representative of Rahman, who retains immense popularity, apparently worked. Because of transportation and communication difficulties, final returns will not be available for weeks, but most reports indicate that the Awami League won 279 of the 289 contested seats; in eleven districts Awami League candidates ran unopposed.

One-party rule, which has been an established fact in Bangladesh since the end of 1971, has thus been formalized by the March 7 election.

But overwhelming as they were in terms of the number of assembly seats, the results do not indicate such enormous popular support for the Awami League as Rahman would like to pretend. For one thing, less than 50 percent of the eligible voters cast ballots. (Government-controlled radio stations in Dacca described this as a "heavy" turnout, which is perhaps an indication of the degree of popular participation the Awami League is seeking.)

Also, the stranglehold the Awami League had over the mechanics of the election virtually assured its victory. The March 4 issue of the Dacca English-language weekly *Holiday* described some of the ruling party's built-in advantages:

"In the dual capacity of being on the one hand ministers, office holders, and relief operators, and, on the other, ruling party candidates, the Awami League nominees have made liberal use of the helicopters, trains, steamers, launches, jeeps, and cars for their own electioneering. While an opposition

campaigner had to spend two or three days to travel from Dacca to the outlying areas, the Awami League propagandists covered several areas in the matter of a day, thanks to the faster means of transport."

The government-controlled media, which in Bangladesh is most of the newspapers and all the radio and television, gave coverage almost exclusively to the Awami League candidates. Apart from its advantage in exposure, the Awami League had two means of influencing the population: pressure and patronage. *Holiday* reported that voters were told by the Awami League that foreign aid, essential to avoid famine, would end if the Rahman regime were not returned to power. And relief efforts—distribution of food, repairing of roads, installations of wells, and so on—showed a marked preelection upswing in many districts where the Awami League was in danger of being voted out.

But there was one additional weapon in the Awami League election arsenal: physical intimidation of opposition candidates and their supporters.

The three major parties that ran candidates against the League were the National Awami party (Bhashani), the formerly pro-Peking group led by the peasant militant Maulana Bhashani; the National Awami party (Muzzafar), the pro-Moscow group that has generally supported Rahman's policies as "progressive"; and the Jatiya Samajtantrik Dal (National Socialist party), a leftist organization led by A. S. M. Abdur Rab, Shahjihan Siraj, and Major Ahmed Jalil, one of the best-known commanders of the Mukti Bahini (Liberation Forces) during the war of independence.

Each of these parties—even the NAP(M)—reported numerous assaults on its candidates by Awami League goons.

The NAP(M)'s charges were especially significant, since this party has tried at all costs to avoid embarrassing the Rahman regime because of Moscow's favorable attitude toward Mujib. It claimed that Awami Leaguers had attacked NAP(M) cam-

paigned in Khulna, Pabna, Habiganj, Nawabganj, Dohar, and Sylhet.

Kazi Zafar Ahmed, general secretary of the NAP(B), charged that his party's campaign workers had been attacked in Mymensingh, Jessore, Rajshahi, Dinjpur, Kushtia, Chittagong, Sylhet, and Faridpur.

But the most serious progovernment gangsterism seems to have fallen on the JSD. The JSD originates from a split in the formerly pro-Awami League student union. While it has not developed a coherent program of opposition to the regime, it has apparently picked up a good deal of support from student leftists whose hostility to Maoism has kept them out of the NAP(B) and various pro-Peking far-left groups.

In its March 4 issue *Holiday* reported that in the "northern parts of the country as well as in the southeastern districts, many JSD activists have been jailed and many others physically assaulted."

The most flagrant attack came during the last week of February, when a group of armed thugs assaulted a JSD meeting in Barisal. Major Jalil was singled out by the goons and was hospitalized after the attack.

On February 27 the JSD held a rally to protest both the attack on Jalil and the Awami League's election thuggery in general. The speeches indicated that the election experience may have induced the JSD to shift to the left. The speakers, *Holiday* reported, "charged the new Establishment with rampant corruption and nepotism in the country. They said that the Government's economic policies, now being paraded by the ruling party as socialist programmes, were aimed at setting up a new noose around the neck of the common men. Socialism of the ruling party means the perpetuation of class exploitation by the feudal lords and the newly emergent capitalists under a new garb, they added."

On the day of the voting, the Jatiya Rakkhi Bahini (National Defense Forces), a semiregular paramilitary outfit that serves as both the police and the shock troops of the Awami League, was posted at all polling places, perhaps as a final reminder to voters that Rahman considered an "antiboat" vote to be an "antisocial" vote. □

First-Round Vote Sets Back Gaullists

In the March 4 voting in France, the ruling Gaullists appeared to lose in one blow all the gains they won in the plebiscitary elections of June 1968. "Overall, the majority vote lined up exactly with what it was in 1967," the March 6 *Le Monde* reported.

The main gainer was the "renovated" Socialist party of François Mitterrand, which, in conjunction with its left-liberal allies, got 20.36% of the vote, as against the 16.53% and 18.96% its predecessor, the Fédération de la Gauche, won in 1968 and 1967 respectively. The Communist party got 21.25%, a gain of 1.23% over 1968, but still short of its 22.51% share of the vote in 1967.

The Socialist party's vote was the highest scored in the entire postwar period. Mitterrand's strategy of a bloc with the Communist party evidently paid off, making the moribund Social Democrats at least temporarily a major force once again in French politics.

Moreover, in the second-round voting on March 11 the Socialist party, running with the left liberals under the title of the UGSD [Union de la Gauche Socialiste et Démocrate—Union of the Socialist and Democratic Left], can expect to do even better relative to the CP: "Communist voters, in this election as in the past, have proved far more disciplined and responsive to their leaders' instructions than the Socialists," Nan Robertson reported from Paris in the March 10 *New York Times*.

"The [French Institute of Public Opinion] poll published today showed that virtually all the French Communists surveyed would vote for a Socialist running in their constituencies in a Socialist-Gaullist duel. Only 68 per cent of the Socialists interviewed said that they would return the favor in a Communist-Gaullist race."

The total vote of the Union de la Gauche [Union of the Left, the coalition of the Socialists, Communists, and left liberals] was 41.61% as against

38.48 for the Gaullists. The 6% won by the PSU [Parti Socialiste Unifié—United Socialist party], the far left, and independent leftists could also be expected to go for the UG on the second round.

But, although their vote was less than predicted, the centrists of the "Reform" bloc were still in a position to weight the results against the left. They got 12.56% of the vote. Moreover, Mitterrand estimates that because of unfair districting the left would have to win 52% of the vote in order to get control of the National Assembly.

The government and its allies evidently have been hoping that in the second round, scheduled for March 11, their "red scare" tactics would have a bigger effect. President Georges Pompidou went on television the day before the runoff elections to warn voters that they were faced with a stark choice between two societies: one "which suppresses individual liberty, the right of property, and submits each person's life to the authority of a totalitarian party and administration; and the other, a free society, with imperfections and injustices, to be sure, but respecting individual rights."

As the pressures built up in advance of the second-round voting, the centrists apparently split, with Jean Lecanuet denouncing the UG as a "Marxist coalition" and Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber, the other main leader of the bloc, arguing that the main thing was to prevent the government from gaining an absolute majority so that it would be forced to broaden its coalition.

Despite the unclear perspectives of the UG, the defections from the Gaullists clearly reflected strong discontent with the government on the part of the population.

In this context, the vote for the far left was quite significant. Although the March 6 *Le Monde* recorded a 3.29% vote for "the PSU and the far left," which was down from 3.95% in 1968, the composition of the vote had

changed markedly. There was a striking swing from the left Social Democratic PSU to the revolutionary-left bloc of Lutte Ouvrière [Workers' Struggle] and the Ligue Communiste [Communist League, the French section of the Fourth International].

In a statement in the March 8 issue of *Le Monde*, Lutte Ouvrière said:

"More than 300,000 votes were cast for the revolutionary candidates of the Ligue Communiste and Lutte Ouvrière in the 261 districts where they ran. In these districts, this represents 5% of the votes won by the PCF [Parti Communiste Français—French Communist party] and the SP, and 10% of the votes the PCF got on its own line. This means that there is a strong section of the working class in this country that has declared its readiness to demand satisfaction of its basic demands no matter what government is elected on Sunday [March 11]. This is unquestionably a warning to all those who think that the workers are resigned."

In many districts the vote of the Ligue Communist and Lutte Ouvrière approached that of the long-established and well-known PSU. In the third district of the département of Essonne outside Paris, Alain Krivine of the Ligue Communiste got 2,258 votes as against 4,311 for the PSU candidate, R. Cruse. In the second district of Essonne, the Lutte Ouvrière candidate, M. Godde, got 2,516 as against 3,146 for J.-F. Vallin of the PSU.

In some districts the revolutionists topped the PSU vote. For example, in the second district of the département of Seine-et-Marne near Paris, the Ligue Communiste candidate, G. Gladieux, got 2,265 votes out of 67,666 cast, as against 1,888 for Y. Letty, the candidate of the PSU. In the second district of the département of Haute-Saone, the Lutte Ouvrière candidate got 1,514 out of 57,000 votes, as against 1,509 for P. Cottard of the PSU. In some districts where the PSU did not put up a candidate this time, the revolutionists got more than the total vote for this party in the 1968 elections, as in the first district of Eure-et-Loir, where the Lutte Ouvrière candidate, L. Lanchon, got 2,202 votes as against 1,106 for the PSU in the last poll.

Irish Fighters Denounce U.S. Aid to Britain

By Gerry Foley

The Belfast Provisional republicans reacted sharply to the news that the British 40th Marine Commandos are to receive training in North Carolina. In a statement published in the March 3 issue of *The Irish People*, the weekly paper of Irish Northern Aid, the Provisional support group in the United States, the leadership of Northeast Belfast Provisional Sinn Féin said:

"With regard to the training of British Marine Commandos in America . . . We see this as a deliberate and positive act of support of British repression in Occupied Ireland by the Nixon administration.

"By offering of training facilities to these troops, we see America as allowing her bases to be used as a springboard for the furtherance of British military strength in the six counties.

"In using the excuse that these exercises were NATO in concept, we see as a feeble excuse of the obvious, that being . . . That the now notorious act of 'Operation Motorman' was mounted by kind permission of President Nixon, when he excused the British from NATO duty so as they could have full use of their armoury to mount it."

The Belfast Provisionals used a rather strange argument to try to dissuade the American government from helping its imperialist allies:

"To America we would say: Tread carefully with Britain. As a sharp reminder of Britain's devious ways we would state, Britain's involvement in the Vietnam war prior to America.

"When in 1945 Japanese troops under British command in Saigon were used to help quell the Vietnamese Nationalists led by Ho Chi Minh.

"28 years of war have followed Britain's destruction of Vietnam's first modern attempt to control her own destiny."

The intent of these passages is unclear. They could be intended as a veiled warning. But if the Provisionals mean to imply that the United States was drawn into the Vietnam war in

an attempt to clean up a mess created by Britain, this is obviously false. And certainly nothing would be gained by trying to make a distinction between the policies of the two imperialist governments.

In 1945, the British imperialists were only able to return to the Far East as the clients of their American big brothers. Both the British and later the French armies in Indochina were backed by the United States and acted as the agents of world imperialism dominated by Washington. This fact became absolutely clear as the American imperialists were forced to take over the fight against the Vietnamese liberation forces from the faltering French.

The Provisional statement, therefore, seems to reflect contradictions in the attitudes of the traditionalist militant nationalists faced with the obvious support of the American government for the British "pacification" effort in Northern Ireland. The traditionalist nationalists have tended to be pro-American both on historical grounds and because their main financial support comes from a largely conservative Irish-American population. Fighting heroically and at the cost of great personal and collective sacrifices against British imperialism in Northern Ireland, the Provisionals have increasingly found themselves facing a united bloc of Dublin, Washington, and London. It is natural for them to identify more and more with the freedom fighters in Vietnam, who have also had to fight virtually alone against overwhelming odds.

Faced in particular with a hypocritical campaign against "terrorism" in the British and American capitalist press, even some rather conservative Provisional leaders have denounced Nixon in recent months as "the biggest terrorist of all" and "the real mad bomber." In view of the American government's atrocities in Vietnam, it is no longer possible even for the most anticommunist nationalist fighters in Ireland to view the United States as a nonimperialist country.

The main factor that seems to prevent Provisional fighters from openly identifying with other anti-imperialist struggles and from waging a consistent battle against the conservative institutions that are out to destroy them is their relying almost exclusively on military means to defeat British imperialism. From this standpoint, they are reluctant to do or say anything that might alienate the conservative Irish-Americans who directly or indirectly provide most of the material resources for the guerrilla campaign. "What have the Vietnamese ever done for us?" you can hear some Provisionals say.

The fact is that although the Vietnamese have not sent any material aid, they have done more than all the weapons available on the international black market could do at this point to tie the hands of British and American imperialism. As Irish-Americans organize to fight U.S.-supported repression against their relatives and countrymen in Northern Ireland as well as repressive attacks on themselves, they will find their best allies among the millions of people in America and throughout the world who have actively opposed the Vietnam war. A whole generation in the United States in particular has gotten its basic political education in the struggle to halt their own government's murderous imperialist assault on a small nation.

The Provisional leaders and the militant Irish nationalists in Ireland and the overseas Irish communities can compare the force of the antiwar movement—which made the war the major political issue in the United States and drove one president from office—with the effects of the verbal support they have gotten from some big-city Democratic party politicians. The most the Irish have gotten from these figures is a few favors and a little moral support that is quite minor in comparison with the anti-Irish campaign of the big press and the main sections of the government.

Furthermore, the Irish freedom fighters and their supporters pay a price for failing to distinguish clearly between their friends and their enemies. As more and more conservative forces and opportunist politicians inevitably turn against them, the danger increases of confusion and demoralization in their ranks. The supporters

of Irish freedom in the United States in particular have not been prepared politically to stand alone against all the "respectable" institutions of society and rely on their own strength. The Provisionals do not seem to understand that all these institutions are obstacles on the road to a free Ireland and that there is no way of avoiding the task of clearing them out of the way.

