

Peronists Declare Amnesty; 500 Prisoners Released

**Nixon's
Strategy
for
Watergate
Cover-Up**



***Israeli Regime Launches
New Wave of Repression***

New Game Plans

For the wiretappers, spies, burglars, and other "national security" crooks in Nixon's palace guard, Watergate turned out to be a regrettable caper. The moral lesson is now being drawn by one and all. Especially the adult games sector of American business. Some of them "have been quick to perceive that there's more money to be made in the aftermath of a major scandal than perhaps was ever involved in the scandal itself," reports the May 24 *New York Post*.

So now you can buy "The Watergate Puzzle," a jigsaw puzzle that will "bug you" as you try to fit the pieces to produce a picture of the White House with thousands of insects crawling out the front door.

And you can buy "The Watergate Scandal." In this game you draw cards marked "campaign chiefs," "attorney general," "White House aide," with a wild card, "attorney general's wife."

According to the rules, "nobody in the Watergate Scandal wins; there are just losers." Except for the manufacturers. They expect to sell five million sets at \$2.99 each.

A game that may prove to be even more popular is "Watergate Darts." It costs \$7.95. The game has a slogan: "Bug your friends to play."

The game consists of a circular board dotted with likenesses of Watergate characters like John H. Ehrlichman, G. Gordon Liddy, John and Martha Mitchell, Sam Ervin, and John Dean. They are arranged in concentric circles, and you throw blunt "tricky Dick" darts at them.

In the bull's-eye, with a score value of 100 points, is former White House chief of staff H. R. Haldeman.

Why isn't Nixon in the bull's-eye? David J. Mahmood of Hobby Time, Inc., told the *New York Post*: "Right now this is all we have. But we've got it set up so the faces can change as the sands shift. If Nixon is implicated, he could go in the center. We might even move the point total up then from 100 to 1000."

Not in the market? Then you might want some Watergate stationery. One letterhead says, "Re-elect Incumbent President, Top Sneakret." □

In This Issue

FEATURES	679	Performing Artists on a Flying Trapeze —by Gerry Foley
U. S. A.	658	New Game Plans
	659	Nixon Outlines Watergate Whitewash Strategy —by Allen Myers
	688	Washington Antiwar March Set for June 16
INDOCHINA WAR	662	Cambodia Devastated by U. S. Bombing —by Jon Rothschild
ARGENTINA	664	Peronists Pardon 500 Political Prisoners —by David Thorstad
BOLIVIA	665	Banzer Regime Shaken by Selich Murder
CHILE	667	Fascist Provocations, Labor Unrest —by Hugo Blanco
PERU	668	"Workers Hold Key to Peru's Future"
LEBANON	670	Lebanon Regime Ends State of Emergency
ISRAEL	671	New Wave of Repression Launched by Regime
	671	Round One in the Haifa Trials
	673	United Front Against Zionist Repression
FRANCE	674	Mobilize for Right to Abortion
	678	Workers Self-Defense on Agenda
SWITZERLAND	676	Bourgeoisie Violates Its Own Legality
	677	The LMR National Convention —by Gerard Vergeat
GREAT BRITAIN	688	Joint Declaration on Repression
DRAWINGS	657	Cartoon by Haynie in Louisville Courier-Journal
	664	Hector Campora—by David
	660	Elliot Richardson; 661, Sam Ervin; 667, Juan Jose Torres; 669, Hugo Blanco; 672, Golda Meir; 674, Moshe Dayan—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, Gerry Foley, Allen Myers, 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 Guemeene, 75004, Paris, 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.

Nixon Outlines Watergate Whitewash Strategy

By Allen Myers

"... appalling as many of the revelations have been that have come to us through the press, the courts and the Ervin Committee hearings," the *Washington Post* said in a May 24 editorial, "none has provided so damning an indictment of the Nixon presidency as does Mr. Nixon's own attempt to defend it."

The paper's complaint was touched off by Nixon's lengthy May 22 statement giving his latest version of the Watergate scandal and the attempted cover-up. In the statement, which the *Washington Post* editors described as "pathetic, unconvincing, confused," Nixon for the first time was forced to acknowledge a portion of his role in the attempts to sweep the scandal under the rug. At the same time, he attempted to pour over the entire affair a large bucket of whitewash labeled "national security."

Implicated by His Own Underworld

Nixon's statement was both a retreat and a long-expected "counterattack." The retreat was in part made necessary by continuing revelations before the Senate Watergate committee.

On May 18 and 22, convicted Watergate burglar James McCord testified about the attempts that were made to silence him in exchange for a promise of executive clemency—which can only be granted by the president. (See last week's *Intercontinental Press*.) The promises were conveyed to him, he said, by John Caulfield.

Caulfield is another of the right-wing "law and order" criminals with whom Nixon surrounds himself. Until the summer of 1968, Caulfield was a New York City cop attached to the Bureau of Special Services, the city's political police. When introduced to him, Nixon was immediately taken with Caulfield's qualifications and invited him to join his staff for the 1968 campaign. Rather than resign from the New York police force, Caulfield took a "leave"—which later made it

possible for him to receive a pension even though he never returned to the police force.

From April 1969 until March 1972, Caulfield was on the White House staff serving as "liaison" with "law enforcement agencies." Presumably as part of this job, in 1970 he participated in stopping an Internal Revenue Service investigation of illegal contributions to Nixon's 1968 campaign fund by a San Diego multimillionaire. (For a report on this scandal, see *Intercontinental Press*, April 10, 1972, p. 398.)

As a reward for his services, in December 1972 he was made assistant director of the Treasury Department's Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, which despite its name is primarily concerned with harassing radical organizations.

When Caulfield appeared before the Watergate committee May 22, he confirmed McCord's testimony in all important respects. The offer of executive clemency, he said, came from presidential counsel John Dean. Caulfield testified that Dean told him to tell McCord that the clemency offer came "from the very highest levels of the White House."

Caulfield said he had never met with anyone higher than Dean concerning the cover-up, but he nevertheless provided indirect evidence pointing in the direction of the presidency. He said that during one conversation with Dean, the latter had received a phone

call and had told the caller, "I'm receiving a report on that right now."

Dean had only two superiors in the White House to whom he would be likely to report his efforts. One was presidential domestic adviser John Ehrlichman. The other was Richard Nixon.

The 'National Security' Whitewash

Whether by design or coincidence, Nixon's statement was issued the evening following Caulfield's highly embarrassing testimony.

As with his earlier comments, Nixon admitted no more than was inevitable. This time, however, more was inevitable than even a few weeks ago.

For the first time, he acknowledged that there had been "unethical, as well as illegal, activities" in his behalf during the campaign, which, of course, took place without his "specific approval or knowledge." (An experienced lawyer, Nixon refrained from saying anything about his *general* approval and knowledge.)

Nixon's counterattack consisted of an effort to restrict the scope of present investigations by invoking "national security." Specifically, he marked off three areas of criminal activities, proclaimed them "unrelated" to Watergate, and insisted that his behavior in each case had been proper and necessary to defend "national security."



Oliphant/The Denver Post

The three areas were wiretapping of reporters and members of the National Security Council in 1969-70; the setting up of a secret agency to plan illegal activities in 1970; and the establishment of the White House group known as the "plumbers," who organized the burglary of the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist.

Nixon also said that shortly after the Watergate break-in, he had ordered Ehrlichman and Haldeman "to insure that the investigation of the break-in not expose either an unrelated covert operation of the C. I. A. or the activities of the White House investigations unit [plumbers]. . . ." A "misunderstanding" of these orders, he said, might have contributed to the cover-up.*

Nixon is not the only representative of the U. S. ruling class who would like to draw a distinction between spying on radicals and the antiwar movement and spying on the Democrats. The *New York Times* gave the same outline of what it considers the proper rules in a May 21 article by Seymour M. Hersh:

"Undercover intelligence activities against radical and antiwar groups are legal and have been routinely utilized by Federal and local police agencies. The Nixon Administration has been linked, however, to a number of illegal activities against Democratic candidates stemming from last year's primary elections."

"Undercover intelligence activities" is a rather euphemistic description. Revelations in the press have shown that what is involved is a prolonged campaign of wiretapping, burglaries,

*Nixon said that a few days after the June 17 Watergate arrests he "was advised that there was a possibility of C. I. A. involvement in some way."

His spokesmen, however, have refused to say who "advised" him, and Richard Helms, then the director of the CIA, has testified that Nixon never asked him about a possible CIA role in Watergate.

Nixon's concern to "protect" the CIA is even more ludicrous when it is recalled that McCord has testified about later attempts to get the CIA to take the blame for the whole operation. And General Vernon A. Walters, in a memorandum of a June 23, 1972, meeting with White House chief of staff H. R. Haldeman, said that Haldeman told him "it is the president's wish" that the CIA try to curtail the FBI investigation of the Watergate burglary.



RICHARDSON: The boss lied.

blackmail, provocations, and frame-ups. And although most of the recent disclosures concern the Nixon administration, they make it clear that such tactics have long been part of the standard equipment of both Democratic and Republican presidents.

Blackmail and Burglary

In his May 22 testimony, James McCord revealed in passing that, to his knowledge, no fewer than twelve different agencies are involved in tapping telephones. Perhaps the most notorious organization in this respect has been the FBI.

In the May 21 *New York Times*, Wallace Turner described FBI director J. Edgar Hoover's years-long campaign to intimidate the late civil-rights leader Martin Luther King Jr. Turner's account was based primarily on interviews with Arthur Murtagh, a former FBI agent.

The tapping of King's phone was authorized in 1963 by Attorney General Robert Kennedy and continued until King's assassination in 1968. During that time, Murtagh reported, FBI agents listened to more than 5,000 of King's conversations.

"The surveillance was massive and complete," Murtagh said. "He couldn't wiggle. They had him."

When King won the Nobel peace prize in 1964, FBI agents attempted to dissuade liberal supporters of King in Atlanta from attending a banquet in his honor, citing allegedly damaging information about King picked up by the wiretaps. Later, the FBI tried to persuade Atlanta newspapers to run stories about King's private life obtained from its espionage. It was reported as far back as 1968 that Hoover had used such information to force King to tone down his criticism of the FBI's cooperation with white racists.

As a result of interbureaucratic rivalries, Hoover in 1966 reportedly curtailed some of the wiretapping and burglary activities of the FBI. (The case of King makes it obvious that he did not stop them completely, as some newspapers have reported.)

By his own admission in the May 22 statement, Nixon in 1970 took the initiative in centralizing and expanding this kind of activity. He created the Inter-Agency Committee on Domestic Disorder, which included Hoover as its chairman; CIA director Richard Helms; General Donald V. Bennett, director of Defense Intelligence; and Admiral Noel Gayler, director of the National Security Agency.

"On June 25," Nixon's statement said, "the committee submitted a report which included specific options for expanded intelligence operations, and on July 23 the agencies were notified by memorandum of the options approved. After reconsideration, however, prompted by the opposition of Director Hoover, the agencies were notified five days later, on July 28, that the approval had been rescinded. The options initially approved had included resumption of certain intelligence operations which had been suspended in 1966. These in turn had included authorization for surreptitious entry—breaking and entering, in effect—on specified categories of targets in specified situations related to national security."

While this was probably the first time in U. S. history that a president has publicly admitted authorizing burglaries, Nixon's confession was still considerably less than frank. It is certain that he would never have even mentioned the committee were it not for the fact that the group's report is now in the hands of the Senate inves-

tigating committee and the Watergate grand jury. (The report was among the documents that John Dean removed from his office and gave to the Watergate judge.)

Perhaps even more revealing are the reasons for Hoover's "opposition" and Nixon's "rescinding" of the plan, neither of which were honestly described in Nixon's statement. Hoover in fact did not oppose the plan; he only refused to carry it out unless Nixon gave *signed authorization* for it. Lawyer Nixon declined to put his signature on the plan: apparently "national security" was not so gravely threatened as to require his signature to such a potentially embarrassing document.

In December 1970, Nixon set up still another spy group, the Intelligence Evaluation Committee. According to the May 22 statement, its members "included representatives of the White House, C. I. A., F. B. I., N. S. A., the Departments of Justice, Treasury, and Defense, and the Secret Service."

Among other things, this spy group provided McCord with regular reports for use in his undercover operations. Its prime purpose was to spy on anti-war and socialist groups.

The *New York Times* has reported that the Watergate grand jury is investigating possible criminal activities by members of this committee, which operates as a division of the Justice Department.

'National Security' Frame-Ups

It must be stressed that the activities of these various "national security" agencies are not limited to spying. They include as well the organization of provocations and frame-ups.

Last week's *Intercontinental Press* described some of the activities of Larry Grathwohl, an FBI agent who infiltrated the Weathermen and in that organization planned, encouraged, and carried out a series of bombings. When he became suspected as a provocateur, Grathwohl's superiors ordered him to transfer his activities to the courtroom. Grathwohl has already testified against a number of radicals whom he persuaded to participate in bombings—without telling the court that he was an FBI agent.

Another case of government provocation and frame-up has had a hap-

pier outcome. On May 20, a jury in Camden, New Jersey, acquitted seventeen persons accused of destroying draft files in August 1971.

The defendants had admitted breaking into the federal building in Cam-



ERVIN: Head of Senate committee investigating Watergate.

den and destroying records. But in the course of the trial, it was revealed that the prosecution's star witness was working for the FBI at the time that he helped organize the break-in. The agent testified that prior to his joining the group, the break-in plans had been abandoned.

At the instruction of the FBI, the agent revived the plans and provided the defendants with the burglary tools necessary for the operation. He explained to the court that one of his superiors had said that "someone in the little White House" in California wanted the break-in to occur.

Because of the extent of government involvement in the break-in, the judge broke with legal precedent and instructed the jury that they could acquit the defendants if they found the government's actions "offensive to the basic standards of decency."

In his most infamous frame-up attempt, that of the Pentagon Papers trial, Nixon has continued to tangle himself in his own lies. It will be recalled that the judge in that case was not informed until April 26 of this year that members of the White House "plumbers" group had broken into the

office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist in September 1971. Nixon spokesmen at the time denied reports that Nixon had wanted to prevent the trial judge from receiving this information. But in his May 22 statement, Nixon in effect admitted this charge:

". . . on April 18th, 1973, when I learned that Mr. Hunt, a former member of the special investigations unit at the White House, was to be questioned by the U. S. Attorney, I directed Assistant Attorney General Petersen [in charge of the Watergate grand-jury investigation] to pursue every issue involving Watergate but to confine his investigation to Watergate and related matters and to stay out of national security matters."

Translated out of lawyers' language, that means that Nixon told Petersen not to question Hunt about the break-in at the psychiatrist's office. Nixon's statement continued:

"Subsequently, on April 25, 1973, Attorney General Kleindienst informed me that because the Government had clear evidence that Mr. Hunt was involved in the break-in . . . a report should . . . be made to the court trying the Ellsberg case. I concurred, and directed that the information be transmitted to Judge Byrne immediately."

But on the same day that Nixon issued this statement, Elliot Richardson, his new attorney general, admitted to a Senate committee that Nixon knew of the break-in in *late March*, a full month before the information was passed along to Byrne. (Richardson's admission should not be taken to exclude the possibility that Nixon

Watergate Suicide

Congressman William O. Mills of Maryland was found dead near his home early on the morning of May 24. Officials said the apparent cause of death was "a self-inflicted gunshot wound."

Five days earlier, it had been charged by the General Accounting Office that Mills had failed to report a \$25,000 cash contribution to his 1971 campaign from the Committee to Re-elect the President.