As a result, the response of the Provisional supporters to the growing campaign against the Irish movement in the United States has been contradictory and confused. The attacks have been interpreted as coming only from certain individuals or layers of government. The Provisional paper, *The Irish People*, has been filled recently with articles plugging various politicians—not just liberals like Paul O'Dwyer but even a "law and order" candidate like Congressman Mario Biaggi, an ex-policeman running for the Democratic nomination for mayor of New York.

It is ironic that a movement under attack from the FBI and the courts would give aid and comfort to the candidacy of a person so tightly bound up with these institutions just because he has demagogically used the Irish issue to garner votes. This practice, after all, is not unusual on the part of local politicians who do not have to take responsibility for U.S. foreign policy. Many such figures have spoken out in support of Irish freedom over the past fifty years without benefiting the cause in any substantial way. The British government can afford to dismiss this sort of thing as meaningless petty politics. Behind the scenes the federal government assures them of this. Moreover, older republicans cannot help remembering that De Valera's being elected with IRA support, for instance, did not prevent him from turning on the patriot movement and smashing it in the 1940s.

It is not necessary to endorse politicians to get the kind of support they are able to give. That has little effect one way or the other. They do what they think will get them votes. But for a revolutionary movement to support opportunistic politicians who cannot help getting tied up in machine politics, or—worse—who call for repression of other peoples fighting for libera-

tion, compromises the principles of republicanism, which are its only capital and which have sustained it through the generations.

Furthermore, such a policy means alienating potential allies who would fight to the end alongside the republicans against repression and the "respectable institutions"—just to get the verbal support of opportunists who will change sides whenever it suits their advantage.

Moreover, while the Provisional supporters do not seem to demand any specific commitments from politicians like Biaggi, some of their spokespersons present their allies and potential allies with a virtual ultimatum. For example, Martin McGing wrote in the March 3 *Irish People*: "The time has come for all, where organized or not, to join Irish Northern Aid in order that we may be able to strengthen our bargaining position here and be able to render assistance to our people at home."

Surely it would be much more effective to call for unity in action of all who support the Irish cause without demanding that anyone join one particular group. Not only would more people probably be drawn into activity but the impact of united non-sectarian actions would certainly be

much greater than demonstrations by the supporters of only one party in Ireland.

But as McGing points out, the Irish have a long tradition of fighting repression not only in Ireland but in the United States. They can learn the lessons necessary to defeat the latest attacks on their movement from the campaigns to free the Fenian prisoners, for example, in which representatives of all parties from conservatives to revolutionary socialists united to free "terrorists" like O'Donovan-Rossa, among others.

The clear support of the U.S. government for repression in Northern Ireland has posed a difficult challenge to the politically and socially conservative American supporters of the fight for an independent united Ireland. It can only be hoped that they will confront the enemies of Irish freedom in the United States as fearlessly and uncompromisingly as the young Volunteers have done in Northern Ireland, and that they will let no prejudices or narrow group interests stand in the way of waging a principled, united fight against the obstacles blocking the path to the kind of independence the Irish people deserve. □



Demonstration of some 2,000 in Copenhagen February 18 in favor of free abortion. Speakers at the demonstration, organized by the Dansk Kvindesamfund (Danish Women's Association) and supported by a number of political parties and groups, expressed support for the Social-Democratic government's legislative proposal on free abortion.

How to Oppose Racist Sports Tour

By Keith Locke

[The following article is reprinted from the March 2, 1973, issue of the revolutionary-socialist newspaper *Socialist Action*, published in Wellington, New Zealand. It discusses the debate over how best to oppose the New Zealand tour, scheduled for May, of the all-white South African Springbok rugby team.

[Supporters of a mass-action perspective have called antitour demonstrations for March 21, the anniversary of the massacre of Black protesters in Sharpeville, South Africa.]

* * *

"Up to 10,000 [anti-tour] demonstrators can be mustered in Auckland, Wellington, and Christchurch," wrote Norman Kirk in his January letter to the New Zealand Rugby Union. There is no doubt that he was correct.

Virtually all the unions, churches, and student groups oppose the tour, and opinion polls show less than half the population in favour. If anything, Kirk was underestimating the potential for mass protest on the issue.

In these circumstances, the disruptionist strategy of the HART [Halt All Racist Tours] leaders is nothing short of disastrous. The media focus on their childish schemes has played into the hands of the pro-apartheid, pro-tour forces, allowing groups like War Against Recreational Disruption (WARD) to divert the issue from racist sport to one of the democratic rights of New Zealanders.

The February 18 *Sunday Times*, reporting on a "clip-and-mail" poll they had just conducted, said that letters from "pro-tour" readers indicated that they were voting "not on apartheid, but on a law and order issue."

The disruptionist strategy is making it more difficult for the anti-tour movement to get a hearing from that large section of New Zealanders who, though not in favor of the system of apartheid, still support the tour. Most of these people can be won over through a strategy of mass protest

and accompanying educational work. It is essentially this approach which, since the 1965 Springbok tour, has changed the minds of half the population.

Most people realise that if the trade unions took direct action against the tour, then it would be extremely difficult for it to proceed. In 1970, Australian trade unions placed a ban on services to the visiting South African rugby team, and this was a major factor in the cancellation of the cricket tour which was to follow. The National government was so worried about a similar eventuality here that it included stiff penalties against "non-industrial" strikes in the draft Industrial Relations Act.

However, despite the verbal stand of trade union leaderships against the tour, there is considerable resistance within the unions to direct action. The pretentious and elitist behaviour of the HART leaders tends to discredit the anti-tour movement in the eyes of workers, and makes it difficult for anti-tour activists in the unions to motivate and carry proposals for collective action.

But what the New Zealand working people think and do is of secondary interest to the HART leaders. To them the tour can be stopped by the physical action of a relatively small number of "committed" activists. The January *HART News* declares that "the tour is only certain to be cancelled when both the rugby union and the government are convinced that it is not physically possible for the tour to be held."

Announcing the disruption policy in June 1971, Trevor Richards, HART's national chairman, described it as "a tactic which appeals to self-interest and not to reason." The right wing fanatics who run strong-arm organisations like WARD could not ask for anything better. Richards has been doing their recruiting for them. If you are pro-tour and you accept HART's definition of the situation—whether the tour is going to be "physically pos-

sible"—then what is more logical than to join WARD?

Whether HART's physical disruption is "violent" or "non-violent" is of secondary importance. "Non-violent" disruption may be a little less distressing to those on the receiving end, but that is about all. To pro-tour rugby fans the effect is the same, and they are not likely to distinguish between "non-violence" and "violence" in their response.

HART is opening the door to wide-scale violence against the anti-tour movement, which can only do it harm. An atmosphere of physical confrontation can only hinder the organisation of peaceful protests. Tens of thousands of people can be drawn into such demonstrations, but they are going to be reluctant to get involved if the streets are thick with police, and if conflict between pro-tour and anti-tour forces is commonplace.

The HART leaders are cultivating these fears. In an interview published in the October 18, 1972, *Evening Post*, Peter Wilson, the Wellington Area Officer of HART, issued the following warning:

"People will get hurt, even killed, and this serious factor must be recognised and seriously considered by the volunteer protestors. Have a long look at what's involved and properly gauge the safety factors to life and limb."

It is inescapable that disruption operates on different assumptions from mass action and *undermines* it. Some anti-tour activists, who don't like to see dissension in the movement, try to ignore this. Disruptive and non-disruptive protests can be organised side by side, they say, and both are good.

The HART leaders themselves are under no such illusions, and understand the contradiction between the two strategies. On many occasions they have tried to rubbish the mass-action approach. At the March 18-19, 1972, national anti-apartheid conference, Trevor Richards was adamant that 50,000 people marching down Queen Street in Auckland would have no effect on the government, but a much smaller group of disruptors could create a state of siege which would make it impossible for the tour to proceed.

"Oh, We Don't Mind *Peaceful* Demonstrations," read the front-page head-

line in the June 1972 *HART News*. It was a quote from Barry Delamore of the Friends of South Africa, supposedly evidence that the mass protest approach is bankrupt. In fact, all the evidence is in the opposite direction. People like Delamore are in a much weaker position now than they were a few years ago before the big demonstrations and meetings against racist rugby took place. The HART leaders also ignore the tremendous success of mass action in the anti-war movement (where U.S. and New Zealand troops were forced to withdraw from Vietnam), in protests

against the planned Omega base, and on many other issues. No one should be fooled when right wing politicians try to dismiss mass demonstrations as ineffective.

There are no shortcuts for the anti-tour movement. It is only when the great majority of the people in New Zealand really understand the issue, and when this is reflected in large-scale activity around it, that this country's contacts with apartheid sport will come to a halt. HART's arrogant threats serve only to postpone that day. □

Labor Party Left Fights Whitlam's Backtracking

Australia Tries to Keep Singapore Spy Base

During the 1971 election campaign, Labor party leader Gough Whitlam promised to withdraw Australian military forces from Singapore. He now states that well over 600 Australian troops will remain. To explain this turnabout, Whitlam's cabinet has leaked to the press secret data revealing that Australia has been operating a radio-monitoring base in Singapore; it is closely linked to U.S. imperialism's worldwide intelligence network.

"From this listening post [Singapore]," wrote Maximilian Walsh in the February 16 *Christian Science Monitor*, "the Australian Defense Signals Division was able to pick up field communications between Indonesians during the period of confrontation between Malaysia and Singapore.

"The electronics intelligence unit, numbering about 160 experts, is directly associated with the intelligence forces in the United States through a long-standing 'swap' arrangement."

The Defense Signals Division was included in a top-secret intelligence treaty Australia signed with Great Britain and the United States in 1947. Although a Labor government was then in power, top Labor leaders insist they were never informed of the existence of the treaty.

Whitlam's retreat has sparked strong opposition, led by the Socialist Left grouping, in the Australian Labor party (ALP). At a meeting of the Victoria State Council of the ALP

a two-thirds majority passed a resolution proposed by Socialist Left spokesman Bill Hartley that stated:

"In view of the federal government's progressive foreign affairs steps, it is with regret that we note the statements of the Minister for Defence concerning the retention of a large number of support forces in Singapore. Bearing in mind the tragedy of Vietnam, we are most concerned at the possible effects of continuing military commitments in Asia or elsewhere.

"We are also of the view that the Singapore government is antidemocratic and that Australian military association with Singapore is incompat-

ible with Labor principles."

This motion came under bitter attack in the nation's capitalist press. The liberal weekly *Nation Review* accused Hartley of "playing the role of a pale pink Che."

Hartley responded to this red-baiting by asking in the February 16 Melbourne *Herald*, "Is the Labor government to reflect the aspirations of those who elected it, and the mass Labor movement which provides its base? Or is it reduced to the piteous condition of being manipulated by a civil-military security establishment whose own bureaucratic interests, career potential, and political sympathies lie predominantly with Labor's political opponents?"

Whitlam, too, has come in for criticism from the press—not for going back on his preelection promises but for letting the Australian public in on the government's participation in an international espionage network.

Whitlam has shown signs of bending to his proimperialist critics. Defence Minister Lance Barnard reassured them on February 28 that the activities of U.S. military installations in Australia would remain secret.

The issue of maintaining Australian forces in Singapore has divided Whitlam's cabinet. Dr. Jim Cairns, secondary minister for industry and overseas trade; Dr. Moss Cass, environment minister; Dr. Everingham, health minister; and Gordon Bryant, aboriginal affairs minister, have endorsed the Victoria ALP's stand for full withdrawal from Singapore. □

Tariq Ali Addresses Meeting in Oslo

Oslo

Tariq Ali, a member of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, spoke here February 13 on the topic "Internationalism in Revolutionary Strategy." The meeting, held in a packed Club 7 theater, was sponsored by the Oktober-gruppa [October Group], a newly formed group of sympathizers of the Fourth International.

In his introductory remarks, Tariq Ali discussed the kind of internationalism the Bolsheviks stood for and how a consistent internationalism was

abandoned with the rise of Stalinism and replaced with the theory of socialism in one country—with tragic consequences for the proletariat in China and Spain.

He then turned to the deplorable continuation of this policy in the present-day foreign policy of the Russian and Chinese bureaucracies.

A lively discussion ensued in which representatives of all the various left-wing groups in Norway engaged in a debate with Ali, for whom they found they were no match. □

The Second Fall of the Dollar

By Ernest Mandel

Fifteen months after its first devaluation, the dollar has just suffered a second. During the negotiations around the first devaluation, certain capitalist groups and their spokesmen were able to spread around the illusion that the new exchange rates "would stick." But today, nobody upholds such an optimistic prognosis for the international capitalist system any more. For the time being, the system of fixed exchange rates is done for—that is the bitter conclusion that emerges from this second devaluation, which will inevitably be followed by others.

The Technical Causes

From a technical point of view, the causes of this fall of the dollar are not hard to find. Today, outside the United States, multinational corporations (most of them in fact American) have dollar holdings of upwards of \$50-60 thousand million in liquid or partially liquid form. Each of these capitalist companies is prepared to hold these liquid assets in dollar form only insofar as it is not worried about taking a loss in exchange.

But since 1971 (actually since 1968), the U.S. central bank has refused to exchange these dollars for gold. The central banks of other capitalist countries will exchange them for their own national currencies only within certain limits.

So all that is necessary for the agreed-upon system of exchange rates to break down is for a certain amount of dollars—2 or 3 thousand million out of the 50 thousand million total!—to be thrown on the currency market. This is what just happened. And inevitably, it will happen again.

The capitalists on a world scale would be willing without hesitation to hold these liquid assets in dollar form only if one of two conditions were met: if the dollar's convertibility into gold (or into some other means of payment with an intrinsic value) were reestablished; or if American imperialism re-

gained its competitive superiority, so that dollars would again be linked to American commodities that could be resold at any time because they would be a better bargain and of superior quality to those of U.S. imperialism's competitors.

Neither of these conditions is about to be reestablished; the persisting deficit in the American balance of trade after the first devaluation demonstrates this. Hence, an exacerbation of the crisis of the international monetary system is inevitable.

Thus, a law established by Karl Marx more than a century ago is confirmed: No inconvertible paper money can retain a fixed rate of exchange beyond the boundaries of a state. The second fall of the dollar thus confirms the decline of American hegemony, the lack of an international capitalist authority, and the reality of inter-imperialist competition.

Economic and Social Causes

The mass of paper dollars that has inundated the capitalist world during the past three years did not fall from the sky. It was not the product of a technical "mistake" made by the Washington monetary authorities, nor was it the reflection of a diabolical scheme to attack the trade of Europe and Japan, nor was it the result of Common Market protectionism. It is the product of the inflation of credit and the budget deficit that the Nixon administration was forced to resort to in order to get out of the 1969-71 recession.

To fail to understand this is to present an idyllic image of the inextricable contradictions in which American imperialism, and with it the international capitalist system, is mired.

Immediately halting the American balance of payments deficit during 1969, 1970, and 1971 would have involved transforming the American recession into a very serious overproduction crisis, would have meant 10 or 12 million unemployed in the United

States instead of 5 or 6 million. That would have involved a very serious economic crisis in the rest of the capitalist world. The disintegration of the international monetary system is the price paid to temporarily avoid this economic and social crisis.

The American bourgeoisie and its ideologues are completely aware of this. If today the bourgeoisie talks about "limiting" the annual increase in the monetary mass (inflation of credit) to 5 percent a year (as opposed to 10 percent a year since 1969), it is because it knows that the higher rate would provoke a new recession. Its only hope, articulated by Arthur Burns and Milton Friedman, is that it would be only a "minirecession." We shall see.

The dilemma of the European and Japanese capitalists is no less real. They can demand that Washington return to a more "orthodox" monetary policy. Their pressure is doubtless partially responsible for the budget cuts (all at the expense of the working people and the poor) that Nixon has just decided on. At some point, they could even refuse to defend the dollar's exchange rate (which is what the Swiss bankers did on the eve of the first devaluation, and also what the West German bankers finally wound up doing, thus precipitating the second devaluation).

But by doing this, they would be running great risks, for two main reasons. Above all because every serious economic and social crisis in the United States, the central fortress of the international imperialist system, would have grave repercussions in all the other sectors of the system. The U.S. domestic market is today a key sector of the world market for all the other capitalist powers.

Bankers and Industrialists

Not only that. By pushing towards devaluing the dollar, they are pushing toward devaluing a not inconsequential fraction of their own holdings. A not inconsequential (albeit minority) part of this worldwide floating mass of tens of billions [milliards] of dollars is held by European and Japanese capitalists. These dollars automatically lose a part of their value when the dollar falls.

The capitalist partner-competitors of the United States are thus condemned

to always lose, one way or the other.

But the opposite is also true. On both sides of the Atlantic, the first commentaries on the consequences of the second devaluation stressed its effects on world trade. In New York they were jubilant: American exports would become less expensive, imports more expensive. In Düsseldorf and Tokyo they groaned: "Our" exports will get more expensive.

All these commentaries are superficial and partially imprecise. The world market is not as monopolized as national markets are. Prices on the world market are not so closely controllable by the big trusts. An increase in the rate of exchange will therefore not automatically reflect itself in prices. Furthermore, demand is not so elastic; products are not so easily substituted for one another as on the national market.

This means that European and Japanese exports to the United States will not decrease in the same proportion as the devaluation of the dollar, that American exports to Europe and Japan will not go up in the same proportion, that the cost of living in the United States will be affected by the higher prices of imports, and that the general expansion of world trade will slow down. The gains anticipated by U. S. industry thus threaten to be less than expected (as was already the case with the first devaluation).

Furthermore, it must not be forgotten that the European and Japanese central banks are not hoarding "devalued" dollars, but are immediately reinvesting them in U. S. treasury bonds on which they earn interest. Thus, one of the consequences of the influx of dollars in Europe and of the devaluation is that the overseas capitalists' share in the surplus value created by American workers increases. In this sense the devaluation, first proclaimed as a "triumph" by Washington, reflects a deteriorated situation and not a strengthened position.

But still, the basic thing is another point. What the dollar devaluation wins for American industrialists and loses for German industrialists, it will lose for American financial groups and win for European and Japanese financial circles. It means in effect that from now on it will take more dollars to buy a factory in Europe, less Euro-

pean (and Japanese) currency to buy a factory in the United States. In this sense also, the American imperialists have no reason to rejoice about the fall of their currency.

The Common Market Threatened

Nevertheless, American imperialism did score some points against its European competitors. But this success is not so much in the realm of trade as in forcing a halt to the attempts at unification of the European imperialist powers through the strengthening of the Common Market.

To promote an interpenetration of capitals capable of creating enterprises of the same power as the major American trusts, the European bourgeoisie would have to create a European superstate with its own currency, its own industrial policy, and its own independent nuclear arms. In view of the great differences in their situations and the great divergences that separate them, these imperialists can hope to achieve such a unification only one step at a time. The formation of the Common Market was conceived only as a first step. Monetary unification by 1980 was supposed to follow as the second decisive step.

But the disintegration of the international monetary system hit the different imperialist powers at a time when the economic and social situations in the various countries are widely disparate. Two of the four big Common Market powers, Great Britain and Italy, are going through a difficult economic situation marked by exceptionally severe class-struggle tension. The bourgeoisies of these two countries could not agree to a united solution with the other European bourgeoisies. They "floated" their currencies not only in relation to the dollar but also in relation to the other European currencies. In one blow, the hopes of monetary union based on a European "superstate" were shot down.

Thus, the devaluation of the dollar, following in the wake of the American attempt to scuttle the Concorde—and with it the threat of seeing the European aeronautics industry outstrip America's for ten years—has put very severe strains on the capitalist integration of Europe.

Calls for "European solidarity" are

on the rise in every bourgeois capital; but reality does not jibe with the appeals.

New Contradictions Hitting Declining Capitalism

American imperialism is trying to make the European and Japanese capitalists bear the brunt of its own falling rate of profit. The European and Japanese capitalists are responding by trying to impose the necessary sacrifices on their own workers in the form of wage freezes, incomes policy, "wage consultations," "rationalization," and so on. When the European workers refuse, the bourgeoisie does not miss a chance to reveal its own basic hypocrisy.

Last week *The Economist*, one of the most representative weeklies of the British bourgeoisie, published two articles, one devoted to the workers' revolts against the incomes policy decreed by the Tory cabinet, the other on the international speculation that provoked the devaluation of the dollar.

In the second article, it was explained that no political decision can prevent "the laws of the market" from fixing the floating rates of exchange; a governmental decree aimed at counteracting the "laws of the market" would be worth only the paper it is printed on.

But in the first article, all the stops were pulled in trumpeting moral indignation against the British trade unions, which had dared to defy government decrees fixing the rate of wages and which had sought to "exploit" the "laws of the market" to their own profit, thus committing outrages against parliament, democracy, and humanity.

In other words, only the workers must bow before government decrees; only the speculators have the right to exploit the laws of the market to their own advantage.

But behind this hypocrisy lies an objective contradiction to which attention must more and more be directed. These famous "speculators" who made the dollar fall are not some obscure figures of the netherworld, the "mafia" of "international finance." They are the multinational corporations, that is, the most honorable leading lights of industry, banking, and trade

in all the imperialist countries—and American capitalists in the lead! These gentlemen have today become uncontrollable by their own governments. But at the same time, they need governmental aid more than ever. Precisely the 1969 recession reminded them of the sad fact that whatever their profits may be, they can very soon be brought to the brink of ruin if a sufficiently deep recession shakes the economies of the imperialist countries.

Bourgeois governments less and less able to restrain the multinational corporations, while the multinational corporations cannot do without more and more sizable periodic governmental

support and subsidies; an inflation that must be accelerated to hold back increasingly serious recessions, but which at the same time wrecks the international monetary system and thereby disrupts the expansion of world trade; an accelerated inter-imperialist competition at the very time that the formation of a new international monetary system demands the greatest international bourgeois solidarity; the necessity of "disciplining" the wageworkers and the impossibility of breaking the obviously rising combativity of the workers—these are the new strains that today are added to the classical contradictions of the capitalist system. □



ERNEST MANDEL

Seeks to Halt Spread of 'Dangerous Ideas'

Switzerland Upholds Ban Against Mandel

The Federal Council in Switzerland rejected on February 7 the final appeal by Ernest Mandel against the government ruling banning him from Swiss territory. The ban was handed down by the federal prosecutor's office on January 27, 1970. Mandel is a member of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.

The argumentation of the council, according to the February 16 issue of *La Brèche*, semimonthly organ of the Swiss Trotskyist group, the Ligue Marxiste Révolutionnaire (Revolutionary Marxist League), was based on two considerations: "Mandel 'has called on his audiences to create conditions favorable to a future revolution'; and Mandel is banned from France and Germany, so why not also from Switzerland!"

The ban against Mandel, noted *La Brèche*, is not a one-shot affair, but is part of a general attempt to lay the groundwork for an eventual criminalization of the political activities of the far left as a whole.

Soon after the decision to uphold the ban on him, Mandel granted an interview to the *National Zeitung* in Basel. Excerpts from his statements were published in *La Brèche*. Mandel said, in part:

"The decision of the Federal Council and the prosecutor of the Confederation to indefinitely ban me from Swit-

zerland is based on nothing but the nature of my political ideas. . . .

"The decision is content to point out that I represent the current of revolutionary Marxism. . . .

"Such a decision, based on the 'dangerous ideas' analysis, represents an arbitrary assault on the freedom of thought and expression of scientists as well as politicians, whether they be 'foreign' or 'native-born.' It is also as inoperable as it is dangerous. Such limitations on the right of thought and expression are inoperable in that they contribute rather to the spreading of proscribed ideas. As Wolf Biermann, an oppositionist poet in the GDR [German Democratic Republic], put it: 'It is what is proscribed that helps sharpen our weapons.'

"This is a constant feature of the history of ideas: Neither the struggle of the Roman emperors against Christianity, nor that of the Inquisition against the Reformation, nor that of Hitler and that of Stalin, to take only the most obvious, succeeded in preventing the spread of ideas that were to be destroyed through proscription and violence.

"The Swiss government should realize that in my lectures I reach at most a few hundred people, whereas the ban alone on my entry into Switzerland has already had the effect that Radio Basel invited me to give a lecture for its German-Swiss listeners,

and the sale of my books, pamphlets, and articles has at least quadrupled in Switzerland since the banning! Thus, through its prohibition, it has made it possible for thousands of citizens to become acquainted with my 'dangerous' ideas via the radio and the newspapers."

Mandel also noted that the Swiss ban is not a sign of a society that is sure of itself, but rather of one that is in a state of decline. "Ideas are banned only when one is unable oneself to offer an equal or superior alternative to them," he added. "One uses force against a theory when one has been shown incapable of overcoming that theory and refuting it." □

Doctors' Plot?

The lead article in the February issue of *Northern Neighbors*, a Canadian Stalinist monthly published in Gravenhurst, Ontario, claims that most anti-bureaucratic dissenters in the Soviet Union "are obviously mental cases; most of them schizophrenics."

According to *Northern Neighbors*, protests against the jailing of these critics in mental hospitals stem from "a worldwide campaign, organized from Israel."

Bukharin-Luxemburg Debate Reprinted

[The following review appeared in the January 20 issue of *The Red Mole*, the paper of the International Marxist Group, British section of the Fourth International.]

* * *

The revolutionary left in this country is only just emerging from many decades of political and theoretical under-development. One of the first conditions for a revitalisation of Marxist thought is an awareness of the traditions and debates in the history of the workers' movement. So we should welcome the publication of two important articles, one by Rosa Luxemburg and the other by Bukharin on the subject of *Imperialism and the Accumulation of Capital*.

Rosa Luxemburg's whole life was devoted to a struggle against capitalism and the reformist ideas of a corrupted socialist movement. She recognised that the struggle to smash the power of the bourgeoisie required a continual fight against bourgeois theories within the working class.

The reformists in the Second International had put forward the theory that capitalism was gradually, of its own accord, developing in the direction of socialism: capitalist crises would become less and less severe, production would become more and more rationally planned. The task of the socialist movement was to achieve piecemeal reforms, not to change the economic basis of capitalist society by revolutionary upheaval. Luxemburg attacked these ideas in *Social Reform or Revolution?* and *The Accumulation of Capital*. In the latter work she developed the theory that capitalism cannot expand indefinitely, that it comes to a point where no economic recovery is possible. In short she put forward the idea of the final breakdown of capitalism.

After severe criticism she published a concise reply and re-exposition of her theories, and this essay is found in the volume which is the subject of this review. Because of its lively

and cogent style this essay is probably the best introduction to her theory.

Luxemburg examined Marx's schemes on how capital is reproduced in an expanded form and found what she thought was a serious problem. If these reproduction schemes are conceived in terms of values (i.e. amounts of embodied labour time) then the

Imperialism and the Accumulation of Capital, by Rosa Luxemburg and Nikolai Bukharin. Edited by Kenneth J. Tarbuck. Translated by Rudolf Wichmann. London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, 1972. £4.

expansion of value is explained by the enlargement of the supply of available labour. But if they are viewed in price terms then where does the additional money capital come from? In vain she searches for an answer. Do the capitalists borrow the additional money capital to finance economic growth from the national bank? That, according to Luxemburg, would be to suggest that additional value can be created out of mere paper. She concludes that capitalism must eventually break down because of these difficulties in the sphere of circulation.

But, she argued, before the collapse, capitalism manages to finance expanded reproduction by the imperialist plunder of the colonies. At the same time imperialism ensures that capitalist relations of production are established on a world-wide scale, and once this comes about there are no more non-capitalist markets to sustain expanded reproduction. Hence imperialism only delays the final collapse and does not prevent the breakdown of the capitalist mode of production.

The leading theoreticians of the Second International, such as Kautsky and Otto Bauer, all missed the point in their criticisms. Bauer, for instance, gave a useful analysis of the way

the growth of accumulated values adjusts to the supply of labour time. Luxemburg pours unjust scorn on Bauer's theory, the result being that neither Bauer nor Luxemburg identifies the crux of the problem.