Mills was reported to have left notes denying that the contribution was improper.

knew about it in September 1971 or even earlier.)

During that month, Nixon met with Judge Byrne to offer him the directorship of the FBI.

Government for Rent

Nixon's attempts to wrap himself in the flag have so far not stopped continuing revelations of corruption. One of the most interesting cases concerns an unsuccessful attempt in the summer of 1972 to burglarize the office of Las Vegas publisher Hank Greenspun. McCord testified May 22 that he had been told of the attempt by Watergate burglar Gordon Liddy.

"Liddy said," McCord testified, "that Attorney General John Mitchell has told him that Greenspun had in his possession blackmail type information involving a Democratic candidate. . . ."

In fact, however, a different sort of information seems to have been involved. McCord continued:

"Subsequently in about April or May, 1971 [from the context, it is clear he meant 1972], Liddy told me that he had again been to Las Vegas for another casing of Greenspun's offices. Liddy said that there were then plans for an entry operation to get into Greenspun's safe. He went on to say that, after the entry team finishes its work, they would go directly to an airport near Las Vegas where a Howard Hughes plane would be standing by to fly the team directly into a Central American country. . . ."

Howard Hughes is a billionaire who happens to be involved in a lawsuit filed against him by Hank Greenspun. In an interview reported in the May 23 *New York Times*, Greenspun denied possessing any derogatory information on Democratic candidates. But he said he does have information concerning Hughes's contacts with the antitrust division of the Justice Department.

The tie between Hughes and Nixon's staff of burglars is perhaps explained by the report that Hughes in 1972 presented the Committee to Re-elect the President (CREEP) with a signed blank check, which was later cashed for a large sum.

Such services cannot be purchased cheaply. To take another example, a lawsuit filed by consumer advocate Ralph Nader charges that a Nixon decision in March 1971 to permit an

increase in milk prices was made only after milk corporations gave at least \$417,500 to CREEP.

The disclosure of the connection between Hughes and Nixon produced the first major embarrassment for

Bureaucrats Back Nixon

The official Soviet press agency TASS published only a short summary of Nixon's May 22 statement, without commenting. According to Reuters, the TASS report "gave prominence to the President's denial that he knew of the bugging plans."

Archibald Cox, the new special prosecutor appointed to handle the Watergate case. Cox was appointed because it was felt that only an "independent" prosecutor would convince the public that the investigation is not a whitewash. It has now been revealed, however, that Cox's brother has been an attorney for Hughes for the past twelve years.

What Else Is Hidden?

The crimes revealed so far, it is

clear, are only a fraction of those committed by the Nixon gang. But what has been disclosed points to the existence of a vast network of espionage and sabotage agents financed with millions of dollars from government and secret campaign funds.

Neither the Senate committee nor the special prosecutor is going to expose the full activities of Nixon's—and his predecessors'—undercover agents.

How many of the bombings attributed to radicals have actually been carried out by agents like Grathwohl? Did the government campaign against King stop with blackmail, or was the assassin who shot him down hired by the criminals in Washington? Who paid Talmadge Hayer, who admitted killing Malcolm X but refused to say who had hired him? Who organized the repeated police shootouts with members of the Black Panther party?

The various government investigators are not even going to raise such questions, let alone answer them. But the longer the scandal continues, the more the U.S. public will arrive at its own conclusions about the reasons for the secrecy surrounding "national security" activities. □

Thieu Issues New Repressive Decrees

Cambodia Devastated by U.S. Bombing

By Jon Rothschild

After a total of thirty hours of secret negotiations in Paris with North Vietnamese Representative Le Duc Tho, Henry Kissinger told the press May 23 that "significant progress" had been made in carrying out the purpose of the talks, which was to bring about "a strict implementation of the Paris agreement" on ending the war in Vietnam. The meetings, Kissinger said, were "conducted in a constructive and positive manner."

Le Duc Tho reportedly endorsed the part about "significant progress." No other information about what was discussed, what was said, or what was agreed to was released. Kissinger said a second series of talks would begin in Paris on June 6.

It is to be regretted that Kissinger

insists on trying to distinguish himself stylistically from the rest of the Nixon mob. For it would have been more to the point for Kissinger to report that the Paris cease-fire agreement is inoperative.

The agreement, it will be recalled, guarantees the population of southern Vietnam democratic rights, including the right to carry on political activity. It should also be recalled that Operation Phoenix, the CIA's notorious program of assassination of members of the NLF "infrastructure" is supposed to be inoperative.

In this connection, a Saigon government decree, the text of which was published in the May 17 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde*, is of some interest. Dated April 5, 1973, and iden-

tified as document No. 7167/N2/B, it is signed "by order of the commander in chief of the national police, the secretary general of the National Council of Operation Phoenix, and the chief of the cabinet."

Its substantive section reads:

"First: Vis-à-vis individuals who disturb public order, apart from placing them under house arrest, concentration measures in conformity with decree No. 020-TT/SLU of November 25, 1972, can still be applied against them if the means of bringing them before rural military tribunals are lacking.

"Second: The Security Council will have to be convoked to decide on the concentration of the individuals in question, and their dossiers will have to be forwarded to the minister of the interior, as in the past. Do not use the expression 'convicted Communist or Communist agent.' Simply write: 'disturbing public order.'"

The third section asks the Security Council to continue its efforts to "neutralize" elements disturbing public order and to act in concert with local security councils to bring "elements arrested for disturbing public order" before military tribunals, to place them under house arrest, or to round them up.

On May 16, the minister of the interior dissolved twenty-six political parties, and on May 17 Thieu put into effect a series of decrees first issued in December 1972 giving wide discretionary powers to the police. Among other things, the decrees provide for the establishment of security commissions at various levels, which will have the power to arrest anyone "disturbing public order." Persons thus arrested may be held for periods ranging from six months to two years; the penalties are arbitrarily renewable. One new wrinkle introduced by the cease-fire accords is that the police are no longer required to specify whether persons arrested are "Communists"—"disturber of public order" is certainly a more democratic category.

In reporting the Phoenix decree, *Le Monde* speculated that the question of democratic freedoms in South Vietnam would be on the agenda at the Kissinger-Tho talks. If it was, there is no evidence that any changes in Thieu's policies will be forthcoming. The Nixon regime made it clear before the Paris talks began that by

"strict implementation" of the cease-fire agreement it meant only that Hanoi should discontinue efforts to protect the southern liberation forces from Thieu's armed forces, which are continuing their "nibbling" attacks on the liberated areas.

Washington is seeking similar "strict implementation" of the agreement in Cambodia, where only massive U. S. bombing prevents the Pnompenh regime from collapsing. The magnitude of that bombing is still not known exactly. This, no doubt, is one of those "national security" matters that cannot be published in newspapers. But in the May 24 *New York Times* Sidney Schanberg gave an indication of its destructive effects.

The region of Cambodia that lies to the east of the Mekong River (some one-third of the country's total area), Schanberg wrote, has been for years completely impervious to government troops, who make no pretense of trying to control the region. American military commanders have a special name for the area: Freedom Deal.

"The Americans have been bombing heavily in 'Freedom Deal,'" Schanberg wrote, "ever since the war began in Cambodia in 1970 [sic]. It is essentially a free-fire zone, where the Seventh Air Force, now based in Thailand, can hit virtually what it wants to. The Nixon Administration has divulged almost nothing about this bombardment. Questions about the tonnage of bombs dropped, the number of sorties, the specific targets hit, the amount of enemy supplies destroyed and the number of enemy killed are not answered. The number of Cambodian civilians killed is also either not known or not revealed.

"But every once in a while, some civilians make their way into Government territory from 'Freedom Deal' and tell stories of bombing that has wiped out entire groups of villages and sizable numbers of the people who were living there under Communist administration."

Outside Freedom Deal, the bombing is presumably less intense and less random—or so Schanberg implies. So the type of destruction to which the liberated areas have been subjected may be gleaned from the situation in the areas that are not free-fire zones, areas in which, Schanberg wrote, "there is no reason to doubt that the Seventh Air Force is

making a marked effort to avoid civilian casualties."

In the western two-thirds of Cambodia, Schanberg reported, "Scores of villages have been blown away. Twelve-foot-deep bomb craters pock the ruins. Great numbers of livestock have been killed, harvested crops burned to ash, orchards destroyed—all creating a degree of damage . . . that until now had been associated only with North and South Vietnam. . . .

"Largely because of air power, whole series of villages no longer exist along Route 1, along the banks of the Mekong and Bassac Rivers southeast and south of Phnom Penh, and in many other areas.

"Sometimes the devastation is continuous for several miles—not a house or a piece of one left standing. Along one 10-mile stretch of Route 30, there is total destruction for three miles, then a break, then two more miles of ruin, then another break, and finally another mile of rubble. Ashes, broken cooking pots, shattered banana and mango trees, twisted corrugated iron roofing and sometimes the concrete stilts of a house reaching toward nothing—that is all that is left."

One of the results of this "marked effort to avoid civilian casualties" has been an increase in the number of refugees. "In the past," Schanberg wrote in a May 22 dispatch from Pnompenh, "when Communist troops entered an area or a village, the worst that would happen would be a brief exchange of fire with the half-hearted Government army. But now, when the insurgents arrive, the villagers know that the bombs are not far behind."

Since February, the number of refugees in the western two-thirds of the country has gone up by 70,000. The total number now stands at about 800,000, or more than one-tenth of the whole population. The U. S. government spends \$1 million a year supporting the refugees, and about \$300 million a year on military and "economic" (i.e., technical assistance that is most often military) aid to the regime. This does not include the unknown tens of millions for the bombing. □

The Ties That Bind

The cardinal of Cologne told the German-Japanese Society in Tokyo that his friendship for Japan went back to his childhood: "When we played soldier, the Japanese were always our allies."

Peronists Pardon 500 Political Prisoners

By David Thorstad

In one of his first acts after being sworn in as president of Argentina on May 25, Héctor Cámpora announced an executive pardon for political prisoners, although he did not disclose the number that would be released. Two days later, the new Peronist-led Congress approved an amnesty law officially pardoning about 500 of the prisoners, many of whom were guerrillas. (Whether there were other political prisoners not included in the amnesty was not clear.)

Shortly after Cámpora's announcement on May 25, a crowd of some 40,000 persons gathered in front of Villa Devoto Prison in Buenos Aires. A section of the crowd reportedly attempted to storm the prison and free the prisoners. Police announced that two youths were killed in the attempt and at least nine wounded.

New York Times correspondent Jonathan Kandell, in a dispatch from Buenos Aires May 27, reported that one non-Peronist guerrilla group had issued a statement to the press in which it vowed to continue its attacks against businesses and the armed forces. He identified the group as the Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo (ERP—Revolutionary Army of the People). However, he went on to incorrectly attribute to the same group a May 23 guerrilla action—the extraction of a \$1-million ransom from the Ford Motor Company—that was in fact carried out by another group, the August 22 ERP.

The statement reportedly criticized the political record of Cámpora and the Peronist labor bureaucracy. "The leadership of the political movement that President Cámpora represents did not vacillate in openly supporting the military dictatorship," it asserted. It also said Cámpora's program for a "political and social truce" amounted to a "national unity between the army oppressors and the oppressed, between exploitative businessmen and the exploited workers, between the oligarchs who own the fields and the ranches and the dispossessed peons." It called on Cámpora to "arm the people."

An Associated Press dispatch published in the May 24 *Washington Post*, prior to the inauguration, reported another guerrilla statement; it identified the authors only as the "Trotsky-



HECTOR CAMPORA

ite People's Revolutionary Army." The communiqué reportedly stated that with Cámpora's assumption of power, "A new era begins in the country." It added that the guerrillas would limit their "armed struggle preferably to imperialist objectives."

The ERP was said to be involved in negotiations with the military government May 23 over the release of two armed forces officials it kidnapped in April. The officials—retired Rear Admiral Francisco Aleman and Lieutenant Colonel Jacobo Nasif—were offered their freedom in exchange for the release of thirty imprisoned guerrillas, according to a report by Kandell in the May 24 *New York Times*.

Prior to being sworn in as president, Cámpora delivered a three-hour

speech to the Congress in which he outlined the Peronist program for the next four years. Kandell called the program "nationalist and moderately leftist" and the speech "mostly conciliatory."

In addition to promising "national reconstruction" and pledging his government to represent not only the Peronists but also "those who didn't vote and those who didn't vote for us," Cámpora reiterated his appeal for a "political and social truce." The Peronist-led labor bureaucracy has reportedly reached agreement with the bosses to observe such a "truce" on social and trade-union struggles for a period of two years.

Although he expressed "solidarity with anti-imperialist struggles" and criticized "the insidious foreign penetration" into Argentine businesses, he did not directly criticize U.S. imperialism.

Among the more than sixty foreign delegations on hand for the inauguration ceremony was one from Washington, headed by Secretary of State William Rogers. As an example of his government's stated intention to work in "close harmony with the countries of the third world, and particularly with those of Latin America," Cámpora had also invited Cuban President Osvaldo Dorticós and Chilean President Salvador Allende. During the ceremony, they both stood directly behind him. Cámpora committed his government to restore diplomatic ties with Cuba.

In the May 23 issue of the *Wall Street Journal* Stanley Ross reported an interview with Jorge Antonio, Péron's right-hand man in Madrid. Ross described the new regime's goal for Latin America as one of creating "an alliance of the 'Popular Military' regimes in Latin America, including Peru, Bolivia, Cuba and Ecuador, for a start." He said that the government "also expects Uruguay, Chile and Panama to join up in the near future."

To help mend Argentina's sagging capitalist economy, Antonio expects investments and loans from Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Libya, and Algeria, in addition to investment money from Japan. The Peronist regime is also seeking to establish economic ties with the Soviet Union, China, and European countries.

Hundreds of thousands of Peronist supporters chanted and sang in the

streets of the capital during the inauguration. When it was over, demonstrators taunted and threw rocks at the cars of representatives of the outgoing military dictatorship, including that of Alejandro Lanusse. Police opened fire on the crowd, killing at least one person. At least thirty-five were reported wounded in the melee. Eight vehicles were set on fire.

Rogers hastily left by a side door, and, according to a United Press International report in the May 27 issue of the New York Spanish-language daily *El Diario-La Prensa*, "walked slowly—so as to not attract attention—to his car, parked several blocks away from the congress." From there he went straight to his hotel.

In the days leading up to the transfer of power to the Peronists, guerrilla groups staged a series of actions in various cities.

On May 23, the August 22 ERP demanded that the Ford Motor Company give \$1-million worth of ambulances and donations to hospitals in the country's twenty-two provinces and provide powdered milk for slum children. Each province was to receive seven ambulances. The company quickly agreed to the demands under the threat of further attacks on its employees and its Buenos Aires subsidiary, Ford Argentina. The previous day, the guerrilla group had wounded two local Ford executives in a bungled kidnapping attempt. In a communiqué, it said that it had shot Luis Giovanelli, a Ford manager, when he resisted the attempt. In the process, Noemi Baruj de la Rin, a supervisor of industrial relations, was also wounded. The communiqué described her as an "innocent bystander."

In mid-May, presumed guerrillas seriously wounded a police agent, Jaime Gine, in Córdoba. According to an Associated Press dispatch published in the May 17 issue of *El Diario*, "unconfirmed reports indicated that urban guerrilla groups had sentenced Gine to death for his alleged role in the questioning of arrested students and unionists, whom he was said to have beaten."

On May 20, another unidentified guerrilla commando unsuccessfully attempted to raid a police station in Merlo, near the capital. In the ensuing shoot-out, one policeman was killed

and three policemen and three of the ten guerrillas were wounded.