Bukharin alone provided an effective refutation of Luxemburg's theory. He attacks Luxemburg for confusing the accumulation of capital with the accumulation of money. This is her most fundamental error. Bukharin points out that the accumulation of capital involves the accumulation of money values, of values and the reproduction of capitalist social relations on an expanded scale. Moreover, "It is true that the amount of circulating money *usually* grows. It is incorrect that the accumulation of capital necessarily pre-supposes an increase of money." (page 199.)

This is Bukharin's first major achievement—he clearly separates money values from values, i.e. embodied labour time. Rosa Luxemburg's misconception is to confuse price with value, and that is why she shrinks from any suggestion that expanded reproduction can finance itself by credit or an injection of newly minted money by the State Bank.

Reproduction schemes were conceived by Marx in terms of values. Prices are indeed determined by values, but they are not proportional to values, even in the long-run average sense. It is the interaction of price and value which is one of the crucial dynamic features of the capitalist system. For example, the rate of profit, which appears to the capitalist in terms of prices, determines investment behaviour which causes a change in the magnitude of values.

It follows that the quantitative dynamics of the capitalist system cannot be examined in value terms alone. Luxemburg attempts to analyse the system in terms of one unit of account: it is not surprising that she finds apparent inconsistencies in the process.

Bukharin's second important achievement is to successfully attack any notion of the permanent breakdown of capitalism. The debate within the Second International was falsely polarised between opponents and advocates of capitalist breakdown. Luxemburg was unable to escape from the false terms of this debate.

Only Lenin, Bukharin and the Bolsheviks saw crises as periodic rather

than permanent. Lenin's statement that "there are no crises from which capitalism cannot recover" is a counter-part to Marx's own assertion that "permanent crises do not exist." Lenin and Bukharin attacked the vulgar breakdown theory and *thereby* paved the way for an effective demonstration of a theory of revolutionary action in October 1917.

The theoretical heritage of the Third International, of which Bukharin was a leading member, is only partially accessible to the contemporary Marxist left. If we are to understand the epoch in which we live, this heritage must be rediscovered. Bukharin's brilliant polemic is a welcome addition to the works now available in English.
— Geoff Hodgson

eleven hostages, the government sealed off all entrances to Wounded Knee. The "hostages," all residents of the town, later elected to remain in Wounded Knee, coming and going as they pleased.

The Nixon administration reacted to the protest by refusing to negotiate anything except the method of ending the occupation. It backed up this refusal with a massive show of force.

Ball wrote, "Although much has been said [in the capitalist press] of the Indian armed security—an efficient force headed by Vietnam veterans—there is a sharp contrast between the Indians' guns, often held together with adhesive tape, and the M-16s of the 'feds' [FBI agents] and the government's armored personnel carriers. There are 30 APCs in the vicinity and three near Wounded Knee."

On March 6, federal officials, angered by the Indians' refusal to back down in the face of this display of military power, broke off negotiations. On the following day the demonstrators were given an ultimatum to leave Wounded Knee by nightfall. The Indians' answer: The government "must either massacre us or meet our basic human demands."

On March 8, an Indian patrol guarding a roadblock was fired on from an armored personnel carrier and two Indians were wounded. However, apparently fearing the effect that an Attica-style slaughter of Indians would have on the U.S. image at home and abroad, the administration drew back from a full-scale assault and agreed to resume negotiations.

Despite protest meetings throughout the Pine Ridge reservation, federal officials still refused to consider removing the puppet "tribal" government. Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton said March 10 that "nothing will be gained by promoting a national guilt complex" about past treatment of the Indians.

"History is full of atrocities," he added complacently, blaming "violent, revolutionary elements" among Indian youth for the occupation of Wounded Knee. □

Kennecott Escalates Embargo Effort

It was announced February 28 that the Kennecott Copper Corporation has brought suit to impose an embargo on Chilean copper deliveries to Italy.

Demand Ouster of Fake Tribal Government

Wounded Knee Seized by Indian Militants

About 300 Indians, most of them Oglala Sioux, occupied the small South Dakota town of Wounded Knee on the Pine Ridge reservation on February 27. The Native American militants are members and supporters of the Oglala Sioux Civil Rights Organization (OSCRO) and the American Indian Movement (AIM).

OSCRO, organized in the course of a long struggle by Pine Ridge tribespeople against their tribal chairman and council over conditions on the reservation, decided on the action to press the demand that the tribal chairman, council, and constitution be suspended. These "tribal" institutions are a facade for the tight control over the reservations exercised by the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). OSCRO is also demanding a temporary federal trusteeship over the reservation until a popular constitutional convention adopts a new system of tribal government.

For support and aid in the struggle OSCRO called on AIM, a nationwide group of young Indian activists. In furtherance of its program, AIM joined in the action to advance its attempts to force the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee to investigate the federal government's violation of hundreds of treaties with the Indians. It was to dramatize this history of betrayals that the action was set in Wounded Knee, site of an 1890 massacre in which hundreds of Sioux were murdered by U.S. troops.

Officials of the Interior and Justice departments have used AIM's participation to advance an "outside agitator" theory, denouncing the militants

as renegades, adventurers, and "violent revolutionaries." The bourgeois press has uniformly pushed this theme, attributing the entire action to AIM, and making absolutely no mention of OSCRO. Almost no coverage is devoted to the particular grievances of the Pine Ridge Indians.

Although the tribal chairman, Richard Wilson, threatened to lead "900 armed Sioux" against the protesters, he was able to muster only eight people for a counterdemonstration.

Some of the reasons for the unpopularity of Wilson's regime were described by Skip Ball in a March 6 dispatch from Wounded Knee published in the March 16 issue of *The Militant*:

"Under federal law those who rent Indian land can receive grants to buy cattle and get going as ranchers or farmers. But Indians cannot receive such aid to work their own land. Many are thus forced to live off welfare and lease their land through the BIA.

"The current tribal council does nothing about this, and tribal chairman Wilson profits from it. . . .

"Lou Bean, an activist in OSCRO, said, 'Among the discrepancies in Wilson's behavior is his ability to buy \$12,000 vintage cars and liquor by the case on a salary of only \$18,000 a year.'"

The Militant also stated: "Wilson ruled by the use of a 'goon' squad that has fire-bombed the local AIM coordinator's house, beaten up old women, and terrorized local opponents."

On the pretext that the Indians held

Ceylon and the Healy School of Falsification

By Jaya Vithana

In the recent past the Healyites of the Socialist Labour League (SLL) have suffered a series of severe setbacks. Since their grandiose efforts to "reconstruct the Fourth International" in 1966—when Healy tried to form an unprincipled alliance with the Lutte Ouvrière (France), the Spartacists (USA), and the Japanese adherents of state capitalism—failed, they have suffered reversal after reversal. The latest debacle which blew up right in Healy's face was the split in the "International Committee" when both factions (i. e., the Lambertists and the Healyites) attacked each other for capitulating to the dreaded Pabloites. This was the logical outcome of the opportunist politics peddled by the Healy outfit (readers will recall that they gave conditional support to the Indian bourgeoisie when the latter's troops invaded Bangladesh to put the Awami League in power and help to crush the leftist forces). With each of these reversals the Healyites, their backs against the wall of Clapham High Street,¹ have been compelled to use Stalinist methods against their political opponents: lies, slanders and baseless insinuations have become their permanent stock-in-trade. The most recent victim of these methods has been the Ceylonese section of the Fourth International and, in particular, its principal leader, Comrade Bala Tampoe. The latter has been singled out for special treatment. The result has been a campaign of vile slanders carried out by the degenerated *Workers Press*.

In this particular article I do not propose to deal with the absurd charge that the United Secretariat of the Fourth International (USFI) is responsible for the betrayal by the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (LSSP) in 1964. Healy wants to rewrite history. He wishes to wash his hands of the LSSP debacle by tracing the degeneration of the LSSP to a period after 1953 (i. e., to a date after he split from the Fourth International). Since Comrade Germain has adequately dealt with all these arguments (see *Marxism vs. Ultra-Leftism*), I will confine myself to some of the more brazen lies that have been peddled recently by the Healyite daily paper. One point on which I do disagree with Comrade Germain, however, is his characterization of the Healyites as "ultralefts." I think he would probably agree with me today that always beneath the veneer of ultraleftism there existed a rightist opportunism. In my forthcoming book on Ceylon I have attempted to demonstrate that the signs of degeneration could be observed in the LSSP as far back as 1950. And yet Healy raised no criticism of the LSSP at that time. On the eve of the 1953 split, Healy's old friend Mr. Doric de Souza (now an official in the Ceylonese government) toured Britain to aid in the struggle against the Pabloites. If

1. The headquarters of the Socialist Labour League are located on Clapham High Street in London.

the United Secretariat is responsible for the degeneration of the LSSP, then Healy shares in the blame. In order to score factional points the Healyites rewrite history. To quote but a few examples:

(a) In the *Workers Press* of October 18, 1972 (p. 5, col. 2), it is stated that in 1953 "LSSP secretary Leslie Goonewardene declared that Mrs. Bandaranaike's capitalist Sri Lanka Freedom Party (SLFP) was in fact a 'centrist' party. . . ." This is a pure and unadulterated lie! Why do they print such lies? In order to demonstrate that the degeneration of the LSSP was due to "Pabloism." (The Healyites use the connotation "Pabloism" in much the same way as the Stalinists use "Trotskyism." It's an easy way out, as it educates the "cadre" in demonology rather than politics!) They must prove that this process started in 1953 at the time of the split in the Fourth International.

First: neither Leslie Goonewardene nor anyone else in the LSSP characterized the SLFP as a centrist party in 1953. In fact it was in this period that the LSSP correctly characterized the SLFP as the alternative party of the bourgeoisie; it was in this period that Colvin de Silva wrote *Their Politics and Ours*, where he not only characterized the SLFP as a bourgeois party, but also castigated the Communist Party for trying to make an anti-UNP bloc with the SLFP, ignoring the latter's capitalist class base. Furthermore (just for the sake of accuracy) the SLFP was led at that time by Mr. Bandaranaike. His wife only entered politics in 1960 after her husband had been assassinated. Moreover it was at this time that the LSSP led the "hartal" against the UNP [United National Party] government.

Second: it was not until 1963 that the LSSP right wing altered its characterization of the SLFP. Even then they did not call it a centrist party, but referred to it as "petty bourgeois." That was ten years after the 1953 split. By slightly altering a few dates, by a casual sleight of hand, the Healyite manages to "prove" how the USFI is responsible for the degeneration of the LSSP. That is why we call the SLL a bunch of cheats and frauds who disgrace the name of "Trotskyism."

(b) In the *Workers Press* of October 20, 1972 (p. 5, col. 1, para. 5) it is stated baldly that the LSSP(R) [Lanka Sama Samaja Party (Revolutionary)] minority broke with the LSSP right wing without the assistance of the United Secretariat. *This is another barefaced lie and Healy knows it.* The decision to split with the LSSP was taken on the advice and consultation of Comrade Pierre Frank, who attended the special conference of the LSSP in 1964. Mr. Healy was also in Ceylon at the time, but the raiding operation which he tried to carry out from his suite in the Galle Face Hotel misfired. He did not succeed in winning a single leading comrade from the LSSP minority.



BALA TAMPOE: Leading Ceylonese Trotskyist slandered by the SLL.

We think that it is vital to have a serious political-theoretical critique of the political practice of the LSSP right from the early 1950s to the final phase of the degeneration. Such a critique would be extremely useful for the revolutionary movement as a whole, but particularly for comrades in colonial and semicolonial countries. Healy of course is not interested in such niceties. The SLL is only interested in trying to score factional points (essentially for the purpose of insulating its membership from the ideas of the evil Pabloites) and to this end they are prepared to manufacture any number of lies, not infrequently with the aid of the bourgeois press. Comrade Germain has dealt with their method fairly adequately in his pamphlet which covers most of their charges against the USFI. I shall therefore concentrate on the more recent events.

Anyone reading the articles published in the *Workers Press* (October 18-21, 1972) on the activities of our comrades in Ceylon might be actually led into believing that the repression unleashed against the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (JVP) in April 1971 was carried out not by the Bandaranaike regime and its allies, but by the Fourth International and its Ceylonese section. Let us examine these charges and catch the falsifiers at work. But we

will not stop there; we will also expose the role of the handful of Healyites that exist in Ceylon during the repression. They have been too modest in relation to the activities of their followers in Ceylon. We will try and fill the vacuum existing in their newspaper on this question.

It is not uncommon for Trotskyists (of all varieties) to be slandered as imperialist or CIA agents by the Stalinists and the Maoists. For decades the hacks of the CPs, unable to answer us politically, have peddled these slanders. Revolutionaries in Ceylon have been branded as CIA agents by their opponents for many years. In fact it is common for the Maoists in particular to hurl epithets at anybody who does not agree with their particular strategy or tactic. As early as August 1970, the JVP was branded as "CIA linked" by both pro-Moscow and pro-Peking groups. In September 1970, when the LSSP(R), the JVP, and the Young Socialist Front (YSF—composed largely of Tamil workers) held a joint meeting at Keenakalle, to protest against the shooting of two plantation workers, one Maoist group distributed a leaflet in which comrades Bala Tampoe, Wijeweera, and Illancheliyan (a YSF leader) were referred to as "well-known CIA agents." It is not therefore an uncommon practice for political bankrupts of all hues and shades to adopt these methods of polemicizing. Now the Healyites have adopted this old Stalinist practice. What evidence does Healy produce to substantiate his vile slanders? It is no more than a mixed bag of downright lies, half-truths and sly insinuations à la Vyshinsky. What is the "evidence" against comrades Bala and others? It goes as follows:

(i) Reports alleged to have been made by a "commission" of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.

(ii) A statement that Bala Tampoe was allowed to leave Ceylon in April-May 1971, i.e., at the height of the repression.

(iii) The insinuation that since Bala Tampoe remained free while between three and four thousand trade unionists were arrested during the repression, he must be linked to the capitalists and imperialists.