On May 22, Dirk Kloosterman, general secretary of the powerful Union of Mechanics and Related Transport Workers in the Automobile Industry (SMATA—Sindicato de Mecánicos y Afines del Transporte Automotor), was shot and killed in La Plata. According to a UPI report in the May 23 issue of *El Diario*, eyewitnesses said that as the union leader got out of his car, he was shot by two men who had been pretending to repair a tire a few yards away.

New York Times correspondent Jonathan Kandell reported from Buenos Aires May 23 that union spokesmen attributed the killing to left-wing Peronists. A report in the May 23 *Washington Post*, however, stated that "Argentina's Trotskyite terrorists later put out a bulletin claiming responsibility for the assassination." It did not specify what guerrilla group it was referring to.

The same day, UPI reported that Argentine police had announced the kidnapping of Oscar Castells, president of the Coca-Cola Bottling Corporation in Córdoba.

Plots From Two Directions

Banzer Regime Shaken by Selich murder

"Although we were not able to accomplish our task of simply obtaining a statement from the prisoner in accordance with our orders because of an unexpected and unfortunate turn of events, we hope that the high authorities will be able to understand that if we displayed any excessive zeal in performing our duty, we ask God to forgive us. We did not mean to kill him."

Thus concluded the confession of three Bolivian policemen May 18 that they had tortured to death the former colonel and fanatical right-wing anti-Communist Andrés Selich Chop May 14. His death at the hands of his own former colleagues created a tense situation in government circles.

Selich was the commander of the battalion of rangers that hunted down, captured, and murdered Che Guevara in 1967. He sported Guevara's wrist-

On May 23, guerrilla groups staged actions in the provinces of Buenos Aires, Rosario, and Córdoba. According to a UPI report in the May 24 issue of *El Diario*, "commandos consisting of men and women occupied a factory and two railroad stations in suburban Buenos Aires, stealing small arms and police uniforms; a metallurgical factory in Rosario, 350 kilometers from Buenos Aires; and the building housing civil census records in a small town in Córdoba, 700 kilometers from this capital." The only group that was identified was the ERP, which reportedly carried out the Rosario operation.

The preinaugural guerrilla activity also involved Peronist guerrillas. According to a UPI report published in the May 25 issue of *El Diario*, four heavily armed men and one woman belonging to the Montoneros took over a police station in Mendoza and made off with weapons and uniforms.

In addition to these actions, there were at least a half dozen reported kidnappings in the two weeks prior to the inauguration carried out by unidentified groups or by common criminals. □

watch and was known among Miami's gusano population as "the world's top anti-Communist."

He took an active part in the August 1971 coup that brought the military regime of Hugo Banzer Suárez to power. Following the coup, he was appointed minister of the interior, a post he occupied until he was forced to resign in December 1971, presumably for permitting the use of "excessive" brutality against political prisoners. The real reason was probably his incapacity to hide his ambition to seize power from Banzer.

Selich was arrested, along with a number of other right-wing military officials, on May 14. He was accused of plotting a coup to overthrow the Banzer government. (Four of the other captured plotters escaped to Argentina two days later.) The coup was said to have been scheduled for

the following week, when Banzer planned to attend the inauguration of Argentine President-elect Héctor Cámpora. Banzer canceled the trip after announcing discovery of the plot.

At first the government claimed that Selich had died while attempting to flee his captors. Under heavy guard, handcuffed, he was said to have fallen down the stairs on the third floor of a local office of the ministry of the interior, dying on the spot.

The official version was met with universal disbelief, and by May 18 the government found itself forced to withdraw its initial story and admit that Selich had been beaten to death. An autopsy showed a ruptured liver and multiple fractures of the ribs. The nature of the contusions indicated that they were caused by blows from rifle butts or kicks from heavy military boots.

Minister of the Interior Alfredo Arce Carpio, a civilian, held a news conference May 18 to announce the change of story in what was clearly an effort to contain indignation among the officer caste. It was also an attempt to stave off a possible governmental crisis. The government consists of a coalition of the Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario (MNR—Revolutionary Nationalist Movement), headed by Paz Estenssoro, and the ultraright Falange Socialista Boliviana (FSB—Bolivian Socialist Falange). Their alliance is becoming increasingly uneasy, and for some time they have been engaging in public criticisms of each other. Selich reportedly had many friends in the ranks of the Falange.

Arce explained that after his capture, Selich had been first taken to Arce's own home. From there he was ordered transferred to a branch of the interior ministry located in a well-to-do section of La Paz. The mission was given to the three policemen who later were to admit that they had been overly zealous in interrogating the prisoner.

Arce reiterated the allegation, made by the policemen in their confession, that under questioning, Selich said that his objective was "to get the MNR out of the government and smash the Communists."

At the conclusion of his news conference, according to the Buenos Aires daily *La Opinión* May 19, Arce sought to appear as an honest upholder of justice and the law:

"He maintained that, as minister of the interior, he could have covered up the truth, as was done so many times in the past, 'but I prefer to face any eventuality in order that the Bolivian people might know that their present rulers are determined to apply the law and set norms for the life of the country that are in harmony with justice and truth.'"

The three policemen, for their part, implied that by dying Selich had betrayed them, because he thereby made it impossible to get the desired statement they were under orders to obtain. When he refused to give them any information about the alleged plot, they said, "we gave him a few punches, but only to frighten him so that he would respond to our interrogation."

Selich collapsed, but rose to his feet, "already recovered," so the questioning continued. The prisoner remained uncooperative, however, and refused to talk as long as he was handcuffed. "In view of this refusal, one of us went over to him and gave him a punch in the right side, following which he again fell down, and this time he lost consciousness."

They became "alarmed" and called the doctor, who told them the prisoner was dead.

The night of Arce's press conference, the police picketed the governmental palace while Banzer and his ministers were meeting inside. The police were protesting the linking of a high police official to the plot and demanded Arce's resignation. The demand was echoed in political and military circles. The Falange reportedly threatened that if Arce did not resign, they would pull out of the government.

Arce resigned on May 21. The ministry of the interior portfolio was returned to the armed forces with the appointment of army Colonel Walter Castro Avendaño.

The revelation of the right-wing plot followed reports that left-wing generals, too, are plotting against the Banzer regime.

"The formation of a military front against the government of General Hugo Banzer, headed by former President Alfredo Ovando and including among others General Eduardo Méndez Pereyra, former minister of mines in the government of General Juan José Torres, and almost all the military figures in exile, is now worrying

the Bolivian authorities in charge of government security," the Buenos Aires daily *La Opinión* reported April 24.

In addition, according to the same source, former President Hernán Siles Zuazo has succeeded in setting up a common front composed of the left wing of the MNR, which he heads, and "all the parties of a progressive outlook that have as a common denominator opposition to the governing regime in Bolivia."

The heads of these groupings reached an understanding with the exiled generals in a "Pacto de Madrid" (Madrid Pact). This was signed at the beginning of March by Generals Ovando and Méndez in the Spanish capital.

According to the report in *La Opinión*, it has been "recognized by various political groupings as a positive step toward unity of all the sectors fighting against Banzer."

The program of the common front was not reported by *La Opinión*.

On May 1, General Juan José Torres, who was toppled from the presidency by Banzer and who is now living in exile in Santiago, Chile, issued a May Day message to the workers of Bolivia. He said, among other things, that "this will be the last May 1 that we will celebrate under the terror of the fascist dictatorship. In the same way that, from the ashes of the Chicago martyrs, arose the world conquest of the eight-hour day, from the massacres of the miners of Catavi, Uncia, Potosí, Villa Victoria, and the 'Night of San Juan' will arise our people's struggle to return to the stream bed of the liberating process, brutally cut off by imperialism on August 21, 1971."

Torres declared that "the history of the Bolivian national revolution has been expressed through unmistakable milestones—Busch's decree of June 1939 that restored government control over the profits from mineral exports, the heroic days of April 9, 1952, the nationalization of Gulf, of the Matilde mine and the dumps and tailings, and the payment of the miners' back wages."

In Bolivia today, he said, "a silent genocide is decimating the Bolivian population. It is a massacre institutionalized through hunger. Those holding power are killing the people, denying them their daily bread, in a



JUAN JOSE TORRES

monstrous operation aimed at depopulating the country in order to turn it over to imperialism definitively."

"The struggle of the Bolivian workers for survival," Torres continued, "is a struggle for survival of the nation itself."

The Banzer regime, "terrified at its weakness, is trying to sow divisions among all the layers of Bolivian society, isolating the workers movement."

The answer to this, the general said, is to unite, and he called on all sectors of Bolivian society to join together.

Torres ended his class-collaborationist demagoguery by saying that "this is Latin America's hour. Every country carries out the revolution through its own methods and its own experience. The common destination is the same, although the roads may be different. Bolivia will also rejoin this grand convergence of continental liberation on the basis of the struggle of its best sons—the workers."

Banzer's reply to the plans of the generals in exile was to step up the repression. On April 24 he exiled several dozen more leftist political figures, shipping them to Paraguay. The April 26 *Le Monde* reported that some of them belonged to the MNR, "which is represented in the coalition government; others belong to the 'National

Action Command,' a small formation of the left."

There are also reports of new arrests. Although some prisoners have reportedly been released in recent months, it has been calculated, according to the May 22 *La Opinión*, that in Bolivia "there are still some 500 political prisoners; at the end of 1972 there were more than 2,000."

A United Press International dispatch from La Paz published in the

May 25 issue of the New York Spanish-language daily *El Diario-La Prensa* reported that the Bolivian armed forces have reaffirmed their support of Banzer in the wake of the removal of Selich from the political scene.

Despite such assurances, rumors persist in the Bolivian capital that the Banzer regime may soon go the way of many of its predecessors. □

Allende Declares 'Emergency Zones'

Fascist Provocations, Labor Unrest in Chile

By Hugo Blanco

Santiago

MAY 15—The government declared Santiago Province an "emergency zone" on May 5. The reason it gave for this was the "seriousness of the events of the past forty-eight hours."

After the murder of the Communist worker José Ricardo Ahumada on April 27, the revolutionary left partially broke with the passivity that the Popular Unity leadership urged in the face of the provocative bluster of the fascist bands. Clashes occurred between leftist and rightist groups. The most serious clash took place May 4 in downtown Santiago. It left Mario Aguilar dead and four persons wounded—all members of *Patria y Libertad* [Fatherland and Freedom], the strongest fascist group in Chile. One of the wounded was Ernesto Miller, who holds a top post in that organization.

Another important event that *Patria y Libertad* was behind was the "resurrection" of Roberto Thieme, the secretary general of the organization. Thieme had been pronounced dead approximately two months earlier; his "death" was handled in the proper way, with a mass for the dead, speeches, and all the appropriate ceremonies. Now he has turned up in Mendoza, Argentina, along with Juan Sesca, another leader of *Patria y Libertad*. They were arrested after they clandestinely landed a plane there May 2. It appears that since his "decease," Thieme has been busy transporting weapons from Argentina to

the big landholders in southern Chile. The Argentine government granted both fascists asylum on May 8.

Subsequently, some *Patria y Libertad* weapons dumps and a contraband trade were discovered near the Argentine border.

There is no question that these ostensible reasons for declaring Santiago an emergency zone are important. But it is no less certain that behind the move were other serious reasons that were not mentioned.

A protest rally of four Santiago municipalities (Providencia, Nuñoa, La Reina, and Las Condes) had been called for May 5. It is true that all four are led by the right wing and that they contain rich neighborhoods, but the reason for the mobilization was the problem of food shortages, which is the main problem in Chile these days. This demonstration could have developed into the first link in a chain of mobilizations around the question of food distribution. And although the demand being raised by the four municipalities was freedom of trade, the subsequent demonstrations that it might have kicked off would probably have raised the demand for direct distribution of goods, bypassing the merchants altogether.

The demonstration was canceled after the area was declared an emergency zone, but this does not eliminate the fact that the problem of the distribution of goods continues to be the big time bomb that becomes more

explosive the longer it takes to blow up.

As a result of the high cost of living and the wretched distribution of goods, the problem of wages also takes on an increasing importance.

A "readjustment law" for workers in state companies is presently under discussion. The executive branch is proposing that only the wages of the lowest-paid workers be raised and that the readjustment be financed through direct taxes being levied against those who have the most money. The parliament, which is in the hands of the opposition, says that the readjustment should not be limited only to the lowest categories, but the demagoguery of its position stands out clearly owing to its refusal to approve any way of financing the proposal.

Besides giving its support to the government in this interminable discussion, the working class is beginning to indicate its concern over its economic situation in more expeditious ways.

Direct struggles around economic demands have been begun by public works employees, truck drivers in collective transport, and miners.

The extension of the emergency zone to O'Higgins Province on May 10, in fact, was the product of a strike begun twenty-seven days earlier by the workers in El Teniente mine, which employs around 13,000 workers. The purpose of the strike is to defend the sliding scale of wages already won by the workers, which the government now wants to do away with. This strike was supported by a forty-eight-hour strike by the workers in Chuquicamata mine; they are discussing the possibility of launching an indefinite strike. In addition to this, a nationwide strike in the copper mining industry appears probable.

The government and the news media that support it are attempting to minimize the problem by pointing out that "the majority of the workers have gone back to work" and that it involves "only a strike by white-collar workers." In addition, they are trying to grotesquely distort the character of the movement by depicting the workers as vulgar pawns of the right wing that have been carried away by their "economism."

The right wing is also trying to make hay out of the problem by giving it publicity and by giving verbal

backing to the strikers. The president of the Senate, for instance, went to the zone, and the leader of the rightist organization of secondary-school students made a speech to the miners in which he voiced "solidarity" with them.

The government attempted to intimidate the workers with 500 carabinieri and two tanks, but the miners offered resistance and blocked access roads to the mine. When it was over, thirty people had been wounded. At that point, both sides adopted a more restrained attitude, but the strike is continuing.

In view of the dizzying rise in the cost of living, it is possible that these conflicts among layers of workers that are not fully under the control of Pop-

ular Unity might be the beginning of a wage struggle on such a broadened scale that it would not enjoy the demagogic support of the right wing.

The public works employees already showed clearly that the struggle against the government for wage increases does not amount to playing into the hands of the right wing. The government came off very badly when it made this insinuation in the case of these workers; actually, it gave the workers a chance to demonstrate their antirightist determination, in contrast to the timidity of the Popular Unity.

In turn, the government's antipopular attitude will become clearer to the workers each time and will have the effect of making them less reluctant to struggle against it. □

Interview With Hugo Blanco

'Workers Hold Key to Peru's Future'

[The following interview with the Peruvian revolutionist Hugo Blanco, currently living in exile in Chile, was obtained by Alejandro Tarquin. It was published in the April 15-30 issue of the Venezuelan magazine *Summa*. Sections appearing in parentheses are observations by the interviewer.]

[The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

(The [March 1973] Chilean elections have one exceptional observer—Hugo Blanco, the legendary Peruvian peasant leader, who is living in Santiago after being expelled from his own country, from Mexico, and from Argentina. We knew that he was here, and searched him out until we found the small flat where he lives.)

(We spoke with him for several hours, both in his home and while walking through the streets of this capital. A virtual legend for the peasants of his homeland of Cuzco, Hugo Blanco bears no resemblance whatever to the political leaders we are used to in Venezuela. Neither pedantic nor imperious. Calm and resolute like his country's Indians. In the restaurant of the UNCTAD [United Nations Conference on Trade and De-

velopment] building, several people approach us. They would like to talk with Hugo, learn about his experience, and perhaps hear the reasons why the Velasco Alvarado government will not let him reside in Peru.)