The first of these lies the Healyites borrowed from the Spartacists of the USA, who recently published a series of allegations against Comrade Bala Tampoe. They were made by Mr. Edmund Samarakkody, a former member of the LSSP(R), who split from the party in 1968. Since then these allegations have been reprinted by the Solidarity group in Britain. Both Solidarity and the Spartacists—the latter in particular—live off this type of politics. Like vultures they wait for the next rumor to come their way, pounce on it, embellish it and then serve it up in their press. The Spartacist grouping has for years now been living off the crumbs of the table of the Fourth International. A bankrupt sect which is totally unable to project any political perspectives of its own, the Spartacists spend most of their time slandering the Fourth International. The Solidarity group prides itself on its belief in workers democracy, proletarian morality, and supposedly despises bureaucracy of every sort. So keen are they in their search for the truth that they sent one of their members all the way to Ceylon to interview Edmund Samarakkody, but did not bother to verify his allegations. Nor did our crusading Solidarist bother to ask Bala Tampoe what he thought about these allega-

tions. Could it really be that Chris Pallis has not been able to wash away all the stains of Healyism? No, these gentlemen were not interested in ascertaining the truth. What they wanted to lay their hands on was some dirt to discredit the Fourth International. When they thought they had found some they rushed into print. Beneath the different masks which they wear, the Healyites, Spartacists, and Solidarist leaders share a common method.

Was there such a report as Healy and his friends claim? In fact Mr. Samarakkody claims that there were two reports, a minority and a majority report. In fact the USFI appointed no such commission. Nor is there such a report or reports. What happened is the following: Mr. Samarakkody came to the last World Congress of the Fourth International and made the above allegations and on their basis argued that the LSSP(R) should be disaffiliated from the International and that his group should be recognized as the Ceylonese section. Now, Edmund Samarakkody had split from the LSSP(R) eleven months prior to the World Congress after his political line had been defeated at the LSSP(R) convention. At no time before the split nor even for some considerable time after the split did he raise these allegations against Bala Tampoe. And yet most of these allegations refer to incidents that took place some considerable time before the split in the LSSP(R); some of them two or three years before the 1969 World Congress and at a time when Mr. Samarakkody was the Secretary of the LSSP(R). How come these issues were not raised at that time? Why

didn't Mr. Samarakkody demand the investigation of these charges by the International Control Commission of the Fourth International? Why didn't he, at least, inform the USFI center about these actions alleged to have been committed by Comrade Tampoe? These are precisely the questions which were raised by the delegates to the last World Congress. It was completely irresponsible for Mr. Samarakkody to have remained quiet about these charges (if they were true or could be substantiated) for three years, and even more irresponsible to ask a World Congress to disaffiliate a section on the basis of unsubstantiated charges against one of its leaders. In the event, the Ninth World Congress decided not to disaffiliate the Ceylonese Section and refused to recognize Mr. Samarakkody's group. Immediately the decision was announced, Mr. Samarakkody went up to Bala Tampoe, shook hands with him, and began to exchange pleasantries! Only a few minutes before he had been accusing Comrade Bala of being an agent of imperialism, etc., etc. For Edmund it was all a contest, a game played between two parties. In this game there were no rules. Thus one of the charges leveled against Comrade Bala was that "Tampoe indirectly supported the party in power" (and this despite the well-known fact that Comrade Tampoe had the longest ever workers struggle against the UNP government). In order to win his case Mr. Samarakkody hurled every possible charge against his opponent, but once he had been defeated and the umpire pronounced against him, like a good cricket captain he went to congratulate the winner.

The Allegations Against Bala Tampoe: Is There Any Truth to Them at All?

Is there any truth in the allegations leveled against Bala Tampoe by Edmund Samarakkody and reprinted by the Healyites and their blood brothers the Spartacists? Let us examine them one by one:

(a) Was Comrade Bala's trip to the United States financed by the Asia Foundation (in turn financed by the CIA), and while he was in the United States did he hold a private meeting with McNamara? (*Workers Press*, October 21, 1972.)

The answer is quite simply *no*. But let us examine how the Healyites and their strange assortment of bedfellows distort and twist the facts to suit their case. Comrade Bala visited the U.S. at the invitation of Harvard University, which had organized a study project on trade unionism. On receiving the invitation, Comrade Bala consulted leading comrades in Europe and our comrades in the United States. He also obtained the approval of the party leadership in Ceylon. Many other trade unionists from all over the world had been invited and it was seen as a good opportunity to make contacts, learn about the trade-union movements in other countries and put across our views regarding the problems of trade unionism. Did he hold a private discussion with McNamara? Again the answer is *no*. One of the seminars at this project was addressed by McNamara and was attended amongst a host of others by Comrade Bala. The latter furthermore raised extremely strong and effective arguments against the policies of McNamara. All these facts

were included by Comrade Bala in a report he gave to the LSSP(R) party leadership on his return to Ceylon. In fact that is how Edmund Samarakkody could distort these facts for factional purposes. Surely this is a rather odd way for a "CIA agent" to behave. In addition Comrade Bala made no secret of his revolutionary views and publicly declared his opposition to imperialism's war in Vietnam and his support for the struggle of the Vietnamese people. Taking advantage of his trip, he addressed public meetings in Boston, Massachusetts; California, and New York, where he strongly attacked U.S. aggression in Vietnam.

Therefore to say that his trip was paid for by the Asia Foundation and that he had private discussions with McNamara is a downright lie. Such attempts to smear his reputation were made by all his enemies in Ceylon, particularly when he was leading important working-class struggles, but they failed. Today they are being disseminated abroad by groups claiming to be revolutionary when he is again leading important struggles and is unable to defend himself in Europe because of the present conjuncture of events in Ceylon. Those who make these charges should ponder them well. History has strange ways of unmasking slanderers and liars in the working-class movement.

(b) Did Comrade Bala and the Ceylon Mercantile Union (CMU) oppose the strike against the 1967 devaluation?

This is a ridiculous charge. The coalition unions that launched the strike had no serious perspective for a struggle. Anyone who knows the history of Stalinist political practice in Ceylon (as elsewhere) should be aware of their strategy, namely, the strategy of paying lip-service to extraparliamentary struggles and organizing token actions; the strategy of using token actions to assist in parliamentary pressure politics. Always a refusal to prepare for a serious struggle. Bala Tampoe and the CMU have always been implacable enemies of these practices. Comrade Bala opposed hasty action designed from the very beginning to dissipate the energies of the working class; action by only a section of the working class—without the participation of the plantation workers, an important section of the working class. When the devaluation took place, the CMU made proposals calling for a serious preparation of the struggle against the UNP government and for united action by all trade unions. The unions of the coalition parties (Moscow CP, LSSP and SLFP) unilaterally and without preparation launched a token strike. Only a fool or an opportunist would have said that the coalition parties and their leaders wanted to initiate a serious extraparliamentary struggle. After all it was the Communist Party and the LSSP that had betrayed the "21 Demands" struggle three years ago when the entire working class was preparing for a decisive showdown with the capitalist government of Madame Bandaranaike; at that time the CMU was at the forefront of that movement fighting the reformists and Stalinists. To say therefore that because the CMU refused to be an accomplice to the treacherous tactic of the Stalinists, it has aligned itself with the bourgeoisie is absolutely ridiculous. It is even more ridiculous when we consider that during 1965-70, when the UNP was in power, it was only the CMU that led all the decisive struggles in the Fisheries Corporation, Insurance Corporation, and the Port, where the LSSP union actually blacklegged and was, as a result, isolated and smashed. The CMU has been in the forefront of every anticapitalist struggle. It will, however, never become a pawn in the hands of the Stalinists and the reformists and be utilized for their electoral charades as long as it is led by the LSSP(R).

(c) Did Comrade Bala Tampoe write to Mrs. Bandaranaike in January 1966 implying support for the curfew? (*Workers Press*, October 21, 1972, p. 5.)

No. This is yet another lie. At no time did Comrade Bala during this period either write to Mrs. Bandaranaike or support the curfew. Again the Healyites show how adept they have been over the years in learning from the Stalinists.

On January 8, 1966, the coalition unions called a strike to oppose the amendment to the Official Language Act. This amendment was designed to give certain minimal concessions to the Tamil-speaking people such as the use of Tamil for limited purposes in their own areas. The strike was directed *against* the Tamil population of Ceylon and designed to oppose the rights of the Tamil minorities. Yes, the CMU opposed this strike and was 100 percent correct to do so. The strike was merely another attempt by the reformists and Stalinists to divide Tamil and Sinhala workers and to reinforce Sinhala chauvinism. Yes, Messrs. Healy, Slaughter, Banda, our comrades oppose communalist and racist mobiliza-

tion of workers. If you think it is wrong to do so, then state it publicly in your press!

(d) Did Comrade Bala attend parties at the West German and British embassies?

Yes. On two occasions Comrade Bala Tampoe attended receptions at the British and West German embassies as a representative of his union. It is the normal practice of trade unions representing workers of foreign-owned companies to send representatives to such functions. Often they were able to collect vital information which aided their union struggles. Nevertheless it was wrong for Comrade Bala to attend these functions. We consider that such practices, which were common amongst the LSSP leaders and regarded as "permissible," can seriously prove damaging for comrades. It is, however, to Comrade Bala's credit that he acknowledged his mistake and made an open self-criticism of his actions within the party and stated that he would not participate in such functions in the future since such actions could be misrepresented to discredit him and the party.

Thus of all the allegations only one of them is even partially true and that, too, needless to add, has been presented in such a way that it is a distortion of reality. Our Healyite slanderers do not, of course, stop there. They add a few more lies to make the tale a little more spicy. Let us examine these as well:

1. The *Workers Press* alleges that April-May 1971 saw Bala Tampoe being given permission by the Bandaranaike regime to leave the country to visit Australia (*Workers Press*, October 20, 1972, p. 5). Why did the Healyites manufacture such a blatant lie? The reason is quite obvious. April-May 1971 was the period of intense repression; it was the time when the regime killed more than 20,000 youth. At the time severe restrictions were placed on foreign travel. If Bala was allowed to leave the country at the height of the repression, he must have been working hand in glove with the Bandaranaike regime. *The fact of the matter is that Comrade Bala has not stepped out of the country since March 1971. We would defy either the Healyites or their Spartacist and Solidarist co-liars to challenge this assertion.* He has not considered it appropriate to leave the country even to attend important meetings of the Fourth International. Comrade Bala did go to Australia to speak at an anti-war conference on Vietnam, but this was in February 1971, two full months before the "April insurrection." By advancing the dates of his visit to Australia, the Healyites obtain the necessary "evidence" to "prove" that Bala Tampoe is a "betrayed." If the Healyites want further evidence as to Comrade Bala's whereabouts during April-May 1971, they should ask their Ceylonese followers. These gentlefolk were so scared and disoriented by the repression that they forgot their ritual chatter about "Pabloism" and crawled over to our comrades Bala and Prins Rajasooriya for advice and assistance.

2. The hacks of Clapham High Street further try to reinforce the above lie by raising the question "Why wasn't Tampoe arrested when over 3,000 trade unionists were taken into custody?" The insinuation being, of course, that if he wasn't arrested, it was because the government was sure of him. Vyshinsky would have looked on the SLL and its apparatchiks with a certain amount of admiration. However, all liars make a common mistake.

They tend to forget their own past lies and get trapped by their present ones. This is easily demonstrated in Healy's case.

Firstly, who were the trade unionists who were taken into custody during the April repression? This is in itself an embarrassing question for the Healyites. With one lie they try to accomplish two goals: to smear Bala Tampoe and to cover up their own previous lies. The vast majority of these trade unionists were members of the JVP. The JVP members had infiltrated most of the CP and LSSP trade unions; they also joined the CMU and in some cases were elected as branch secretaries, etc. A large number of CMU members were arrested, but almost all of them were members of the JVP, and others were suspected of being members. Apart from the Maoist leader Shanmugathan (whose arrest at that time was a sop to the Americans and who has denounced the JVP and supported Peking's line) not one important trade-union leader was arrested in this period; in other words Comrade Bala was not singled out for special treatment. Watson Fernando (CTUF), Seneviratne (LESWU), Prins Rajasooriya (UCCTU), not to mention the leaders of the plantation workers unions, were not arrested. The reasons are simple: the government did not consider it opportune to take on the working-class movement at the time. For instance, even much later, in September 1971, when the Petroleum workers (a small group) went on strike, violating emergency regulations, the government did not dare arrest them or their leaders. Since then increasing sections of the working class have broken with the popular frontist ideology of the Bandaranaike regime, thus making it even more difficult for the government to arrest trade-union leaders. All efforts to single out our comrades (like the twelve comrades including the assistant secretary of the party who were arrested in April 1972) have failed. This did not occur either spontaneously or as a response to a thunderbolt from heaven. Only a blind factionalist would deny the enormous role played by our comrades in preparing and reeducating the working class.

There is, of course, another important fact which the Healyites do not wish to disclose. When the repression was initiated in April 1971, the *Workers Press* wrote a series of articles where they depicted the JVP as a "petty

bourgeois" organization. Apart from repeating government propaganda against the JVP, the Healyites tried to portray them as students who ignored the working class, as communalists, etc. The JVP was in fact blamed for the whole repression! Today the facts are so blatantly clear and the evidence so foolproof that ignorant hacks cannot repeat these ridiculous charges.

Nevertheless even today they are not prepared to admit that the JVP managed to win a substantial number of young workers and that they made important inroads into the coalition trade unions.

Yes, dear Anglocentric "Trotskyists," the vast majority of the JVP militants who were arrested in April 1971 and in the subsequent weeks were workers. Not a single issue of the Healyite press has ever published this fact. It is these charlatans masquerading as Trotskyists who have carefully collected lies, slanders, half-truths, innuendo to attack our comrades in Ceylon.

In April-May 1971 the theoreticians in Clapham High Street put the total blame on the JVP for the April 1971 massacre. A year and a half later, without making any self-criticism of this position, the *Workers Press* admit that the massacre was actually initiated by the Ceylonese government. And yet when the *Red Mole* explained this fact we were accused of "whitewashing" the JVP. Today no serious student of Ceylonese politics (and this includes bourgeois commentators) can deny that it was the Bandaranaike regime which initiated the repression in the middle of March 1971. It is also clear that the JVP leadership had no plans to launch an offensive, and what occurred on April 5, 1971, was a series of uncoordinated actions initiated by the JVP who feared annihilation (the example of Indonesia appears a lot in JVP internal documents); in other words it was an act of desperation in a situation where the organization and its leadership couldn't function (see the trial reports of the Criminal Justice Commission). At the time the first article appeared in the *Red Mole* we had very little information. Today there is sufficient information which has been smuggled out of Ceylon to substantiate this fact. This once again proves that it was the opportunist politics of the Healy group which led them into a position where their position on the uprising was little different to that of the Ceylon government.

Healyism in Ceylon: Parody of a Parody

The lengthy articles which recently appeared in the SLL press on Ceylon were significant for another reason as well. There is a conspicuous absence. There is no reference to the Ceylonese supporters of Healy's politics. Why are the accusers silent about their own role? After all, modesty is not one of Healy's sins. Could it be that the facts cited below partially explain this uncharacteristic silence?

1. During the 1970 elections the Ceylonese Healyites (Revolutionary Communist League [RCL]) supported the coalition and called upon the workers to support the popular front led by Madame Bandaranaike. Even after our comrades had pointed out that their political position was incompatible with revolutionary Marxism it took them nearly three months to change their position. Healy prefers to remain silent on this question.

What was the position of the LSSP(R), led as it is by the "CIA agent" Bala Tampoe? The party manifesto published in May 1970 (but approved six months before that) clearly understood the political conjuncture. Our comrades wrote: "The bitter truth, which the LSSP(R) considers it essential for the masses to understand, is that whatever parliamentary regime may be established following the general elections of 27th May 1970, capitalist rule and capitalist exploitation will continue, with increasing likelihood of the suppression of the democratic rights of the masses and their complete regimentation in the interests of preserving capitalist rule. . . . In this social crisis of today, there is no other road but the revolutionary road. . . ." Our comrades made it clear that there was no real choice between the coalition and the UNP and called for a boycott.

2. After the repression had begun, the RCL wrote a letter to the Prime Minister pleading with her to lift the ban on their newspaper and citing as a reason the fact that they were the only ones who had consistently attacked the JVP's politics. Given the situation that existed there was nothing wrong in using the tactic of writing letters to Bandaranaike in order to reach the masses. But Healy's Ceylonese friends were more concerned about their own sect and driving a nail in the JVP "coffin" rather than the mass movement. However, both Mrs. Bandaranaike and the Healyites have been unable to bury the JVP.

3. While the repression was still going on—in fact was at its height—the leading "theoretician" of the RCL crawled up to certain government ministers and obtained a government scholarship to Australia. Yes, slanderers of Clapham High Street, it was not Bala Tampoe who left the country with government permission at the height of the repression. It was your own "leading theoretician." No wonder Healy is silent on these questions.

4. At a time when layer after layer within the working class in Ceylon is breaking with the coalition parties, at a time when large sections of the masses consider the LSSP a stinking corpse, and at a time when both the pro-Chinese and pro-Moscow CPs are in a state of disintegration, the Healyites call upon the CP and the LSSP to form a "workers and peasants government." What is the political justification for this slogan today? Neither the LSSP nor the CP has a base in the countryside. Both parties are heavily compromised, as they are part of the government which has carried out the most vicious repression Ceylon has known since 1948. Elections have been postponed for seven years and there is no likelihood of the "state of emergency" being lifted by the gov-



Government troops arresting "suspects" during massive repression in 1971.

ernment unless it is compelled to do so by mass action. The LSSP and the CP have between them less than 26 seats in a Parliament of 151 (the SLFP has 96) and even if they withdrew from the government, it would not precipitate a parliamentary crisis. They have been so heavily compromised by the repression that their departure from the government would not create an extraparlimentary crisis either, as their impact on the working class today is virtually nonexistent. Why then do they raise meaningless slogans? Essentially because of their tailist and opportunist politics copied from the mandarins of Clapham High Street.

Yes, Let Us Pose the Question: Who Is Bala Tampoe?

Since the Healyites and their Spartacist and Solidarist bedfellows have chosen to slander our Comrade Bala Tampoe,² we think it useful to give some idea about Comrade Tampoe and his political activities. We make no false claims. We certainly do not consider that Comrade Tampoe is a superrevolutionary of the Healy, Banda, Pallis or Robertson brand. He is an ordinary mortal and therefore is bound to commit errors of judgment, assessment, tactics or strategy. We also consider that whenever such errors are committed, Comrade Bala or for that matter anyone else must be criticized. Public and internal self-criticism is certainly not alien to the Fourth International. It is the only revolutionary tendency which has made public self-criticisms and admitted its mistakes. We have no hesitation in stating that the entire Trotskyist movement needs to reassess and draw a balance sheet in relation to its inability to come to grips with certain

2. It may be useful to recall how the Healyites slandered our Bolivian Comrade Gonzalez Moscoso and supported the opportunist Lora. A few months later, Lora betrayed the Bolivian struggle and the Healyites were forced to disown him, attack him publicly, and finally split with their French cothinkers on this issue.

specific and concrete problems relating to the dynamic of revolutionary struggles in Asia. We will do so. But the so-called "orthodox Trotskyists" of the Healy and Robertson brand, or the "purist Marxists, but not Leninists!" of the Pallis type, cannot even begin to pose the right questions, let alone provide the real answers. Since these superrevolutionary gentlemen have slandered Comrade Tampoe's reputation, we shall give some facts about him.

Bala Tampoe entered the revolutionary movement during its illegal period in the course of the Second World War, when he acted as a courier for the underground comrades. Under the direction of the party he worked also in the antiwar activities and was particularly involved with the politicization of British soldiers. After the war he played a leading role in the 1947 general strike and, as a result, was dismissed from his job as a lecturer in botany at the University of Ceylon. Although quite a number of militants were victimized during that strike, all of them except Comrade Bala have either been reinstated or compensated.

In the period which followed he led the struggle against the rightists in the CMU and succeeded in breaking their

grip. Since then he has reoriented the CMU to become not only the most militant, but also the most democratic trade union in Ceylon where all important decisions are made by a General Council consisting of 400 workers. He has also changed the composition of the union from a largely white-collar into a predominantly blue-collar workers union. The CMU has been in the forefront of every important struggle of the Ceylonese working class, contrary to the lies of the Healyites. Comrade Tampoe took an active part in the famous "hartal" of 1953, the

1962 port strike, the 1963 "21 Demands" movement, the 1968-69 wave of strikes.

Comrade Bala is one of the two major trade-union leaders of the LSSP who did not capitulate to coalition politics, the other being Comrade Prins Rajasooriya, the assistant secretary of the LSSP(R). In reality both these comrades led the fight against the right wing of the LSSP and built the "21 Demands" movement. These comrades have demonstrated in revolutionary action their dedication to revolutionary socialism.

Did the Fourth International or the LSSP(R) Make Exaggerated Claims?



JVP leader Rohana Wijeweera speaking to mass rally shortly before his arrest.

The hacks in Clapham High Street claim that the *Red Mole* and other journals of the Fourth International made exaggerated claims about the role of the LSSP(R), particularly in relation to their united-front activities with the JVP. Is this true? What was our relationship with the JVP and what role did our comrades play? The April repression of the JVP was sudden and well-organized. However, the intimidation and harassing of JVP leaders had started long before that. As early as September 1970 our comrades publicly solidarized with the JVP and wherever possible rendered legal and other assistance. Contrast the attitude of our comrades to that of the Healyites, who spent most of their time slandering and vilifying the JVP and created a barrier between themselves and JVP militants. Comrades who know how the SLL operates will be able to visualize this quite clearly, but Healy's bizarre rituals in a semicolonial country are even more grotesque than in Britain. Our comrades on the other hand correctly appreciated the strength as well as the weaknesses of the JVP. The ossified sectarianism of the Healyites was totally irrelevant to the problems which the JVP were beginning to pose. It was after all not a small movement. It had hundreds of members and thousands of sympathizers. And while it had certain misconceived Debrayist conceptions regarding the working class, it is a slander to describe them as being anti-working-class. By the middle of 1970 they had changed their

position and as we recounted above had managed to gain an important foothold within the urban working class. (A major article published in *Janata Vimukti* on the question of trade unions and the task of revolutionaries would make interesting reading even for ossified sectarians. It contains the essential ideas of Trotsky contained in "Trade Unions in the Epoch of Imperialist Decay.")

Furthermore the JVP were not communalists. Since a fair proportion of them came from a rural milieu, they did start off with certain prejudices against minorities, but as soon as these were pointed out most of them were prepared to change their position. For instance, the JVP comrades agreed to hold a joint rally with the YSF and the LSSP(R) to protest against the shooting of two plantation workers of Indian origin. Wijeweera, speaking for the JVP, clearly expressed the need to unite the oppressed minorities, urban workers and the rural proletariat in order to overthrow capitalism. In other words the JVP was an organization which was evolving, and within it there were a number of currents; in fact, within it there were a number of currents; in fact, within it there was a strong anti-Trotskyist current as well. Our task, however, was not to engage in sectarian mudslinging but to intervene in such a manner that we could politically influence the best elements with the goal of winning them to revolutionary Marxist politics. This is why our comrades engaged in a political dialogue with the best elements of the JVP while at the same time defending them against police harassments. At the same time the comrades of the LSSP(R) tried to bring them into joint struggles and common actions on concrete issues. Our comrades discussed with the most advanced comrades of the JVP on such questions as the Transitional Program, permanent revolution, antibureaucratic struggles. It was in the middle of all these developments that the Bandaranaike coalition government unleashed the repression. There is sufficient evidence today to prove that if the repression had not taken place there would have been a split in the JVP and the most uncritical and slavish Maoists would have broken off. It is not an accident that it is these elements who have betrayed the JVP and become witnesses for the government.

At no time did either the LSSP(R) or the Fourth International claim that the LSSP(R) was a big or a mass section. Numerically our section is small. But can anyone deny that the influence of our comrades in the working-class movement is completely out of proportion to

our numbers? We had only a handful of comrades, for instance, in the bank employees union, but in February 1972 we captured the leadership and by September 1972—in six months—we prepared the union membership to launch an illegal strike which has now lasted for over three months. The JVP were not mad sectarians. They were prepared to work with us not because we were big or that our sect was the best sect in the Ceylon League of Sects, but because our comrades played an important role in the working-class movement.

The Healyites also confuse the issue by the way they refer to the April 1971 incidents. We have insisted that the JVP did not launch an insurrection and this is today accepted as an incontrovertible fact. Moreover only a section of the JVP actually took part in the April actions which at best can be characterized as acts of armed resistance. The leadership of the JVP (in prison) asked its members to carry out an organized and disciplined retreat in the face of the repression, but this decision could not be communicated to the membership. There was no question therefore of our comrades taking part in the "insurrection." We neither had the necessary forces nor were we in agreement with the tactic of the JVP. However, what our comrades did do was to unconditionally defend the JVP both before, during, and after the repression despite our tactical differences with sections of the JVP.

The brave warriors of the SLL try to ridicule the manner in which the opposition to the repression was initiated. They mock the letters written by Comrade Tampoe in the name of the CMU to the Ceylonese Prime Minister. They say these letters were "soft." Yes, Messrs. Healy, Slaughter, Banda and Co., these "soft" letters laid the basis for a reawakening of the working class and re-orienting it on a perspective of struggle. Unlike Healy and the SLL, our comrades had to carry out this task under a "state of emergency," where all publications were banned. It was done at a time when the masses had been divided and disoriented, when they had experienced a period of mass killing and mass arrests carried out by a government which included the LSSP and the pro-Moscow CP. Our comrades made a realistic assessment of the potentiality as well as the limitations of the working class. That is why it was our comrades who were able to launch the first mass action, the first important illegal strike, and continue these actions today, while the Ceylonese branch of the Friends of the SLL with their so-called "numerical superiority" and their "absolutely correct" political line have done nothing except to carry on the struggle against . . . Pabloism!

Yes, our comrades did write letters to the Prime Minister, but they also duplicated them in tens of thousands and distributed them to the members of the CMU. The present security regulations prevent us from speculating as to whether the CMU members retained these letters or whether they were passed on to others including those in the prison camps and the countryside. Yes, we wrote both "soft" and "hard" letters. Dear Mr. Healy, why don't you publish them all in your daily newspaper and let your members judge for themselves what impact these letters would have had in the situation which then existed in Ceylon? Why don't you publish the CMU letter on the war in Vietnam? And as a comparison why don't

you publish the letters written by your own followers to Bandaranaike, so that your readers can make a comparison for themselves? The reason you won't is that you are falsifiers, political frauds, bureaucrats and the standard-bearers of Stalinist methods.

Why did the Healyites publish these articles at this particular time? Maybe some of the comrades are not aware of the fact that the repression is still continuing and the state of emergency is still in force (in December 1972 another 150 people were arrested). Comrades are also perhaps aware that at the same time as our comrades are organizing the legal defense of the victims of repression on one hand, they are on the other hand broadening and strengthening the mass opposition to the Bandaranaike regime. In this situation the coalition government has tried to trap our comrades by various means (for instance, twelve comrades were arrested last April and one last February) and have attempted to use every means to get them. For instance, the Ceylonese bourgeois press printed the slanders contained in *Newsweek* concerning the Fourth International and Comrade Ernest Mandel.³ The Ceylonese High Commission in London regularly buys all material published by the International Marxist Group on Ceylon. If the Healyites imagine that we are going to be forced into a position where we might inadvertently aid in the repression of our own comrades, they are in for some disappointments.

We repeat that our comrades in Ceylon as everywhere else would welcome criticisms based on facts and would be prepared to discuss with any critics. What we shall not tolerate is slanders and lies about our comrades. We are proud of our comrades in Ceylon and in particular Comrade Bala Tampoe, Prins Rajasooriya, etc., who despite very difficult conditions have played an important role in defending the victims of popular front repression in Ceylon. Instead of helping to break the curtain of silence regarding Ceylon in the Stalinist and Maoist press throughout the world, the activities of Messrs. Healy, Pallis, and Robertson have played right into the hands of the Popular Front government and the Stalinists in Europe and North America. It is these activities you indulge in, gentlemen, which convince us that you will remain where you are—in the political gutter.