Question. Is it true that every Cuzco peasant keeps one bed ready in case "Brother" Hugo Blanco should need it?

Answer. Yes.

(The peasant struggles in Concepción made their mark on the history of Latin America during the first few years of the last decade. Still today Hugo Blanco remains the general secretary of the Federación de Campesinos de la Convención y Lares [Peasants Federation of La Convención and Lares]. Belaúnde intended to kill him with the Tacna trial, but spared his life thanks to a campaign of international solidarity.)

(He spent eight years in Frontón Prison. Freed by General Velasco in 1970, he was forbidden to leave Lima. Months later the army expelled him from the country more or less secretly when he supported a teachers' strike. Then he was transferred from Mexico to Buenos Aires, where he was

shut up in a jail for three months. And then from Argentina to Chile.)

Q. Will you be allowed to remain in Santiago very long?

A. For the moment they are letting me stay here for a few more months.

Q. The press in all Latin American countries has been devoting a great deal of attention to Velasco's illness these days. Rumors are going around. . .

A. There are too many unknown factors for us to be able to say anything definite about the matter. There was talk of an attempt on his life, but we don't believe it. Whatever the case, the illness of Velasco Alvarado can have important political consequences. The Peruvian right wing is interested in imposing Mercado Jarrin as head of the military junta. Would this happen if Velasco were not to go on governing? As soon as Mercado took over we would see an offensive by the bosses against the workers movement. And this is not a remote possibility, if you take into account the fact that there is no mass upsurge applying pressure in an opposite direction.

Q. Many leftist tendencies in Peru are offering their advice to the government—the Communist party, [Ismael] Frias [a former Trotskyist], [Héctor] Béjar [former guerrilla leader], and others. The Venezuelan readers of Summa would be interested in knowing what the reasons are behind your opposition to the military junta.

A. It cannot be denied that the measures taken by the government have given the country a certain stability—measures such as the nationalization of banking, national industry, improved trade with the Soviet Union, and the initial expropriations. The measures themselves deserve our support. But this is a capitalist regime, not a government of the workers. For this reason, the crisis facing Peru will not be overcome. And for this reason, we cannot support a government that does not belong to us. The Communist party does this, but we are already used to seeing the CP capitulate.

The government's economic plans

June 4, 1973



HUGO BLANCO

were based on its nationalizations, a greater capitalization of the state sector of the economy, on giving an impetus to the industrial sector through credits and tax benefits, etc. All these plans met with serious setbacks: 1) In reality, strikes also were carried out in the state sector of the economy; 2) Difficulties increased with the refusal to refinance the foreign debt and under the impact of a suspension of credits; 3) In the countryside, production was not adequate, even though it surpassed that of the year before; 4) Climatic factors resulted in a decrease in the production of fish flour.

Last year we had some big struggles, with strikes in the mines and in the factories of the capital. This produced definite rifts between the various sectors of the bourgeoisie, which forced the government to grant concessions to the workers, but also to deal some repressive blows. As a result, the regime began to lose its prestige.

Q. But the right wing is opposed to the military junta.

A. Certainly. The czar was also opposed to Kerensky in 1917. The bourgeoisie is not a monolithic bloc. It suffers from internal contradictions.

It is easy to understand why the

most reactionary groups refuse to go along with modernizing the country along capitalist lines, because this strikes at—although it does not do away with—their privileges. The most opposition on the right is coming from the APRA [Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana — People's Revolutionary American Alliance], together with the importer-bourgeoisie. Through their press, they are calling for "institutionalization," that is, for elections. This political solution that they are seeking is reflected in the army and has the support of imperialism.

Q. Allow me to pursue my point a little further. Are you saying that you believe the industrial communities do not represent a progressive step by the regime that benefits the workers?

A. If we had to briefly define the industrial communities, we would say that they are an attempt to get a policy of capitalist development moving by stimulating workers control in the factories as a way of increasing production and preventing strikes.

Q. I believe we have strayed a bit from the initial topic of our conversation. We were talking about the Peruvian left. It would be good if you could say a little more about the situation in which it really finds itself. For, at first glance the Velasco government seems to control the situation in the country—with the support, in fact, of this left itself.

A. The key to Peru's future lies with the workers movement. Its strength is decisive. Just a while ago, there was an attempt to force the workers to discuss their demands and sign contracts every two years instead of annually. The law was repudiated by strikes and mobilizations that forced the government to suspend the measure until 1975. Here you have an example of a government concession to the right wing that did not succeed thanks to the workers themselves.

The Communist party is the main force on the left. It controls the CGTP [Confederación General de Trabajadores del Perú — General Confederation of Peruvian Workers], the most important union. The other unions—or, more accurately, union headquarters—are the APRA-oriented CTP

[Confederación de Trabajadores Peruanos—Peruvian Workers Federation] and the CTRP [Central de Trabajadores de la Revolución Peruana—Central Workers Union of the Peruvian Revolution], which was created by the government. But these last two unions have hardly any real strength within the workers movement. And we already said that the CP has unconditionally surrendered to the capitalist government. Just look at the 1971 teachers strike, which this party sabotaged. And that's not the only example.

The revolutionary left is in a state of crisis. The MIR [Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria—Movement of the Revolutionary Left] and the pro-Peking tendencies have broken up into many different groups. The FIR [Frente de Izquierda Revolucionario—Front of the Revolutionary Left], which is our organization, was hit very hard for having led the peasant mobilizations in Cuzco. We just began to get reorganized in 1968, and not without splits; in 1969 we suffered an especially serious one. These tendencies are in opposition to the government.

Q. What is the policy of your party, the FIR, at the moment?

A. I already pointed out that we are supporting the government's progressive measures, but not the government itself. We are calling on the workers to have no faith in it, but rather in their own forces. We are struggling, both inside the CGTP and outside it, against the high prices and unemployment. We are demanding that its leadership put forward a plan for struggle on a national scale. This anticapitalist and antibureaucratic struggle begins with each union conflict and tends to be waged among the ranks—in view of the incompetence of the union leadership—and to point in the direction of a government of the workers.

Q. All this does not have much to do with Guevarism. Yet you are known everywhere as a guerrilla and a Guevarist. Could you clarify this?

A. In contrast to the traditional, reformist parties, we uphold the international stance of the Cuban revolu-

tion as expressed in Guevarism. In this regard, we recognize Che as our teacher. Another of his tremendously positive sides is that he proposed armed struggle as the only way out for our peoples, thereby breaking with the pacifist molds of Stalinism. And we recognize the heroic efforts of the revolutionary vanguard that came together around this concept and that has shed its blood all across this continent.

Along with these merits, the biggest error of this current, we feel, is the fact that its activities are not linked to the concrete struggles of the masses. This is the reason that all the efforts of the Guevarists have ended in failure. The masses do not learn only through leaflets, manifestos, or heroic actions by a particular group. *Basically* (Hugo Blanco asked that we emphasize this word—A. T.), they learn through their own experience, and it is through their concrete struggles that they will understand the need for socialism and will be prepared to lay down their lives for it as the only alternative to all social problems. We do not claim that this occurs spontaneously. What is necessary is a revolutionary party that is integrated into the mass movement and that from that vantage point orients the struggle around such a perspective.

In this sense we have differences with Guevarism, and for this, as well as other, reasons we belong to the Fourth International.

Q. If you were to return to your

Lebanon Regime Ends State of Emergency

On May 23 the Lebanese cabinet lifted the state of emergency that had been imposed on the country sixteen days earlier during fighting between the army and the Palestinian fedayeen. The announcement of the end of martial law was made by Premier Amin el-Hafez, who briefly left a cabinet meeting to report the decision to the press.

The following day the army withdrew its units to barracks, turning "law and order" maintenance over to the police and paramilitary forces.

Military censorship of the press also was lifted, on May 24.

While the formal state of emergen-

country tomorrow, what errors made in your previous work would you try to overcome?

A. Our main shortcoming was to have neglected the building of a revolutionary party. We let ourselves get carried away by the dynamics of the struggle itself. This was a syndicalist deviation. Now we are trying to rectify this error by applying the methodology I just described. But the FIR does not consider itself to be the sole proprietor of the revolution. There are many tendencies that, on the basis of their daily experiences, are coming to the same conclusions that we have. And a unified party is necessary for the Peruvian revolution.

Q. Do you believe that you will be returning to Peru soon?

A. The answer to this question lies with the Peruvian workers. I have reports that there is a repatriation committee there that is demanding and struggling not only for my return but also for that of other compañeros. Rolando Breña is also in exile, and suffers from tuberculosis. It appears that Compañero Napuri has been deported. It is a duty to demand the return of all these people to Peru.

(We took our leave of Hugo Blanco. As we were leaving, he observed that nationalism and anti-imperialism are on the rise in our subcontinent. "This is good, but don't forget that the liberation of the workers can only be the work of the workers themselves.")

cy was ended, riot policeman behind sandbags continued to guard government buildings, and armored cars were still posted at radio and television stations. A midnight-to-dawn curfew remained in effect.

There has still been no solid information on the terms of the agreement reached between the fedayeen and the government. A May 24 dispatch to the *New York Times* reported that the fedayeen had agreed to remove all weapons that require more than one operator from the refugee camps. Small arms may remain for defense purposes.

New Wave of Repression Launched by Israeli Regime

The Israeli army's April 10 terror raid on Beirut has provided the Zionist regime with excuses to intensify an already severe witch-hunt against the anti-Zionist left. When the Israeli commandos gunned down three leaders of the Palestinian resistance movement, they also ransacked the Palestinians' apartments. The Israelis claim to have carried off a large number of fedayeen documents, which have now become known in Israel as the Beirut Papers.

The anti-Zionist left had expected that the government would use the Beirut Papers to arrest Arab militants in Israel, claiming that those arrested were named in the documents as "undercover agents."

That process has apparently now begun. The first arrests occurred in the Little Triangle, a heavily Arab area. In no case has any specific charge been laid against a detainee; under the Emergency and Defense Regulations, passed by the British in the late 1940s and still in effect today, any person (more precisely, any Arab, at least so far) can be held indefinitely without charge or trial.

The Little Triangle arrests came just after the trials of most of the persons arrested on charges of membership in the "espionage and sabotage network." The network case began in December 1972, when thirty-nine persons, six of them Jews, were detained on charges of having been part of an underground group working for Syrian intelligence or of having known about the existence of the network and having failed to inform the police. (See *Intercontinental Press*, January 29, p. 73.)

The "network" defendants were divided into four groups, three of which have already been tried. The first group (of six) came to trial in February and all the defendants were convicted on March 25.

They were sentenced March 26. The penalties were especially severe. Daoud Turki and Ehud Adiv each got seventeen years in prison; Subhi Narani and Anais Karawi got fifteen years, Dan Vered ten years, and Simon Haddad two years.

The convictions were supposedly for treason, conspiracy, and passing information to the enemy. In actual fact, the six defendants had done no more than talk to Arabs who did not hold Israeli citizenship. The "information" supposedly passed to the "enemy" consisted of commonplace observations readily available in the newspapers.

We do not yet have information on the results of the second and third trials. The fourth trial was scheduled to begin at the end of May.

The heavy sentences handed out, the continuing arrests, and the fact that the regime has been intensifying censorship of the leftist press make it clear that a new wave of repression is under way. We publish below two articles on that repression

and the anti-Zionist left's response. The first, on the first round of the Haifa "network" trial, appeared in issue No. 69 of *Matzpen* (Compass), monthly newspaper of the Israeli Socialist Organization (Matzpen-Marxist), Israeli sympathizers of the Fourth International.

The second, which is scheduled for publication in *Matzpen*, deals with the more recent arrests in the Little Triangle and with the United Front Against Zionist Repression, which has been set up by the anti-Zionist left to counter the regime's attacks.

We received the articles in French translation; the translation from the French is by *Intercontinental Press*.

* * *

Round One in the Haifa Trials

The curtain has just come down on the first act of the Haifa trials. At this point, we have to be able to evaluate these trials and to draw the political implications of them. Although the skein of these trials has not yet fully unrolled—nor have the regime's attempts to liquidate the anti-Zionist left, attempts linked to the exacerbation of the class struggle, yet run their course—we can say with certainty that the first round did not end in victory for the regime.

What did the regime want to achieve with this business about an "espionage and sabotage network"?

The new rise of class struggle in Israel, the rise of the militancy of the working class and its increasingly strong desire to organize itself and to struggle have strengthened the regime's fears. All the Zionist parties, each in its own way, have been trying to put the brakes on the struggle. As the first glimmer of the crisis appears, the political weight of the anti-Zionist left organizations is becoming greater and greater—in fact, it is much greater than their actual forces. Incapable of resolving its own contradictions, the regime is trying to divert mass attention by bringing up espionage

and concurrently it is trying to liquidate the left organizations that are attempting to put forth an economic, social, and political alternative.

Even by itself, this attempt reveals the regime's fears and weaknesses. But more important, the facts have shown that the left organizations have not been scared off, nor have they fragmented; rather they are getting together for a united struggle against the repression. The formation of a united front and the strengthening of its activities have clearly shown the regime that we will do everything we can to raise the price the regime will have to pay if it wants to liquidate the left organizations.

The United Front includes all the anti-Zionist left organizations as well as the Union of Arab Students. The Front has succeeded in maintaining unity in action while at the same time not squashing political discussion nor hiding it. Because of the Front's rejection of any opportunism and its commitment to unity in action, various reformists have refused to participate in it, notably Siah on the one hand and the Communist party (Rakah) on the other. The attitude of

the CP, which hopes to escape the storm by lying low, has provoked some ferment in its ranks among many members. As for Siah, it passed a resolution that can be summed up as follows: "The Security Service is ours and it is certainly correct." This resolution has liquidated the left wing of Siah and all its activities. The attitude of Maki, a right-wing split from the CP, has surprised no one. Immediately after the arrests, it appealed to the government to intensify its repression of the anti-Zionist left organizations. Such an attitude is characteristic of a party that has definitively gone over to the bourgeoisie. For it, the existence of revolutionary parties cramps the image it is trying to present.

Everyone knows that the political differences between us and Red Front are many and basic, as are our differences with other organizations of the anti-Zionist left. But one point must be clear: These differences must be thrashed out through discussion and struggle between us and them. This has nothing to do with the Zionist regime. In face of the class enemy, we are united. The regime must not be able to exploit these differences among us as breaches that make its attack easier. On the contrary, it must be confronted with one bloc, one front, one will.

* * *

Everyone knows that the defendants in the "espionage and sabotage network" were tried and convicted mainly for their political ideas and not for their acts. The authorities' moves at each stage were political: sending active provocateurs into the organizations, deciding to bring the victims of the provocations to trial, deciding to orchestrate a huge hysterical campaign around the case.

But political moves that are not based on an analysis of the concrete situation can have consequences going far beyond those intended. This has been the case for the Zionist regime. Once the smoke is cleared away, it can be seen that the Zionist state, by the virulence of its attack against the left, has mowed down some of its own most sacred cows.

The first sacred cow that has been shot down—right in front of everyone's eyes—is the idea that in the

Middle East it is "all the Arabs against all the Jews."

For all the years of the Zionist colonization, and for all the years after the formation of the state of Israel, the regime succeeded in splitting and



MEIR: Slaughters a few of her own sacred cows.

preventing any common struggle of Jews and Arabs. The "conquest of labor" was based on the attack of the Jewish worker against the Arab worker and the dispossession of the latter. The "liberation of the land" was the means of dispossessing the Arab peasantry, and the "defense of the country's produce" meant the expulsion of Arab agricultural products from the market.