January 1, 1973

London

3. See "'Newsweek' and the Real 'Terrorist International'" by Jon Rothschild in the September 25, 1972, issue of *Intercontinental Press* (p. 1003); and "Ernest Mandel Answers 'Newsweek' Smear" in the October 9, 1972, issue (p. 1080).

Kadar Pays Off—And Wants Crown

The Hungarian government agreed on March 6 to pay \$18.9 million "compensation" for U. S. holdings nationalized by the Stalinist regime or damaged during World War II. In exchange, the Nixon administration will release Hungarian bank deposits frozen during the cold war.

Still unsettled is the fate of the crown once worn by Hungary's monarchs. It has been in U. S. hands since 1945. According to the March 7 *New York Times*, the Kadar regime regards it as a "symbol of Hungarian sovereignty" and wants it back. U. S. officials have always admitted that the crown belongs to Hungary but are holding on to it until they are satisfied with the state of East-West relations.

Open Letter to Left Wing of Parti Québécois

By Alain Beiner

[The following article, entitled "An Open Letter to the Left Wing of the Parti Québécois," was published in the March issue of *Libération*, the monthly newspaper that reflects the views of the Trotskyist Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière in Québec. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Introduction

Like the previous conventions of the Parti Québécois since its formation in 1969, the fourth convention is turning up division, this time between the "participationist" wing and the "electoralist" wing. The former is supported by, among others, Pierre Marois, Pierre Bourgault (who has just pulled out of politics), and Claude Charron. The latter wing—in the lead, to be sure—is grouped around René Lévesque and Jacques Parizeau.

At the heart of this debate is not any particular question, such as the PQ's opposition to French unilingualism, its opposition to trade-union struggles, or its refusal to mobilize its ranks to struggle for independence. What is involved, rather, are general questions of "orientation" or "political practice." In the view of the "participationist" wing, the PQ risks losing its support among the youth and the working class and becoming "bourgeoisified" if it does not turn the party's resources to more "militant" ends, such as politically educating its members and intervening in daily struggles.

The leading wing feels that the party has to avoid any kind of "radicalism" and continue to function along "traditional" lines so as not to disturb "public opinion" during the coming general elections.

The left wing of the PQ is closely following this "confrontation." After their many attempts to transform the PQ into a "genuine instrument" of the struggle for national and social liberation, are the trade-union militants in the PQ and those who consider themselves socialists going to give in "just one more time" to the illusions

consciously fostered by the top leadership?

The Nature of the Parti Québécois

The left still thinks it can change the PQ because it does not understand the true nature of the party, which is rooted in its origins, its leadership, and its program. The PQ is not a valid instrument created by the workers or by other oppressed people in order to advance their interests. On the contrary, the PQ originated among the oppressors in our nation, among those who have always managed to reach an accommodation with domination by foreign imperialism in order to preserve their own privileges and profits, which they enjoy at the expense of the Québécois masses.

The PQ was created by former government ministers, deputy ministers, and other technocrats from the top state bureaucracy—in short, by those who drew up antilabor policies (Parizeau and Lévesque) and traitorous pacts with the federal government (Morin). The bourgeois character of the PQ is thus deeply rooted in its very origins.

The goal of its "sovereignist" and procapitalist program, far from leading forward the struggle for national emancipation, is only to reinforce and extend the privileges of local exploiters without, for all that, challenging the dominant position of foreign, Anglo-Canadian, and American imperialism. The PQ's plan will be carried out with the support of imperialism, not behind its back; hence the need to appear "traditional," "respectable," and above all capable of maintaining capitalist "law and order."

Trying to turn the PQ into an instrument for liberation is like trying to turn a boss into a worker. For the internal democracy of the PQ functions only to the extent that no one calls into question the PQ's basic goals. The violent opposition of the PQ to French unilingualism illustrates this well: At every "democratic" convention, Lévesque's threats to quit the presidency win out over the wishes of the vast majority of the delegates

and members, who are strongly in favor of unilingualism. After all, the capital that dominates Québec speaks English!

The liberation that we all want will be the work only of the oppressed themselves, completely independent of the oppressors. No "infiltration," no "coup d'état," and no misplaced hopes can turn a bourgeois party into its opposite.

The illusions of the PQ left wing are based on false theories, furnished by, among others, Pierre Vallières.

'We Must Unite Even With the Bourgeoisie Because We Are All Oppressed'

According to Pierre Vallières, the "imperialist mode of production" has been imposed "upon the Québécois collectivity as a whole." Since we are all in the same boat, that is, victims of national oppression, why not unite during an early stage to defeat the common enemy?

While it is true that all social classes in Québec to one degree or another suffer from foreign domination, it is also true that this domination was originally established, and has subsequently been maintained, with the complicity of "leading Québécois citizens" who foster the illusion that Québec belongs to us.

One might be able to conceive of unity among all classes in an anti-imperialist struggle—if there were no Québécois police to club us in demonstrations against Trudeau; if there were no Drapeau to cancel the national festival; if there were no Jean-Jacques Bertrand to adopt laws like Law 63, or no Bourassas to call on the Canadian army!

Vallières is using formal logic, not Marxist logic, when he concludes that all social classes have an interest in the struggle for national liberation. Quite the contrary, imperialist oppression of the Québécois nation as a whole has not drawn social classes in Québec together, but has qualitatively aggravated all the contradictions between oppressed and oppressors within the nation.

While the "national" bourgeoisie sees itself increasingly put in a bind by Anglo-Canadian and American imperialism, and less and less able to compete with it for the Québec market,



Alain Beiner speaking to mass rally for a French Quebec. October 16, 1972.

this has not brought it to the point of breaking with imperialism or of becoming a partisan of liberation, for it is entirely dependent upon imperialism in order to maintain its power over the working masses and to divide the spoils. The envious hatred of the local "leading citizens" for imperialism is invariably subordinated to the internal class struggle.

Rather than confront the power of imperialism, which would compel it to rely on mobilizing the Québécois masses, the Québécois bourgeoisie makes further attacks on the workers and others who are oppressed in order to make them pay the costs of the imperialist yoke.

Vallières invokes the need for a strategy based on a concrete analysis of the "relations of exploitation"; yet it is precisely within the framework of these concrete relations themselves that any basis for unity between bourgeois and worker inside a single party evaporates — all the more so in view of the fact that this unity occurs within a bourgeois party, on the basis of a procapitalist program, and behind people like Lévesque, Parizeau, and Morin!

When push comes to shove, the Québécois exploiters will always rally to imperialism in order to betray the national struggle, just as they have been doing since the 1759 conquest. Socialists would do better to teach these truths to the masses, rather than lead them into dead ends.

The PQ for the 'First Stage' of the Revolution?

This theory of "stages" is very widespread in the left wing of the PQ. Starting out with a mechanical and nonhistorical conception of the relationship between the struggle for national emancipation and the struggle for socialism, Vallières concludes that the PQ is the vehicle for at least the "first stage" of the process, that is, of the national "stage."

Not only is it unacceptable under any circumstance for socialists to preach unity of all classes within a bourgeois party (since for the bourgeoisie, class interests are always more important than the interests of the oppressed nation), but it is equally unacceptable in the period in which we are living to conceive of the national struggle as separate from the struggle between the classes existing within the nation and from the struggle for socialism.

The struggle for national emancipation in Québec cannot be reduced to the PQ's half-hearted plan for formal independence. The national problem will not be eliminated short of the establishment of a truly independent state with French as the national language both on the job and in school, and with an economy that is free of foreign control—in other words, short of the consistent expulsion of every vestige of imperialism.

While such a program could have

been carried out under a capitalist regime during the last century or the one before it, the historical development of capitalism on a world scale since the beginning of this century makes it no longer possible to achieve the goal of national struggles without overturning capitalist property relations themselves.

Since the birth of the imperialist phase of capitalism, that is, the phase in which capital dominates the world and breaks out of national boundaries, the domination of small nations and colonies by the imperialist countries has become an integral part of capitalism itself. It is impossible to tear such a dominated nation out from under the imperialist yoke without *at the same time* tearing it loose from the capitalist system itself.

How many are the positive examples (the workers states in Cuba and North Vietnam) and negative examples (the Thieu puppet regime in South Vietnam, the "independent" Irish republic, "anti-imperialist" Bolivia, etc.) that unquestionably prove that in the epoch of imperialism a national liberation struggle cannot be victorious without a mass struggle led by the working class and resulting in the establishment of a workers state—a state that simultaneously drives imperialism out and forcibly proceeds to overthrow "national" capitalism and to build socialism.

It is in this sense that the anti-imperialist "stage" cannot be separated from the anticapitalist "stage," for in Québec, as in any other oppressed nation, the national struggle and the struggle for socialism are completely intertwined and constitute two aspects of the same program for social revolution. Throughout the entire history of the twentieth century, those who have taken on the task of fighting foreign exploiters while not taking into account the local class struggle have invariably wound up being stabbed in the back by their own employing class.

'The Revolutionists Ignore the National Question'

The weakest thesis of Vallières and the left wing of the PQ is the one that depicts left-wing groups outside the PQ as devoting themselves to "ideological ping-pong" instead of becom-

ing involved in "positive" action, and as disregarding Québécois reality by ignoring "our situation of national alienation."

Those on the left like Charles Gagnon and the Maoists, who denounce the national struggle and want to reduce the struggle for socialism to an "ideological struggle," are not genuine revolutionists and do not understand the ABC of Marxism. But the Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière, in spite of its meager material and human resources, has initiated more militant street actions for national rights than the PQ, which devotes itself entirely to playing parliamentary "ping-pong" and frantically opposing very positive mass actions.

For the LSO, it is precisely the central importance of the national question in the class struggle in Québec, the importance of independence and the French language to the workers, and the positive role of national consciousness in the development of socialist consciousness that make it imperative today for socialists to build a mass revolutionary party capable of taking the national struggle in hand and leading the working class to power at the head of all the oppressed.

Build the Revolutionary Party

Only such a perspective of the working class building a socialist society can guarantee the Québécois masses that their oppression and exploitation will be eliminated—provided that the workers equip themselves with this vanguard party that can point the path to power, while clarifying its goals at every step. It is with this approach that the LSO participates in any struggle of the oppressed against whatever oppression they may face. It does this armed with a program that joins the immediate demands of these struggles (national struggle, struggles of workers, feminists, students, etc.) to transitional demands that propel the masses toward the destruction of bourgeois power and the taking of state power by the working class.

The way this programmatic method is applied can be seen in the LSO's approach to the working masses who are presently in the PQ. On the one hand, it does not adapt to the inadequate level of consciousness of these

masses, and on the other hand, it cannot wait until these masses are ready as a bloc to join the revolutionary party, given the fact that the LSO remains a very small organization.

In order to counter the support of the workers for the PQ in a realistic fashion, the LSO's program raises the need for the working class and the unions to break with all bourgeois parties and create their own independent political organization responsible to no one but themselves. In order to make this concept of class political action more concrete and understandable, and in order to apply it to the only mass workers' organizations that exist, the LSO calls on the trade unions to launch a labor party.

The LSO's program thus constitutes a bridge for those in the PQ toward the revolutionary party, a bridge over the gap between the present level of political consciousness of broad layers of the working class and the objective needs of the struggle for national liberation and socialism.

The Inevitable Crisis

Whether it is the PQ or some other party in power that attempts to perpetuate capitalist exploitation, the national oppression of Québec and class contradictions will not cease to exist and to mount. The oppressed will respond with vast spontaneous protests, radically calling into question the capitalist regime itself, and with militant mobilizations, thereby provoking division and paralysis in the ruling class and its parties.

It is under the impact of such decisive political crises that the Québécois working class and its allies will look for an alternative leadership capable of sweeping away the old exploitative society—a genuinely revolutionary leadership. In such a conjuncture of instability in the relationship of forces, a revolutionary-socialist party equipped with a correct program and cadres immersed in the struggle can acquire the necessary influence among the masses to change history.

The Time to Act

Every dead end that the masses are led into, and every betrayal that they experience, leads them not more rap-

idly toward this revolt, but on the contrary, leads them away from it. Following a defeat, the masses cannot be restored like a punctured tire. They can't be patched up, refilled, and put back on the road. This is why socialists cannot allow themselves to play around with the masses. And that is why they do not light-mindedly accept new and "more effective" paths. It is the duty of every socialist to tell the masses the truth and to point only to the good path to follow.

It is inevitable that the working class and the national liberation movement will be betrayed by the PQ. This betrayal could discourage and demobilize them for an indefinite period, causing them to hesitate before staking everything on a different political approach.

Trade-union militants and socialists must quit the bourgeois PQ and withdraw all political confidence from it. They must point the way for the PQ masses instead of following behind them. This is all the more necessary in that a broad layer of the PQ's left wing has an indispensable role to play in building the revolutionary party in Québec, a task that has already been begun by the Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière. □

Viet Unionists on Tour

Two North Vietnamese trade-union leaders, Vu Dinh and Tran Thanh, toured New Zealand from February 19 to February 24. The purpose of their trip, said Vu Dinh, who is president of the Hanoi Federation of Trade Unions and deputy mayor of Hanoi, was to "thank those unions who have staged many actions in support of Vietnam."

In Wellington, the Vietnamese delegation spoke to a meeting attended by more than 100 dockworkers and met with officials of the Federation of Labour. Receptions for the Vietnamese unionists were held in Wellington, Christchurch, and Auckland. In all these meetings, Vu Dinh and Tran Thanh stressed their appreciation of the help provided to Vietnam by antiwar demonstrations.

In addition to discussions with New Zealand trade-union leaders and members, the delegation met the mayors of Wellington and Christchurch, and prominent representatives of the National Council of Churches and the Roman Catholic Church.

Before visiting New Zealand, the Vietnamese completed a two-week tour of Australia. They spoke to meetings of more than 1,000 persons in Melbourne and Sydney. □

U.S. Irish Oppose Nixon's Support to Britain

By Fred Burns O'Brien

[The following article is reprinted from the March 3 issue of *The Irish People*, the weekly paper of Irish Northern Aid, the American support group of the Provisional Republican movement.]