The great Arab revolt against the British regime [in 1936] was defeated with the aid of the Zionists who, at that time, were stepping up their expropriation and setting up military nuclei aimed at broadening it.

The state of Israel was founded on the creation and extension of a system of Jewish privilege and of denial of all civil liberties for the Arab inhabitants. From the beginning, the regime was willing to tolerate a Jewish political opposition (within the framework of recognition of the Jewish state), but denied this right to the Arab citizens. For the Jewish inhabitants, Israel has a bourgeois-democratic aspect, but for the Arab inhab-

itants, there is a legal and institutional system based on the "Emergency and Defense Regulations," that is, a typically colonial regime.

The common accusation against Jews and Arabs that they were struggling together for a common goal against the Zionist regime and their common sentencing as accomplices equally inculcated in the struggle for social change on a regional scale marks a crucially important turning point. For the first time, the Zionist regime has dared to break the taboo that it itself had created [that maintained] the complete separation of the Jews struggling against the regime from the Arabs struggling against the regime. Thus, the regime, involuntarily, has helped to present the real content of the struggle against Zionism. The proof that Jews and Arabs *can* struggle together on a class basis has been provided by the regime itself.

We know that to really solve the problems of the area, they *must* do this. But the proof that the regime has provided is a very important step forward for the consciousness of the masses of the region.

A second sacred cow to be hit was the Israeli legal system. Arab citizens who have tried to struggle against the colonial emergency laws by going before tribunals have for a long time understood that the principles of "justice and democracy" guide these tribunals only as long as they serve the objectives of Zionism.

Political organizations that do not accept the goals of Zionism are forbidden for the Arab population (el-Ard party, for example); appeals to the State Council against administrative arrests are always rejected, just as requests for annulment of arbitrary imposition of exile, expropriations, destruction of homes, and other attacks against all political activities in the territories conquered in 1967 have been rejected.

These measures, which for years were imposed against the Palestinian Arabs, during the past two years have been used against the Black Panthers as well. They too have been subjected to preventive arrests or "exile" to Jerusalem, for example, and have also met with hostile attitudes from the courts. This was the case, for example, with Judge Werlinska in Haifa, whose attitude went even beyond "classical" bourgeois hypocrisy.

But up to the trial of the members of the "espionage and sabotage network" the courts did their best not to reveal their class character and not to lift the fig leaf of "objectivity" from the corpse of bourgeois justice. According to the rules of bourgeois legality, a person is innocent until proven guilty. But in the "network" trial, the judges abandoned the last vestige of objective appearances.

One after the other, the three judges played the role of accusers, aided the prosecution in difficult moments, made fun of the accused, and in general turned the trial into a farce. In their reportage, the journalists did not even try to cover this up; because for them it was "natural" that a Zionist judge would be prejudiced against an anti-Zionist suspect.

Throughout the press, daily reports were littered with pearls drawn from the mouths of the judges who, wanting to make fun of the defendants,

made the trial into the farce it was. Thus, not only was justice not done, it was not even played at. After these trials, it will be more difficult for all the democrats, liberals, and other reformists to pretend that the judicial system is the only sound institution in the rotten Zionist edifice.

The Israeli press—all segments of it—demonstrated once again that the only principle that guides it is worship of the existing regime. Just as it has no use for journalistic ethics—not even of the type prevailing in banana republics—it has no use for facts. By spreading around a whole system of lies, half truths, and falsifications, the press organized an unprecedented campaign of incitement, made up of a mixture of imagination and ill will. The condemnation of the defendants by the press before the trials even started was only the prelude to the injustice that would go down at the trials themselves.

United Front Against Zionist Repression

The arrests of the members of the so-called espionage and sabotage network showed the desire of the Zionist state to deal a serious blow to the whole anti-Zionist left. The heavy sentences imposed on those who have already been tried—and this despite the fact that the trial clearly showed that there had been no question of spying or sabotage—only confirm this estimation. New repressive steps against the extraparliamentary opposition were not long in coming, and it can be said today that the government has decided to wage a real campaign.

As always in the Zionist state, the repression starts against the Arab population. During the past few months, late-night surprise visits by the Security Service to Arab militants and their families and friends have been on the rise, as have various sorts of pressure on Arab militants to stop their political activity. On May 4, ten militants were arrested in the Arab village of Tira, among them several active sympathizers of the Israeli Socialist Organization (Matzpen-Marxist). Among these were Said Atili, secretary of the Tel Aviv Union of Arab Students, and Rushdi Haskeh, who had already been impris-

oned for several months by administrative decree.

The names of these militants supposedly appeared in the "Beirut Papers," documents that were said to have been seized during the Israeli attack [April 10] on the Beirut offices of the Palestinian resistance. It is obvious that today anyone can be arrested on the pretext that his or her name appears in these so-called documents. The fact is that those imprisoned were questioned only about their political activities in the Union of Arab Students and in the Organization of Arab University Teachers, and about their relations with our organization.

Having no evidence against those arrested, the authorities threatened to hold them under administrative detention for one year. It is clear that this is a threat aimed at making them end their militant activities.

The Union of Arab Students was also attacked in Jerusalem. The Arab Students wanted to organize a meeting against expropriations, but were denied a room to hold it in. They distributed a leaflet and were stopped by university guards; the president of the group, Mohammed Naamni, was threatened with punishment. Also

at the University of Jerusalem, during the university elections, a poster that amounted to a real anti-Jewish provocation was pasted up with Siah's and Matzpen's names signed to it.

Today, it is the opposition press that is under attack. Having imprisoned the editors of *el-Fajar*, a legal magazine published in the occupied territories, for printing an article expressing the revulsion of all Palestinians to the Israeli army's criminal attack against the Palestinian organizations in Lebanon, the Zionist authorities are now going after two English-language opposition journals, *Israleft* and *Viewpoint*, as well as our journal, *Matzpen*, which they have threatened to close down, and whose latest issue has just had several articles censored.

If to all this we add the imprisonment of soldiers who refuse to serve in the occupied territories, the violent suppression of a demonstration of liberal students who opposed the independence-day military parade, the imprisonment of two Maoist militants accused of having had in their possession "forbidden magazines," the new attempt to put an end to the activity of the Human Rights League, and various other acts, it becomes clear that we have here not just a few "errors," but a new stage of a policy of repression.

This new policy is determined by the real danger that the far-left organizations represent today (far out of proportion to their actual numerical membership) in the context of the new radicalization of the Israeli working class and in a political situation in which it is more and more difficult to block all struggles on the pretext of "national security."

In such a context, the necessity for a united front of all organizations subject to the repression is on the agenda. After the arrests around the Haifa "network," we called on all organizations to unite in the struggle against repression. It is unfortunate that Siah and the Communist party (Rakah) failed to understand that it was in *their* interest to participate in this United Front and that they preferred to differentiate themselves from the other organizations in the vain hope that the authorities would leave them alone—an idea that was soon enough proven illusory by events (the arrest of several Rakah members).

Also regrettable was the liquidation-

ist attitude taken by the local Lambertist group. Several times it tried to sabotage the Front, but under the pressure of its membership it was forced into the joint struggle—formally at least.

Having put out several leaflets, published in the press a petition signed by more than 150 persons, and organized a meeting attended by more than 250 persons, the United Front began working on a pamphlet on the Haifa trials and organized a demonstration in front of the Haifa court where the third group of defendants were being tried.

This demonstration, which brought out about fifty persons, was dispersed by the police. Sixteen demonstrators were arrested and were held for six days, when they were released on bail of 4,000 Israeli pounds. Their trial is scheduled to take place on May 17; they are liable to heavy fines and even to terms of imprisonment.

In addition to activities directly related to the Haifa trials, the United Front has also organized a campaign at the University of Jerusalem for elementary democratic rights (the right of assembly, the right to hand out leaflets without having to submit them to the censorship of university authorities, the right to sell political magazines, and so on). On May 1, the United Front held a united May Day demonstration under the slogans "Down with the occupation!" and "Workers power!" along with the Black Panthers who, in contrast to Rakah, accepted the principle of a united demonstration and are preparing in coming months to come to a series of meetings and demonstrations against the repression and for the release of all political prisoners.

The Arab Students Union in Jerusalem, which is part of the United Front, is in the process of forming a permanent coordinating body of the Unions of Arab Students and is trying to draw its affiliates into the United Front's activities.

All these activities will culminate in a big united demonstration against the repression and against the occupation, to be held on the anniversary of the 1967 war.

The United Front has also taken up the legal defense of political prisoners and the support of their families by setting up an aid fund drawing on donations both in Israel and abroad. The fund has already raised



DAYAN: With the "Beirut Papers" he can arrest anyone he wants.

several thousand pounds. The heavy fines that may be imposed on the militants who demonstrated in front of the Haifa court will necessitate a par-

ticularly important financial campaign.

In face of the new repression launched by the Zionist authorities, the revolutionary organizations have united and have thus clearly shown that they will respond together against any attempt to liquidate them by piecemeal attacks. The Zionist state, more than any other state, needs the support of world reaction. And Israeli revolutionists likewise need the international support of revolutionary forces. Israel's role of policeman for imperialism in the Arab East is of concern to militants throughout the world, and the attack on revolutionary anti-Zionists concerns the entire revolutionary movement. We need political, moral, and material solidarity from all organizations and from all revolutionary militants.

Free Said and his comrades!

Free all political prisoners!

Acquit all those accused of political crimes!

Long live the United Front against Zionist repression!

As Parliamentary Wrangling on Reform Bill Begins

French Mobilize for Right to Abortion

More than 2,000 persons, most of them young women, filled the Mutualité in Paris May 18 for a mass meeting that capped a "week of mobilization" called by the *Mouvement pour la Liberté de l'Avortement et de la Contraception* (MLAC — Movement for Freedom of Abortion and Contraception).

The week had been called after the arrest May 8 in Grenoble of Dr. Annie Ferrey-Martin, a member of the pro-abortion group *Choisir*, who was charged with performing an abortion in violation of the reactionary 1920 law forbidding the operation. (See *Intercontinental Press*, May 28, p. 621.)

The arrest of Ferrey-Martin was closely followed by a series of police measures against defenders of women's right to abortion. The May 18 issue of *Rouge*, weekly newspaper of the *Ligue Communiste*, French section of the Fourth International, reported that on the afternoon of May 8 cops conducted an illegal search of the offices of Family Planning and

Choisir; three assistants were interrogated.

On May 9, the president of Family Planning was interrogated for three hours by the police. The same day, the police entered a center in which abortions are "clandestinely" performed at nominal charge and carried off all the medical equipment they could get their hands on. They had no warrant of any kind. It was, *Rouge* said, "pure and simple theft."

The government crackdown on Ferrey-Martin and its attack on the abortion center coincided with the opening of a parliamentary debate on the 1920 abortion law. Rising sentiment for elimination of the law, combined with the organization of that sentiment (not least through the establishment of "clandestine" centers at which abortions are performed free of charge by qualified medical personnel), has impelled the Gaullist regime to propose modification of the 1920 law.

After stalling around for months, the

government finally announced May 15 that a new bill on abortion will be submitted to the National Assembly before the end of its current working session July 2. The announcement came in the form of a speech to the Senate by Minister of Justice Jean Taittinger, who promised that if the government law is enacted, abortion will cease "to be a problem for society and will remain simply a problem for the individual's conscience."

But his failure to explain the exact terms of the Gaullist proposal, especially in light of the indictment of Ferrey-Martin, only spurred on the activities around the week of mobilization.

Those activities culminated not only in the Paris meeting, but in a series of demonstrations and rallies throughout the country. The May 20-21 *Le Monde* reported that demonstrations took place in Lyon (1,000), Rouen (500), Bordeaux (500), Reims (200), Marseille (600), Toulon (300), and Toulouse (more than 1,000). In Grenoble more than 3,000 persons attended a meeting in solidarity with Ferrey-Martin.

A demonstration had been planned in Paris, but it was banned by the police department. *Le Monde* reported that the organizers announced that they had decided not to try to challenge the police ban but that if the government's reform bill fell short of their demands, they would take to the streets regardless of police interference.

As of the end of the week of mobilization, the terms of the Gaullist proposal remained a mystery. But three other draft laws had been proposed.

Yves Le Foll, a deputy from the PSU (Parti Socialiste Unifié—United Socialist party), has presented a bill stating that "every woman can, at her request and regardless of her age, undergo an abortion up to the end of the twenty-fourth week of pregnancy." One restriction on the bill is that if a woman is less than eighteen years old and more than twelve weeks pregnant, an abortion can be performed only after "serious consultations" involving family counselors who can decide to recommend abortion to the woman's parents.

The Socialist party has put forth a proposal similar to the PSU's. It was drafted by members of Choisir. The proposed law, according to the May

17 *Le Monde*, says that "every woman can, at her request, undergo an abortion up to the twenty-fourth week of pregnancy. In cases where the pregnancy has passed its twelfth week, the woman should consult with a physician of her own choice and a social and family counselor . . . who will present a motivated opinion on the advisability of abortion. In every case, in the final analysis, only the woman can make the decision."

The law also reportedly states that after the twenty-fourth week of pregnancy abortions should be authorized only "in cases in which the pregnancy places the woman's life in danger or in which there is a risk that the child will be born seriously handicapped."

Le Monde mentioned that the SP had made certain changes in the draft proposed by Choisir but did not explain what these were.

The women and men who mobilized during the MLAC's action week were demanding more sweeping changes in the law. In its report of the May 18 Paris meeting, *Le Monde* noted that most of the participants seemed united around four major points: that women and women alone should make decisions on whether or not to undergo abortions; that all medical and psychological services should be put at the disposal of women with no constraints or restrictions; that minors should have the same rights as any other women in this regard; and that no law should take effect giving physicians the right to refuse to perform abortions on grounds of "conscience."

The combination of the growing movement for free abortion, the government's declared commitment to "reforming" the 1920 law, and the counterreforms put forward by the PSU and the Socialist party forced the leaders of the Communist party to take a public position on the matter.

This proved to be an operation of some delicacy. Since the Communist party does not formally recognize the ideological hegemony of the Roman Church, it is deprived of arguments against abortion that the Gaullists are able to resort to. At the same time, the Stalinists have shown what is for them unusual ability to withstand social pressure by refusing to come out for women's right to abortion. This presents a dilemma.

It was resolved on May 16 when the CP announced its bold new proposal



MARCHAIS: CP leader wants restrictions on women's right to abortion.

for the abortion law. Abortion, said a statement issued by the CP parliamentary bloc, should be authorized—in any of the five following cases:

"When the life of the mother [sic] is in danger; when significant risk of fetal malformation or congenital deformity exists; when the pregnancy results from a violent or criminal act [conceivably a reference to rape, although the separation of "violent" from "criminal" would tend to suggest that the Kremlin sycophants have in mind incest or perhaps just "doing it wrong"]; when the consummation of the pregnancy would place in question the physical or mental health of the woman; and when the pregnancy poses a social problem without immediate solution for the mother or the family."

This last point is complex. Who is to decide when a "social problem without immediate solution" looms? The CP had an answer. Commissions are to be set up that will "urgently seek the means" of providing a solution. If none could be found, abortion would be acceptable.

Lest any doubt remain about the rectitude of the Stalinist position, the leaders added that the Communist party "rejects theories that make the right to abortion one of the essential means of the liberation of women and those [theories] that present rejection of maternity as the solution to social questions [?]." Abortion, the statement said, should be a "last resort."

The lead article in the May 18 issue of *Rouge* presented a quite different position. The article noted that the events around the arrest of Ferrey-Martin represented a decisive test for abortion activists. To meet it, the movement would have to ensure "that the campaign for free abortion and contraception on demand transcends, with no possibility of backsliding, simply issuing propaganda manifestos

and charters of principles; that the struggle becomes an integral part of the day-to-day united struggle of women, youth, and workers against capitalist oppression and exploitation.

"From this point on, the national breadth of the mobilization must put a stop to the regime's attempts to defuse it by offering crumbs and half measures.

"Drop the indictment against Ferrey-Martin!

"Free abortion and contraception on demand!

"We will struggle for conditions that allow women a real free choice:

"Down with medicine for profit!

"Free child-care, housing, and social services!

"No to the current system of profit-morals!"

Thus, we learn that for months at least, maybe even for years, a penal inquiry has been under way against the LMR, under the pretext of investigations into the charge that the LMR is an "illegal group" (Article 275 of the Penal Code). It is no great shock to anyone: Yet an inquiry has been under way for months conducted by federal authorities who did not even inform the accused that it was going on. Even the most narrowly legalistic supporters of bourgeois-democratic legality seem to have forgotten the elementary principle that the accused must be allowed to inform himself of the charges against him so as to be able to prepare the best defense.

For revolutionary-left militants the procedure is somewhat simplified; the investigation just goes on in total secrecy. That way it is easier to fabricate "proof" of all the charges thanks to the discretionary investigative powers of Walder-Hoover.

For the first time since the second world war, the bourgeoisie is threatening to dissolve an organization linked to the workers movement. In addition, the penal investigation of the LMR is an easy excuse for sweeping police measures: searches, photographing of militants, arbitrary arrests, wiretapping, collaboration with the French police in banning an LMR leader from France, planting bugs in our meeting halls, even in the hall of a convention that had been announced publicly in the press!

All this goes on within the strictest democratic legality, affirms Furgler, colonel and Christian football player. This is allegedly based on Article 17 of the federal penal procedure and on an order to the department's agents dated April 30, 1969. But this Article 17 has nothing to do with bugging, and the April 30, 1969, memorandum is in complete conflict with the penal code, which forbids all use of secret wiretapping.

This *illegal memorandum*, which says exactly the opposite of what the "sovereign" parliament had voted a few months earlier, runs on and on about the sacrosanct respect of the state apparatus for the "sovereignty" of parliament—some of whose members, just by the way, had had their phones tapped regularly by Messrs. Walder, Amstein, and Riesen.

The Furgler-Walder mafia has its

Swiss Trotskyists Denounce Police Bugging

Bourgeoisie Violates Its Own Legality

[The Ligue Marxiste Révolutionnaire (Revolutionary Marxist League), the Swiss Trotskyist organization, held its national convention May 4-6 in Epalinges, a suburb of Lausanne. A preliminary security check of the hall turned up a listening device that the federal police later admitted to having planted. (See *Intercontinental Press*, May 28, p. 632.)

[The police statement taking responsibility for the bug included an admission that an investigation was under way to determine whether the LMR should be declared an illegal organization. The LMR's initial response to this twofold attack appeared in the May 17 issue of its semimonthly news-

paper, *La Brèche*. That article is reprinted below.

[In spite of the bugging incident, the LMR, which has grown considerably during the past year, conducted a successful convention. In addition to *La Brèche's* article on the repression we are publishing a report of the convention itself. The report appeared in the May 18 issue of *Rouge*, weekly newspaper of the Ligue Communiste, French section of the Fourth International.

[The translations are by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

On several previous occasions we have denounced the special powers of the federal prosecutor general and the even broader use to which they have been put by the unspeakable Dr. Walder, the vestal guardian of Swiss legality and morality.

The "Epalinges affair" and the May 11 communiqué of the Federal Department of Police and Justice shed a more "official" light on the juridical-police measures, sanctioned by the Federal Council, aimed at systematically spying on the left and the far left.

Correction

In the statement by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International "For Unconditional Political Opposition to Cámpora," which appeared in the May 28 issue of *Intercontinental Press* (p. 649), the next to the last sentence should read: "They will fight for the independent organization of the proletariat and other exploited layers with the perspective of establishing workers and popular committees."

own laws. Illegality does not restrict what it has to do to make bourgeois legality triumph, and, if necessary, this mafia will not bother with a parliament that only the most sanctimonious Social Democrats still try to believe in.

The LMR National Convention

By Gerard Vergeat

The Swiss Ligue Marxiste Révolutionnaire held its second convention May 4-6 in Lausanne. Comrades from all the regions of the country—French-, German-, and Italian-speaking—gathered in a national conference to deal with two basic questions on which depends the further development of the organization:

1. The political situation and the current tasks of the LMR, and

2. The problems of national organizational structure in the light of the organization's growth during the past two years—from French-speaking to German-speaking Switzerland (geographical extension), and from students to Swiss and immigrant—Italian and Spanish—workers (social implantation).

The problem for the LMR comrades is to define the development of Swiss capitalism in the context of the transformations of European capitalism faced with international competition and in relation to the international monetary crisis, which weighs heavily in Switzerland because of the place it occupies in the finances of the world capitalist system.

The first report recalled the factors that led to the growth of Swiss capitalism after the second world war—the development of a huge reserve army of labor formed by the massive and continuing arrival of immigrant workers from Italy and Spain. Thus, the "labor peace" (that's the official terminology) that was successfully established for so many years was the basis of the fabulous profits reaped by Swiss industry, which was able to buy off the trade-union bureaucracies and integrate them into the bourgeoisie's policies.

To this it should be added that the continued massive influx of capital into Switzerland permitted an extension of the boom that lasted from

In filing our complaint—whether initially or in response to the government's—we will show the real meaning of a legality in whose name a part of the workers movement is declared illegal and systematically repressed. □

1947 to 1967. Thus, during this period, exports rose 350 percent. The structural changes due to this growth have brought about a socioeconomic dislocation that is the basis of the present problems of Swiss capitalism, especially of the failures of the policy known as "labor peace."

The long sleep in Swiss political life concealed a deep change in political structures: the erosion of the bourgeois parties and of the Socialist party as electoral parties. The xenophobia of the Social Democracy about immigration, and the support it got from older layers of Swiss workers who followed the collaborationist policy of the trade unions, are one of the elements of this development, which is resulting in a split between the old generation and the young generation of workers on the one hand and between the immigrant workers and the Swiss workers on the other.

The entry of the immigrants into local political life at the same time as that of the far left, mainly the LMR, has been the dominant political phenomenon during recent years. This twofold phenomenon has provoked dislocation in the Social Democratic and trade-union routine and is alarming the Swiss bourgeoisie. Today, by all evidence, the Swiss workers movement is composed of the local Social Democratic and Stalinist parties, along with the Italian and Spanish CPs, which play a very important role because of the great numerical and political weight of the worker immigration in the country. It is in this organized workers movement that our comrades of the LMR have been working. This gives rise to very complex problems of uneven development of struggles, of international solidarity (even within the country itself), and of organization.

The report at the conference was a

kind of recapitulation of the basic problems of revolutionary action in Switzerland, and at the same time it presented to the large number of new comrades the heritage of Trotskyism in Switzerland. In this sense it was an excellent job of revolutionary education.

The second report, in the light of the first, raised all the difficulties that have yet to be resolved in the area of organizational centralization, and of building leadership at all levels of the organization and in all sectors in which the LMR works. The strong development of the LMR in German Switzerland is a concrete expression of the progress achieved; but at the same time, it poses the problem of the new balance that must be established within the leadership structures. The first report was presented in French, the second in German. (The comrades had a remarkable simultaneous translation system.)

A national campaign for a forty-hour workweek was discussed, as well as other themes, among them the anti-imperialist action catalyzed by the Indochine Vaincre [Indochina Will Win] Committees in which our comrades are active.

The convention adjourned after electing a new Central Committee.

If there are any doubts about the LMR's sinking roots into national political life, it is enough to recall the response of the national press when, just before the convention, the comrades discovered that the hall had been bugged by the police. □

Meir: Let Them Bug

Israeli Premier Golda Meir assured reporters May 22 that the Watergate scandal—and reports that the Israeli embassy in Washington was bugged—would not disturb her government's cozy relations with the Nixon gang.

Meir called the scandal a "sad and disturbing affair." She continued: "Any friend of the United States and of the president feels sad about it, naturally. But as far as relations between our two countries are concerned, nothing has changed."

Referring to reports that her telephone conversations with the Israeli ambassador had been tapped, Meir indicated that she has no secrets from her patrons in Washington:

"I don't know if it's true, but anybody that talks on long-distance telephone calls must realize that somebody else is listening somewhere."

Workers Self-Defense on Agenda in France

[Despite the "settlement" of the massive Renault strike that shut down a large part of the French automotive industry, strikes are continuing in many plants. Increasingly, the employers have responded to the workers militancy by calling out gangsters from the CFT (Confédération Française des Travailleurs — French Confederation of Workers), a fascist-type organization.

[CFT goons have attacked strike pickets, individual workers, and delegates of the CGT (Confédération Générale du Travail — General Confederation of Labor, the country's largest trade-union federation). The actions of the CFT have made the question of workers self-defense a crucial one in France today.

[We reprint below an article that appeared in the May 18 issue of *Rouge*, weekly newspaper of the Ligue Communiste, French section of the Fourth International, on the problem of how to defend the workers movement against gangster attacks. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

The automobile employers have revealed their methods. A question is now posed for all worker militants: that of self-defense, of the protection of strikes by the strikers themselves. At Citroën the CFT attacked CGT delegates with gas pistols. At Sainte-Etienne, the same gangs turned up, armed with bicycle chains, carrying out a nighttime attack on strike pickets.

How to respond? The employers brazenly admit using violence and deny the workers the right to defend themselves. At Peugeot, the same employer that recruits its managers among retired military officers and its strongarm men out of Ordre Nouveau piously protests against the strikers' "aggression": "Out of concern for peaceful relations, we had decided to rehire those wageworkers fired for serious violations so long as they had not resorted to violence against the factory's personnel. On the other

hand, it is out of the question that aggressors and victims should again find themselves at work side by side."

Incredible capitalist cynicism — contemptible.

Fortunately, the Peugeot workers did not accede to blackmail. The scabs found this out to their chagrin.

Confronted with this employers' violence, there are several ways to react.

The Communist party vehemently protested the aggression of the Peugeot commando and the misdeeds of the CFT at Berliet, Simca, and Citroën. The very eve of the attack, Bruyère, a local CP leader, held a meeting at Sainte-Etienne. He *already* had information on what was in the works, as he denounced the company's "recourse to outside elements to engage in commando actions against the strikers."

A legitimate denunciation. But what did the CP do to prevent this attack?

As to the CFDT [Confédération Française Démocratique du Travail — French Democratic Confederation of Labor], one of its Peugeot leaders admitted in *Le Nouvel Observateur* that an error had been made in not setting up a more solid picket. But at Sainte-Etienne, [CFDT head] Edmond Maire took care to state: "Let us not fall into the trap of open violence that calls for minority actions that are not followed."

The Ligue's position on this ques-

tion is clear: Self-defense is not a hollow slogan for cowboy-movie buffs, but a practical need at present. The struggle against the CFT is not a crusade against Hitlerite fascism banging at our doors, but the vigilant struggle against an antiworker group, extremely dangerous in the auto industry, where the employers are making full use of outfits that are seeking to worm their way into other factories as well. This fight is indispensable, and educational in the face of pacifists of all stripes.

In practice, this involves specific tasks:

Setting up dissuasive pickets in front of striking factories. And this includes, as at Citroën, formation of mobile groups of workers from other factories in order to provide reinforcements in cases of tough battles. Workers solidarity in face of the gangsters.

Struggle against the CFT: through regular educational work about this antiworker "union," through denouncing its leaders by name, and exposing their actions. And through physical responses to the reign of terror the CFT is trying to impose.

Unity of the workers organizations, trade-union and political. On April 18 the Ligue publicly proposed:

- a self-defense pact of workers organizations;
- common agreement to give an immediate retort to any new moves by the armed gangs of the employers and the regime;
- to make the struggle against the employers' militia one of the themes of the May Day mobilization.

We will continue on this road. □



CFT goons attacking workers demonstration in front of Citroen plant.

Performing Artists on a Flying Trapeze

By Gerry Foley

II

If the leaders of the Official republican movement are to fulfill their aspiration of building a "revolutionary party of the Irish people," two elements are essential: (1) a consistent revolutionary program; (2) a strategy enabling the revolutionary political nucleus to reach out to broader and broader layers of the Irish population and working class and involve them in effective united action against British imperialism and the dependent capitalist system in Ireland.

On both key questions, although they have not been slow to offer advice, the various British sectarian groups have proved unable to point the way forward. One such group, however—the Socialist Labour League (SLL), led by Thomas Gerard Healy—has provided examples of major pitfalls to avoid. In particular, the SLL's apparent attempt to influence the sectarian fringe of the Official republican movement offers some useful lessons.

In the first place, the methods and arguments used reveal a great deal about the SLL and its claims to be a Trotskyist organization. For a group that purports to have maintained intact all of the principles and experience of revolutionary Marxism, the development of an acute crisis almost next door, in the neighboring island, should have been an excellent opportunity to demonstrate the relevance and usefulness of this heritage.

In a situation dominated by a number of groups with vague and unfinished political programs, an organization that claimed to have all of the answers should have been able at least to lay out a consistent strategy for the fighters and show by example some of the techniques of revolutionary organization. It could be expected, moreover, that a principled revolutionary ally in Britain would have been much appreciated by the Irish fighters, who have not seen a great deal of helpful solidarity from the British left and labor movement.

Moreover, one of the main forces in the situation was a recently radicalized and, in many respects, strikingly capable and seasoned leadership—the leaders of the Irish Republican Army and later the Official republican movement. Despite heavy doses of Stalinist influence from various sources, the minds of the key republican leaders were still generally open and receptive to revolutionary ideas. They were eager to make a start toward overcoming the poverty of ideas that had long afflicted the Irish revolutionary movement. Nor was the republican movement the only promising factor in the situation. A whole generation of fighters was displaying high revolutionary qualities in a series of groups and actions.

Thus, if the SLL were really the sole heir of uncorrupted living Marxism—Trotskyism—as claimed, it now had an exceptional opportunity to educate some of the best revolutionary material that has appeared in recent decades.

An Important Resolution

The history of the SLL's twists and turns on the Irish question in the four years that have passed since the start of the mass civil-rights movement is complicated. The only constant has been the SLL's abstract, propagandistic attitude. Nonetheless, the SLL's approach was presented rather well in Ian Yeats's article in the March 22 issue of *Workers Press*, "Marxist Phrases Hide Backing for Nationalists." The "Marxist phrases" were attributed to my articles on the December 15-16, 1972, Official republican convention.

In the first place, it is interesting to see how Yeats reacted to the signs of a political discussion taking place in the Official republican movement. His approach was indicative of the SLL's method. For example, he wrote: "Foley quotes at length and approvingly from the preamble to a resolution on the north not on the Clar (agenda) but which he claims was circulating among delegates.

"A spokesman for Gardner [sic] Place confirmed that no such resolution was on the Clar or put to the Ard Fheis."