* * *

It appears that the allies of World War II are once again collaborating, this time to defeat the Irish menace in Northern Ireland. There, a handful of Irish Freedom-Fighters have kept the British Army at bay for the last three years. Certainly, the British Army could root out most opposition in the North, but to do so they would have to contemplate genocide as an end solution. With the IRA and UDA being peoples armies, they are deep-rooted within the respective communities, and to effect elimination of these associations whole communities would have to be leveled with the inevitable mass slaughter of the populace.

There is a distinct possibility that if matters further deteriorate in the interpretation of the British Government, they might feel compelled to contemplate the detestable action of massive raids into rebel strongholds of both communities. This would be similar to the raids of "Operation Motorman" done in Derry during the summer of 1972. This military foray was not contested by the Irish people. The majority of the inhabitants of "Loyalist" and "Nationalist" neighborhoods talk of severing the umbilical cord of Britain's stillborn child. Former loyalists, now separatists, call for an independent Ulster with equitable autonomy for all citizens within a new governmental structure. The nationalists would prefer to unify the whole island, but separation might be a vehicle towards their final goal of reunification. There is at the least a point for compromise among the Irish people rather than with a foreign hand offering unwanted guidance.

With the long Vietnam conflict now appearing to have come to its climax with the peace agreement and exchange of prisoners, American military facilities, rather than lie entirely dormant, are now contributing to the British war effort against the self-determination of the Irish people. It has been

revealed that British troops were indeed being trained at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, thereby involving the tax dollars of United States citizens, and personnel of the U.S. Armed Forces in Britain's Irish War. After ten years of war in Southeast Asia, it is terrifying to see the U.S. involve itself in any way in another very similar conflict.

There were many tactics of guerrilla warfare utilized by U.S. Forces that are now being passed along to British Soldiers for employment against the Irish enemy. It is image-shattering to see the country in which you reside suddenly contributing to a war against your own people. They only seek the same freedom and self-determination sought in prior years by the United States under the same principles and against the same enemy.

Why should such goals be permissible for Americans and not for other peoples? The Irish living in America should be enraged to think for a moment that British troops are being trained in the United States for duty against the Irish people. The eight-hundred soldiers in the U.S. have just returned from a tour of duty in "Ulster" to acquire more vicious tactics to facilitate their assignment in Ireland.

The question must be posed—What have the Irish in Ireland or in America ever done to deserve United States involvement in a war on Irish citizens? Not to dwarf the achievement of any other American Ethnic Group, but it can easily and truthfully be stated that no people have contributed more than the Irish to the United States of America. The Irish people have proved to be extremely loyal Americans and have proved this in times of national crisis; yet the U.S. now turns on the Irish to aid her enemy. We Irish can certainly respect U.S. neutrality in Ireland, but we cannot understand U.S. complicity in any British actions against our people.

The American people could never offer favor to any nation that would quash another's freedom, so it must be assumed that the proper culprit in this turn of events is not the American people, but instead the administration of Richard Nixon. There have been a series of events over the past few

years that would verify the fact of Mr. Nixon's outright support of Britain, which would be consistent with British troops now being trained on U.S. soil. Those events are not put forth for consumption.

In the first instance, Richard Nixon, like most national leaders, but more than most, is a massive egotist whose aims serve to illuminate his, rather than the country's, fame. Mr. Nixon's ego suffered a severe blow in October 1970 on a trip to Ireland, where he assumed he would receive the same adulation accorded John F. Kennedy in a similar "sentimental journey." The Irish people were not deceived by Mr. Nixon's political motives to gain Irish votes back home, however; they extended a cold, polite greeting to him as the leader of a friendly nation. The U.S. Ambassador to Ireland, Mr. Moore, was embarrassed that he could not set up the proper enthusiasm for Mr. Nixon. In the Spring of 1971, when large-scale demonstrations were being held around the world against U.S. involvement in Indochina, a group of 12 people gathered to demonstrate in front of the U.S. Embassy in Dublin. The demonstrators burnt an American Flag as an act of protest, hardly an uncommon scene over the last ten years. Mr. Moore, remembering the cold reception given his leader by the Irish people, demanded that Irish authorities fully prosecute these criminals and afford them the maximum punishment. Mr. Moore made fools of the American and Irish peoples as well as the respective governments of each, with his childish conduct.

In September of 1971, Mr. Joe Cahill, an alleged member of the IRA, sought to present his political views to the American people, but he was denied entry by U.S. authorities at the request of the British Government, who evidently feared the truth being made public. When British Soldiers murdered thirteen innocent civilians in Derry, Mr. Nixon could not be moved, an assurance to Britain that he would not offer any detrimental comments which might affect their efforts in the North. It was at this time that Mr. Nixon stated flatly that the United States is completely neutral with regard to Northern Ireland.

Shortly after Mr. Nixon's statement on U.S. neutrality, a Central Intelligence Agent was exposed by Irish citizens in the Spring of 1972. The man was too inquisitive about IRA operations. He had been posing as a writer, according to the Irish papers, but his purpose was to infiltrate the ranks of Irish Freedom-Fighters to gain any Americans' names who might have been contributing to the cause of Irish Freedom. It can be assumed that this was a portion of Mr. Nixon's policy of neutrality toward events in Ireland.

The Department of Justice of the United States is harassing Irish-Americans doing charitable works for Ireland, assuming that all Irish-Americans are running guns to the rebels. Five Irishmen are being held in Texas as a result of a purge of Irish people in the United States. In a corollary event, the United States and Britain entered into an extradition treaty allowing U.S. citizens to be extradited to Britain to stand trial for what the British define as crimes against the British Government.

Prior to their invasion of the Minority areas of Derry, the British Government informed Mr. Nixon of their intended plans, obviously desiring the stamp of approval for their actions. They would have undoubtedly thought twice about their objectives if the American President had any reservations. If the Irish Freedom-Fighters had offered any resistance, there would have been mass civilian slaughter with the contrived approval of the American President. In a request for NATO troops to perform in these excursions against the Irish people, Britain sought to remove three Regiments for service in the North from their NATO commitment. Knowing these troops would have to be replaced, and with growing furor in the United States over present European troop assignments, the decision for Britain's request was deferred to President Nixon. The President gave his consent, placing a further burden on American taxpayers due to a rise in NATO commitments.

These events show a clear pattern of approval by Mr. Nixon for the policies of Britain. It is heartbreaking for an Irish-American to have to live with the fact that his or her President is conspiring to support a war

machine that slaughters their people. British soldiers are not gentle or humane as the British Information Service would have the world believe. As an eyewitness to the imposition of internment without trial on August 9, 1971, it can be stated with clarity that British soldiers do not aim their bullets at only gunmen, as they claim, but instead their bullets tend to be disseminated indiscriminately, as this witness observed.

Now with the United States offer to train British Soldiers confirmed, denials from worried sources start pouring forth, which are just not acceptable. The British Defense Ministry said British Marines are being trained in the U.S. under a NATO exchange program. As was shown previously, NATO is fully cooperating with

Soviet Political Prisoners' Tribute to Galanskov

[The following letter by inmates of the Ural and Mordovian prison camps in the Soviet Union was written in tribute to Yuri Timofeevich Galanskov, who died November 4, 1972, in the Mordovian prison camp at Potma. The Russian text, which recently became available, has been translated by *Intercontinental Press*.

[Galanskov was one of the best-known activists in the Soviet opposition movement. A poet by profession, he wrote many works critical of the Soviet bureaucracy that appeared in samizdat publications. He also edited the *Phoenix*, a samizdat literary journal that appeared first in 1961 and again in 1966. In January 1967 he was arrested and a year later was tried and convicted under Article 70 of the Russian criminal code for "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda." He was sentenced to seven years of forced labor. While he was in prison, he actively protested the unreasonably harsh prison regulations.

[Galanskov died of peritonitis after having undergone an operation for a severe ulcer condition at the prison-camp hospital. He had been warned by a hospital surgeon that hospital conditions were too poor to guarantee a successful operation, and because of this he had asked not to be operated on in the prison-camp hospital. Nevertheless, an operation was performed

Britain to perpetrate her war in Ireland. A NATO exchange program connotes a definite connection with the situation in Northern Ireland.

What can Irish-Americans do to bring an end to U.S. involvement in British war efforts? They can write to their representatives in Congress demanding not just an explanation from the administration, which will be totally inadequate, but insisting that U.S. contributions to Britain's efforts against the Irish terminate immediately. Of course, Mr. Nixon might want to comment on the matters reported in this article, but it is doubtful he could clarify them. No American President has ever done so much to prevent the final attainment of Irish Freedom than Mr. Richard Nixon. □

October 18 by a doctor who had no training as a surgeon.

[On November 27, Galanskov's parents wrote a letter to the department of supervision of places of confinement of the Soviet Ministry of Internal Affairs, demanding a "comprehensive and official explanation" of their son's death. They stated that unless such an explanation were given, they would "insist that our son was killed in establishment ZhKh 385," the number of the Mordovian prison camp. As of that date, no such explanation had been reported.

[Galanskov's death was seen as a profound loss, both by those in the Soviet dissident movement and by the other political prisoners who knew him. His death has not discouraged others from continuing his fight. This letter attests to the continued determination of those struggling for democratic rights in the Soviet Union, despite the increasingly severe repression the Kremlin has directed at them during the past year.]

* * *

A tribute from Captivity to Yuri Galanskov, From the Political Prisoners of the Mordovia and Ural Prison Camps

Last November 2 Yuri Timofeevich

Galanskov died. Our hearts are full of grief and rage. But it is not ordinary grief and rage, because this is not simply a death; it is a death that shows all the signs of a political murder. Yuri Galanskov wasn't taken around the corner and shot; he wasn't thrown out of a window or poisoned. His murder was prepared gradually, step by step. He was killed by constant persecution, by an unjust sentence, by the slanders of stool pigeons, and by the brutality of the camp regime. He was killed by the lack of concern in the camp regarding his state of health, despite constant worsening of his chronic illness. They kept at him, and at him, and at him until at last they killed him. And he died on the operating table under the indifferent knife of a surgeon of the Mordovia prison camp hospital.

Yuri Galanskov was a man with a resolute character and an original turn of mind. He was always taken with new ideas. But perhaps his strongest feature was his intense feeling of civic conscience. Before his arrest, he participated in pacifist demonstrations, spoke out to demand freedom of expression for the intelligentsia, collected all the materials in defense of Sinyavsky and Daniel, and was one of the publishers of the illegal Moscow journal *Phoenix*.

He inspired many people with his personal example. His courageous conduct during the investigation and trial attracted the attention and sympathy of all sorts of people. The letters circulated by the intelligentsia in defense of Galanskov, with hundreds of signatures, are widely known. His voice of civic conscience could not be suppressed by prison bars, labor camp fences with multiple rows of barbed wire, nor by towers where sub-machine gunners stand guard. It continued to be heard ever more strongly—ever more dreadful for his torturers and persecutors, those who are waging war against their own people.

Despite his illness, which caused Yuri Galanskov so much torment, the impossibility of obtaining food, and insomnia at night because of constant excruciating pain, he fought as hard as his strength would allow for the recognition of rights for political prisoners and for creative and political freedom for other prisoners and for society at large.

He devoted himself fully to this task.

His instruments of struggle were hunger strikes, appeals, and his own example. And this was terrible for the do-nothings, the thick-skinned, and the superfluous souls within the organism of arbitrary rule. For these qualities he was appreciated by all the prisoners; and, in fact, everyone who met him in the prison camp "zones" noted his responsiveness, kindness, and desire to help everyone with their problems, and they had confidence in him.

Galanskov died at the age of thirty-three, at the height of his political and literary abilities. In addition to everything else, he wrote verses. One of the lines of his verses reads as follows: "The lips of justice are stained with blood." Now this "justice" has touched him personally. He could not get away from it, and now the blood of yet one more fighter calls out to everyone, "Brothers! All those who fight along with us for deliverance from the unyielding yoke of lawlessness, for the abolition of an unprecedented slavery, for a new, free Russia;

all who struggle alone; all who can hear us throughout the world today! Raise your voices in defense of those who perish today for your, and our, common freedom—those in the prisons, those in the camps for political prisoners, and those who are perishing in spirit from the treacherous poison of daily propaganda."

Let us honor the memory of our friend Y. T. Galanskov, who stands as an example of conscience and duty for us. Let us increase our ranks and continue his work!

We appeal to the citizens of Russia and the whole world to honor his memory with a moment of silence. Let this moment also be marked by a special oath of loyalty to our common hopes and dreams! It is time to pull ourselves out of our criminal indifference and understand that only all together can we secure freedom for all of the peoples of Russia.

The brilliant memory of Y. T. Galanskov will always be with us.

Vorster Goes After the 'Pink Liberals'

16 South African Students Banned

Prime Minister John Vorster responded February 27 to growing protests against South Africa's apartheid policies by banning eight leaders of the National Union of South African Students [NUSAS] from attending school or participating in student activities. Similar measures were taken against eight leaders of the all-Black South African Students Organization.

The bans, issued under the Suppression of Communism Act, bar the sixteen youths from leaving districts where they live, communicating with each other, or publishing. It is also illegal to quote a banned person in the press. Restrictions on the eight Black students are even more severe: At least three of them are under house arrest.

Those banned include the leading officers of NUSAS: President Paul Pretorius, Vice Presidents Paula Ensor and Philippe Le Roux, and General Secretary Sheila Lapinsky.

In response to the new repressions, students at English-language universities throughout South Africa, where the NUSAS has more than 20,000 members, held mass protest meetings.

In announcing the ban, Vorster said the government was also investigating other opponents of apartheid, including the Institute of Race Relations and the Christian Institute of South Africa. He warned that his regime "would in no circumstances tolerate any unrest from whatever quarter."

Vorster's attitude to his critics was exemplified by his reaction to a letter from Andre Brink, an author widely regarded as one of South Africa's leading writers. Brink warned Vorster that attempts to suppress student rights had led to de Gaulle's downfall.

Vorster wrote back denouncing Brink as a "pink liberal." He ended by wishing Brink a good night's rest "in spite of the curlers in your hair." □