In view of an apparent attempt by Yeats to provoke a split in the Derry republican group (see Part I of this article, *Intercontinental Press*, May 28, p. 637), Yeats's discussion with a "spokesman for Gardner [sic] place" is likely to have been a short one. But he could have read the newspapers. The resolution he was referring to was clearly identified. In my January 22 article I referred to it as the "resolution redefining policy on the Northern question." In the February 5 article I wrote:

"At the *ard fheis* a major resolution on the civil-rights movement was introduced which clarified the policy of the Official republican movement on some issues: 'The Republican Movement could not under any circumstances call for the reestablishment of a 6 County parliament. To do so would mean total recognition of Britain's right to impose a Partitionist assembly on the Irish people, and would be in complete conflict with the Republican and Separatist tradition.' This resolution made it clear that although the Official republican movement favored demanding democratic rights from the British government and Northern Irish authorities, it did not accept the context of a Northern statelet. In effect, this resolution rejected the 'stages' concept earlier held on one level or another by some of the republican leadership, a concept that envisaged 'democratization' of the Six-County state as a precondition for struggling for national liberation.

"In particular, the preamble to this resolution represented a major step forward in republican thinking toward a consistent revolutionary perspective. Unfortunately this document was not distributed; but many of those present seemed to be familiar with its contents. The main objection to making it public seemed to be that it contained a characterization of the Communist party as reformist,

which was repeated in the open debate by the resolution's sponsor, Seamus Costello."

What Were Yeats's Sources?

The debate over this resolution was the most important political discussion at the convention and was referred to in all the press reports. Furthermore, there have been publications and statements of the Official republican movement since the *ard fheis* that reflect this change in policy, which was also expressed by Malachy McGurran in his December 26 interview: "Our movement both nationally and locally is going through a period of coming to realize the need for reorganization and reeducation, of developing a clearer perspective of its role in relation to the national question and the social question, of how to combine these two main issues and achieve a oneness of the struggle." ("Under the British Occupation," *Intercontinental Press*, January 15, 1973, p. 25.)

Furthermore, Yeats himself, later on in his March 22 article, refers to the very same supposedly "mysterious" resolution.

"The resolution put to the Ard Fheis by right-wing Bray delegate Seamus Costello, which more than any other summed up the Officials' new course, laid down that in future civil rights was to be seen as part of the overall programme and struggle of the revolutionary party."

Is it possible that the Healyite reporter was not sure what resolution I was referring to? But later on he writes:

"Foley argues that the Officials are in danger of abandoning civil rights altogether and that the reason for this is their failure to analyse where the role of the Communist Party helped the movement go wrong.

"But as the preamble to Costello's resolution, in which he took the CP to task for their reformism, clearly showed, this analysis had been made."

This preamble, however, was not only not distributed; no report of it, to my knowledge, has appeared in the Irish press. There are only two ways Yeats could have known about it. He either saw a copy or based himself on what I wrote in my article. The indications are that the latter is the case.

Yeats writes that I quoted "at length" from the preamble. In fact, I only quoted a short paragraph or two to indicate its main political point. Virtually all this is requoted in the Healyite reporter's article. I did not, however, directly quote the most politically sensitive section, the part attacking the Communist party. It is notable that Yeats does not quote this passage either, although it would seem to be the most important from his point of view. He really should have quoted it, for example, to prove his contention that the Officials have analyzed "where the role of the Communist Party helped the movement go wrong."

Unfortunately, this claim was grossly overoptimistic, as shown most notably by the parasitic "role" the Officials still allow the tiny Communist party of Ireland to play in the civil-rights movement. The preamble to Costello's resolution was only a first step toward developing a critique of the reformist position on the relationship between the civil-rights struggle and the fight for national independence. This same reformist position,

by the way, is not only put forward by the Communist party of Ireland but by some Maoist-tinged and presumably independent Stalinists and Stalinoids, who are not altogether without influence in the Official movement.

Moreover, so far, the new line seems to have had only the most minimal effect on the practical activity of the movement. One of the ways this has been shown is by the Bloody Sunday commemoration fiasco in Derry (see Part I of this article), where the timid reformist policy of the NICRA leadership resulted in a stinging defeat for its major component, the Official republicans.

The Communist party is so small that it has little to lose if the civil-rights movement stagnates. It can even hope to recruit from a narrowing but more committed circle of "democratic" activists. But the decline of the civil-rights movement is a matter of life and death for the Officials, because it leaves them without a mass alternative to the Provisional guerrilla campaign. They would not accept such defeats if they were not to some extent still under the influence of Stalinist reformism.

What was the reason then for all Yeats's pretense about the "mysterious" "preamble to a resolution on the north not on the Clar (agenda), but which he [Foley] claims was circulating among delegates."

The reason is all too obvious, especially after Yeats's Derry operation. He was trying to create a scandal over the document, to arouse fears that its authors represented a trend toward conciliation with the Provisionals. His objective was to stampede a few insecure dogmatists toward the safe harbor of the SLL, where there would never be a thought of "conciliation" with anybody.

The Official leaders did make a mistake, in my opinion, in not distributing the document in question. Failing to inform the membership fully of important discussions among the leadership encourages intrigue of all kinds. Still, to the credit of the republicans, it must be said that this document has now been rather widely circulated. Rank-and-filers who had not gotten copies in December had them in February. And it was evident that the republican leaders intended to distribute it, since the various persons who gave me copies did not regard it as secret but only wanted to restrict distribution in order to avoid arousing untimely speculation in the capitalist press, which does pay a fair amount of attention to rumors about the internal life of the movement.

But producing this document was to the credit of the republican movement in a far deeper and more important sense. It showed that the Officials were still a living political movement able to discuss the political situation in the country objectively and to reevaluate their positions. Is there any such evidence of internal political life in the SLL? In ten years at least there has not been a whiff of real discussion in that organization.

If the SLL were a Trotskyist organization, its reaction to the development of a political discussion in one of the major Irish organizations would have been completely different from Yeats's small-time political skulduggery.

The Voice of Chairman Mao

In the first place, one of the most important principles of Leninism is the need for collective democratic discus-

sion of elaborate effective tactics and strategy. Even the Stalinist parties pay lip service to this concept. In an article on building the revolutionary party that appeared in issue No. 3 of the Official theoretical magazine *Teoiric*, an anonymous author was able to cite Chairman Mao as the advocate of internal democracy:

"It is through its internal work that a party evolves its theory, applies that theory to decide its practice, learns from its practice to test its theory—evolving better theory for better practice. Correct ideas are not to be found on trees, but are the result of clear, logical thinking and scientific analysis of actual events. Correct ideas cannot be worked out in isolation and then presented to an astounded populace. They must be tested in the crucible of practice. Mao Tse Tung, in his essay 'Where Do Correct Ideas Come From?', expresses this perfectly when he says: '*Where do correct ideas come from? Do they drop from the skies? No. Are they innate in the mind? No. They come from social practice and from it alone; they come from three kinds of social practice: the struggle for production, the class struggle and scientific experiment.*' In other words theory begets practice which begets theory which begets more practice. For it is experience which teaches lessons, and rationality and logic which puts them into a pattern. The first aspect of internal work, therefore, and the first task of those who wish to build a revolutionary party, is to ensure that the organization is geared for discussion. This depends on the principle of criticism—self-criticism.

"Criticism—self-criticism is the principle by which correct theory is evolved. Correct theory is essential for any revolutionary party for otherwise it can never give correct leadership and smash the power of the capitalist and imperialist state. Only conscious action can do that. As Marx said: 'Man determines history on the basis of pre-existing conditions.' In other words if a situation is correctly analyzed, a balance of forces can be developed favourable to progressive advance. This phrase of Marx is often distorted. . . . For Marx did not say, as the ultra-left imagine, that it is man's actions alone which determine history regardless of the objective conditions in the situation. It is this type of woolly thinking which leads many sincere people to argue that *socialism* should be the slogan at this stage of our struggle, despite the fact that the working class is viciously divided and overwhelmingly under reactionary influence both in the south, where Fianna Fail is more secure than ever, and amongst the Northern Protestant workers, who still support fascist-type Unionism."

The author goes on to say that the opposite of voluntarism is the "Economist approach to 'revolution,'" whose advocates "argue that Marx meant that objective conditions change the world regardless of man's actual participation." He calls for overcoming these two deviations "through the interaction of practice and theory; and this interaction cannot be achieved unless there is open discussion."

Any reader not dazzled by the wisdom of these Little Red Book aphorisms could legitimately ask what the results of "self-criticism" and "open discussion" have been in the Great Helmsman's own country. Hasn't one previously infallible leader after another been suddenly exposed as a "secret enemy"? Hasn't one disastrous bureaucratic fantasy

after another, from the Great Leap Forward to the cultural revolution, prevailed without the slightest voice of criticism being raised against it—that is, not until the worst damage was done and all the blame was suddenly loaded onto one individual bureaucrat or group of bureaucrats? How does this differ from the 180-degree shifts in line that became typical of the Communist International as internal democracy and open discussion were crushed by the Stalinist bureaucratic machine? No matter what the line was, it was always justified by the same sort of ponderous pronouncements indulged in by the author or authors of the *Teoiric* article, which could be given a different concrete meaning to fit each situation.

The Role of Leadership

The fact that this type of thinking apparently passes for good coin in at least some quarters in the Official movement is, of course, an indication that there may be possibilities there for the SLL, which also supported the Red Guards in the "cultural revolution" on the basis of the abstract rhetoric and "red revolutionary" generalities of Chairman Mao. But this fact also indicates that in order to foster a leftward development in the Official movement, revolutionists must encourage concrete discussions of the fundamental problems the republicans are facing. This involves not only helping to clarify the issues and enrich the debate but explaining how to organize and conduct discussions in a constructive way.

Part of this, too, is making clear the role of leaders in a revolutionary party. Policy is not formulated through some anonymous process. The ranks do not make decisions in a vacuum. Leaders have to take clear and consistent stands and assume responsibility for them. Persons who accept a wrong policy or concept without fighting against it disqualify themselves for leadership.

These principles are crucial for the Official republicans at this point in their development. They cannot go forward unless a leadership emerges that has a consistent revolutionary program and unless the ranks are educated in clear and democratic discussions.

Instead of trying to encourage political discussion in the Official movement, however, Yeats tries, by his pretense about "mysterious" preambles, to turn the very existence of such a debate into a petty scandal. Moreover, he crudely distorts the actual political points of the document in question (see Part I of this article). Instead of commending the leaders who came forward with relatively clear political positions, he tries to rouse unsubstantiated suspicions about them. What is it, for example, that makes Seamus Costello "right wing," and who precisely qualifies as being to the "left" of him and why?

In short, Yeats shows either no understanding or no interest in the process of political development going on in the republican movement. His attitude is basically that of a political parasite.

Yeats, of course, has already written off the possibility of any positive development in the Official movement. In his March 22 article he said:

"A new, 'democratic centralist' structure is to be given the party to make sure that in future the leadership's writ runs in unchallenged uniformity."

It is, in fact, not unlikely that there are some in the

Official movement who look toward a tighter structure as a means of clamping down on various political elements. It is obvious that there are a number of Stalinist-trained activists who conceive a revolutionary party as being a kind of mystical "Marxist" mandarin, or church. They seem to have more traditionalist conservative allies. However, Yeats apparently does not take into consideration the effect of the actual experience of the republican leaders in trying to lead a politically heterogeneous formation in a situation characterized by the sharpest tensions. In such conditions, responsible and sincerely revolutionary figures have naturally come to look to the Bolshevik example as an answer to their difficulties.

Why is Yeats so quick to assume that there can be nothing positive in the aspiration of the Official leaders to build a democratic centralist organization? Ordinary sectarianism is one obvious answer. But there also seems to be something more subtle. For the SLL, concrete experience apparently never leads in the direction of revolutionary consciousness but only to "reformism" and "impressionism." The only thing you can learn from experience is that you must renounce your sins and join the true church of Healyism.

One result of this concept is that the SLL tends to recruit individuals disillusioned with all concrete struggles, who are basically looking for the reassurance of routinist activity and airtight ideological certainties. In fact, the SLL's sudden interest in a polemic on Ireland seems to be related to the fact that the struggle has reached a fairly low ebb and there is a considerable amount of demoralization in and around the main Irish organizations. This would appear to be one reason the SLL decided to open up an attack on *Intercontinental Press* at this particular time.

They Can Turn It On or Turn It Off

There is, of course, a fundamental difference between the revolutionary-Marxists and the Healyites on the revolutionary dynamic of the national struggle in Ireland. This difference has been clear from the very start of the recent crisis. In article after article over the past four years, I have analyzed the dynamic of Irish national aspirations. In the October 27, 1969, issue of *Intercontinental Press*, for instance, I took up the Healyite position in some detail. None of this provoked any response from the SLL.

It was notable, in fact, that by late 1970, when it was apparent that the crisis in Ireland would be quite prolonged and would have a major impact on the British left, the SLL seemed to lose its taste for polemics somewhat, concentrating more on less ambitious articles exposing the evils to be found in the Six Counties.

As the struggle declined beginning about April 1972, the urge to do political battle on the question seems paradoxically to have revived in the *Workers Press* offices. But the predictions of final betrayal by the major Irish groups have so far at least proved premature. And it can be expected that new flareups and turns will soon discredit the SLL's dogmatic generalities, as they have so often in the past.

At various times since the start of the mass civil-rights movement in Ireland, the SLL has argued, of course,

in favor of three correct and vitally important principles: the need for arming the masses, distrust of the British army, and opposition to terrorism as a method. But these arguments have always been raised in a way calculated to maintain the SLL's image of unassailable "revolutionary" and "Marxist" virtue without committing the organization to involvement in any real struggle.

The Healyite Call to Arms

When the first civil-rights marches were being organized, the tactic used by the leaders was to defend the participants politically by stressing the nonviolent and legal character of the actions. The support of international public opinion prevented the fanatical Orange groups and the special police of the imperialist fortress state in the North from immediately suppressing these protests as they had previous ones.

The Healyites were critical. When a student march was attacked in the middle of an Orange area, the *Newsletter*, the predecessor of *Workers Press*, wrote in its January 14, 1969, issue: "Farrell and the other leaders thus led their marchers, including many young girls, into a conflict with Bunting's thugs bereft of any weapons save their undeniable courage. . . .

"*Workers' defence guards should be formed in every area, and there must be no more unarmed marches. Fight for the repeal of the Special Powers Act and against all bans on marches.*" (Emphasis in original.)

The Healyites did not have to worry about the result of "armed marches" in those days because there was no danger of any one taking their call seriously.

When massive fighting and real "workers' defence guards" sprang up in August 1969, the Healyites quickly changed their tune. At first they call for "pure" workers defense guards made up of both Protestant and Catholic workers, a safely unachievable demand.

In the September 20, 1969, *Newsletter*, the "dialectician" in charge, Cliff Slaughter, wrote: "The Newsletter has called for the *labour movement* to organize workers' defence guards as the only guarantee against the armed right-wing thugs and has denounced the armed intervention as well as Callaghan's visit as a cover for Paisleyism. . . .

"It does not occur to Treacy [the Irish expert of the International Socialists] that insofar as Catholic workers are dominated in their politics by the Catholic hierarchy, their consciousness is reactionary and must be fought against and that those who proceed to support them as 'more progressive' are helping precisely the efforts of the Irish capitalists to prevent working-class unity at all costs."

This pious rejoinder came only a month after Catholics in the ghettos of Belfast and Derry were being attacked, shot at, and burned out in the name of their religion.

Then, in the *Workers Press* of October 3, 1969, Slaughter wrote:

"After many months of a disastrous reliance on the middle-class civil rights leadership, the Catholic workers find themselves isolated from their Protestant brothers in the barricaded slum areas.

"Whatever the problems of 'law and order' for the capitalists, this situation is *politically* a good one for them. . . . [Emphasis in the original.]

"All the talk about arms is adventurist rubbish at this stage." (My emphasis.)

This line had several advantages for an opportunist sect like the SLL. By a neat left feint, it enabled the Healyites to avoid the pressure on them to help defend the embattled Catholics against the regular and irregular repressive forces of British imperialism. Invoking working-class unity that was unachievable in the concrete circumstances sounded much more "Marxist" than defending the "prisoners of a reactionary ideology" in the Catholic ghettos. It also corresponded to the tendency of British left and liberal opinion to dismiss the Irish fighters as "hopelessly backward," and not worth worrying about.

Down the Barricades and Up Again

At its most pious, the SLL has in fact shown a dismaying tendency to slip into imperious attitudes toward Irish revolutionists, as for example when it attacked the Official Sinn Féin organizer Seán Garland in the June 20, 1972, issue of *Workers Press*: "Garland is no ordinary bog-trotting Republican. He prides himself on being some kind of 'Marxist'. . . ."

But vague and hackneyed calls for working-class unity were not entirely sufficient even for the SLL. In order to maintain its claims of offering a revolutionary alternative, it needed to be able to point to concrete betrayals by the forces leading the struggle. Therefore, the SLL switched its position on the barricades that were supposed to be separating the Catholic workers from their "Protestant brothers." The SLL transformed these formerly unfortunate barriers into sacred arks of the revolution. When the barricades were taken down in 1969, the SLL suggested betrayal.

When again, in the summer of 1972, some barricades were taken down in the course of a confrontation between the British army and the people of the "no-go areas," the July 1 *Workers Press* proclaimed: "What Whitelaw thinks today, the Social Democratic and Labour Party says tomorrow — and the Republicans the day after that.

"So it was with the ceasefire. So it is with the barricades — the last remaining symbol of defiance to British military occupation.

"It only needed a hint from the Ulster Defense Association-Vanguard group that 'selective' barricades were going up this weekend for the SDLP — in the person of Bogsider John Hume MP — to immediately launch an appeal for the removal of the barricades. . . ."

"Synchronously with this appeal came the announcement from Republican sources that three barricades would come down because they were 'rat infested'.

"The barricades, of course, have only a symbolic and provisional significance since the IRA agreed to bury their arms together with the cause for which they fought — namely a united Ireland. . . ."

"So, thanks to the SDLP collusion and the IRA (Official and Provisional) capitulation, and only a few hours after the SDLP meeting, the Londonderry [sic]¹ Commission

1. Derry is the native name. The "London" was added when the London corporation acquired title to the land as a result of English conquest. Since the Irish name also has the advantage of shortness, only proimperialist chauvinists and those most

bulldozer knocked a 12-foot path through the Little Diamond Barricade to the paradoxical cheers of the local inhabitants."

The UDA did more than hint that barricades were going up. It went on a campaign of building barricades in an attempt to give the imperialists an excuse for attacking the ghetto areas in the guise of impartial peacekeepers. It also threatened to go in and "clean out" the Derry ghetto if the British troops did not do the job.

With the Catholic community divided in the aftermath of a series of political disasters in the spring and early summer, the ghetto defenders were in an extremely difficult position. The objective problems of the Official IRA were made even worse by their ideological weaknesses, including the idea that a confrontation with the "Protestant workers" would be the ultimate catastrophe.

This, of course, was the same line the SLL had been trumpeting since 1969, but the Official republicans, whose skins were really at stake, unfortunately took this dogma seriously and followed it rather consistently, at the risk of finding themselves and their followers ideologically disarmed in the face of new pogroms.

Protestants Battling the British!

That the SLL's doctrine of "working-class unity" was only a propaganda pose is clearly shown by the gyrations on the question of the reactionary Protestant popular organizations and militias.

In its October 7, 1969, issue *Workers Press* hailed the riots touched off in Protestant areas by the moves leading up to the dissolution of the B-Specials, the reactionary militia of the Protestant ascendancy. These outbreaks, according to the Healyites, heralded the approach of working-class unity. British imperialism had proven unable to maintain the division of the class.

"But the game is up! Because capitalism can provide no future for either the Protestant or the Catholic worker; and because these workers sense the strength and offensive power of their class throughout the world, their need to fight will not and cannot be contained within the old religious 'sectarian' framework.

"Within only a week or two of the clashes between the forces of the state and groups of Catholic workers in August this year, a remarkable change took place in the situation.

"Protestant workers, for half a century used as a pillar of support for the 'British connection', found themselves in street battles against the British Army!"

The republicans (still not formally split) also saw grounds for hope in this clash between Protestant workers and British troops. The November 1969 issue of their paper, the *United Irishman*, carried "An Open Letter to the Poor Protestants of Ulster," which said, among other things:

"Fifty years of religious and political loyalty to the Crown and what do you get but a kick in the stomach. Or worse.

"You who have fought so fearlessly for the connection with England have been rewarded by English bullets, English bayonets and English tear-gas. . . ."

respectful of "her majesty's" municipal nomenclature continue to use the form introduced by the conquerors.

"The main reality is the economic reality; and if worker stands against worker because deluded by the boss that he should do so for some snobbish silly reason ('we're better than they are'), the only one to suffer will be the worker, all workers.

"Most of us workers are joined already in a trade union which fights the boss, Orange or Papist, for better wages and conditions.

"Isn't it time we got together politically to do away with all bosses and their hypocrisies?"

In contrast to the "Marxists" of the SLL, who were so quick to see a linkup coming between Catholic workers fighting the repressive forces of British imperialism and Protestant workers protesting the disbandment of the most ill-famed terrorist force of the state, the republican statement was not outside the bounds of reality. It was correct to take the opportunity to try to explain to Protestant workers that Britain was not really concerned with defending their interests.

But a false conception was embedded in the republican appeal. The flattery of the Loyalists who were supposed to have "fought so fearlessly to maintain the connection with England" (Against whom did they fight? They were armed to the teeth by British imperialism and fought against half-armed and outnumbered nationalists) was indicative of illusions that were to have serious results.

Voices were raised in Official circles suggesting that the next time the British troops and Protestants had a go, it might be a good idea to stage diversionary attacks on the imperialist troops to divert them from attacking "our brother Irishmen." Since the main clashes occurred when Protestant mobs were on their way toward Catholic ghettos, it could be predicted that this idea would be hard to defend to the nationalist-minded people. It was apparently dropped.

The Primacy of Politics

The same concept showed up in an article entitled "Taobhú leis na Protastúin ["Side with the Protestants"] in the October 1969 issue of *An Phoblacht*, the monthly paper reflecting the views of Provisional Sinn Féin.

"If a section of the Protestants start a fight against the forces of the crown in the Six Counties, what should we in the republican movement do? If a group of Protestants rise up against Westminster, London, what should we do?"

"That is how the question was put to me recently. I have only one answer to the two questions; take the side of the Protestants against the army that has its boot on the stomach of Irishmen in the six counties of the Northeast.

"But are these people fascists? . . .

"It doesn't matter if they are fascists; they are Irishmen and we are Irishmen and England is the enemy." [Is cuma faisistí nó eile iad nó is Eireannaigh atá iontu agus is Eireannaigh muide agus is ea Sasana] [an namhad.]

At least this writer was more consistent than the SLL "Marxists." He was able to dismiss and not ignore the political ideology guiding the Protestants who clashed with the British troops. Furthermore, the Irish writer shared the SLL's evaluation of the need for fighting the influence of the Catholic church:

"The Presbyterians never cared much for kings and princes or aristocrats in general. They didn't need bishops.

They understood what democracy was.

"I must remind those who are dubious about the role of the Protestants in the new Ireland that the Catholic church has worked hard against republicanism with the strongest weapon it could use against believing Catholics—excommunication."

It is not surprising that republicans armed only with moralistic ideas and unanalyzed (but rationalized) tradition should make errors about the dynamic of the Northern struggle, which is certainly extremely complex. This is clearly a case where Marxists can make the best demonstration of the superiority of their method.

The first thing a Marxist would have to explain is the primacy of politics: that as long as the Protestants mobilize in opposition to the movement of the Catholics for national liberation, they can only move in a reactionary direction. It is understandable that populist republicans think that all of the poor, the "people," or the working class can be rallied by appeals to a general common interest. There is no excuse for Marxists making this mistake; they have a rich heritage of analyzing differences in the working class and mobilizations of popular strata for reactionary interests.

But not only did the SLL not offer an objective and scientific analysis of the Protestant behavior; it did not even have the courage of its "convictions."

The republicans, operating in accordance with the romanticized view of the Protestants bequeathed by petty-bourgeois nationalists like Eoin Mac Neil, not only drew the same optimistic conclusions as the SLL about the cases of Protestants clashing with British troops; they tried to act on the basis of this view. They sought contacts and dialogue with leaders of the Protestant militants such as Ian Paisley and the UDA leaders, who were often at sharp variance with the British authorities and the established leaders of Unionism, at times even being subjected to jail terms and other forms of repression.

This policy was a logical conclusion of the SLL's view of the Catholics and the Protestants converging in struggle. But when the republicans actually tried to do something about it, the SLL took this as another chance to raise the cry of betrayal. When Paisley carried out some tactical maneuvers in the fall of 1971, opposing internment (in favor of regular prison sentences for IRA "terrorists") and talking vaguely about a deal with the South, if the theocratic features of the Free State were removed, most nationalist opinion was disoriented. Both the Officials and Provisionals, as well as other nationalist organizations and personalities made overtures to the "activist" proimperialist groups.

In its December 6, 1971, issue, *Workers Press* seized on one such overture by David O'Connell:

"A leading member of the IRA has issued a statement calling on the Rev Ian Paisley to build branches of his extreme right-wing party in Catholic working-class areas.

"This reactionary appeal is a damning indictment of the treacherous forces inside the IRA leadership."

It is possible, of course, that the SLL writer was unaware of the circumstances around this appeal; one stray newspaper clipping might have triggered a conditioned reflex. It is also possible that this journalist did not draw any consistent conclusions from the SLL's pronouncement. There is not much real consistency in the

SLL's attitude over the last four years. But what was unforgivable was the implication that the Provisionals and the Protestant rightists were both equally reactionary. This was pandering to the worst chauvinist prejudices of the British working class.

On the Question of Terrorism

Another example of inconsistency on the part of the SLL raises even more serious questions about its understanding of principle. *Workers Press* has continually repeated the classical Marxist criticisms of terrorism as a method of revolutionary struggle, opposing both the republicans and the young British ultraleft. On occasion, these criticisms coincided with the Official IRA's critique of the Provisional campaign. For example, the September 13, 1971, *Workers Press* said:

"The use of 'terror' in a negative, one-sided fashion is doing considerable damage to the building of unity between the Catholic and Protestant workers."

After the political disaster the Official IRA suffered in May 1972 in Derry as the result of executing a local youth on leave from the British army, the May 26 *Workers Press* had some friendly advice for the Officials:

"We call upon the official IRA to consider seriously political changes in its policies which will mean the abandonment of terrorism and its replacement with revolutionary policies which unite the Irish with the English working class against their common enemy the Tory government."

But when the Officials called a halt to "offensive action" a few days later, the May 31, 1972, *Workers Press* trumpeted:

"For the second time in ten years the Official IRA leaders in Gardiner Place, Dublin, have sold out the heroic struggle of the Catholic Irish workers in the North.

"No amount of Republican rhetoric and no amount of evocation of sectarian violence can hide this. . . .

"Calling off the military campaign will not lessen the sectarian hatreds, but will only strengthen the demands of the 'Vanguard' gorillas. William Craig dismissed the IRA 'initiative' as 'unimportant' and designed 'only to gain favour in Londonderry'.

"The Orange reactionaries predictably view this capitulation with contempt and are encouraged in their campaign to put more pressure on the army to take the Creggan and other 'no-go' areas by storm."

The Officials' retreat from terrorism was now seen as betraying the forces still engaged in such activity.

"This is exactly British strategy in Ulster: split the Officials from the Provisionals [now who's talking about unity with the Provos?], neutralize the former, isolate the latter, and hit the Provos hard.

"With leaders like the Gardiner Place reformists who needs the British army? Beaten by Lynch's referendum in the South and bewildered by direct rule in the North, these petty-bourgeois imposters are now crawling unashamedly before imperialism.

"Nobody should be surprised if yesterday's inmates of Long Kesh and the wanted men on the RUC's list should

soon be seen serving on Whitelaw's wretched advisory commission.

"Is it any accident that Whitelaw's nominee on the Commission, Tom Conaty from the Central Citizen's Defence Committee and his mouthpiece in the SDLP, Gerry Fitt, have unreservedly welcomed the Officials' statement?

"The stage is now set to go from direct rule to direct collaboration."

From the safety of its London offices, *Workers Press* dismissed the danger of the Irish fighters becoming isolated from the nationalist community, where for the first time in months the moderates felt strong enough to launch a "peace offensive."

"While it is true that the indiscriminate bombing of the Provisional IRA has outraged Protestants and incensed many Catholics, this does not give the Officials any political justification to kowtow to Whitelaw or his stooges.

"Workers Press, which has criticized in the past and will continue to do so in the present and future, the Provisionals' political bankruptcy and sectarianism, denounces this act of the Officials.

"It is unprincipled and traitorous. As the Provisional leaders stated: 'We look upon this surrender as a gigantic confidence trick aimed at giving firmer control to the Official wing of their undisciplined members.'"

The SLL's principles are thus so elastic as to make it possible to have your cake and eat it too. Its "orthodox Marxist" condemnation of terrorism did not stand in the way of appealing to the romantic ultraleftists getting vicarious thrills from the "armed struggle" in Ulster. Out of the wreck of the Irish cause, the SLL could hope to emerge as the only uncompromised guardian of "revolutionary principle," in other words, a church where a few of the survivors might want to seek sanctuary and spiritual solace.

Unfortunately, this sectarian project needed a long period of relative stagnation to be successful, and the Irish struggle was still to experience some dramatic shifts.

When the Provisionals were also forced to declare a truce few weeks after the Officials, the June 24 *Workers Press* wrote that the betrayal of the "nationalists" was now complete and only the "Marxists," represented by the SLL, were still in the field.

"Peace' says Harold Wilson—three years after dispatching the troops who started the war in Ulster. 'Peace' shout the disparate group of People's Democracy, Official Republicans, Women's peace corps and last but not least, Miss Bernadette Devlin, MP, as they crawl behind the SDLP.

"And 'peace' says the two-faced Lynch as he jails more Republicans to prove it.

"Peace' grunts the paratrooper as he slips another round into the breach of his SLR [self-loading rifle].

"And now comes the echoing cry of 'peace' from the Provisionals as they bury their arms—and probably some of their comrades who opposed the cease-fire. . . .

"If 1922 was a tragedy, then this is history repeating itself as a grotesque farce. The Irish petty-bourgeois Republicans—in alliance with the revisionists—have once again led the Catholic working class into the cul-de-sac of sectarian terror only in order to recoil from their folly and prostrate themselves at the feet of imperialism in the end."

Our Line's Been Changed Again

But less than three weeks later, when the Provisionals ended their truce and resumed their bombing campaign, the SLL had to revise its claims about the betrayal being complete. It even began to refer to the Provisionals as "the IRA":

". . . the IRA had every right to reject the truce and fight back—however tardily. Workers Press, while criticizing the policies of the IRA which led to the 'truce', nevertheless supports unreservedly, the disruption by the IRA of the cynical and fraudulent 'truce' of imperialism. We also support critically [?] the withdrawal of troops (not in 1975, but now) and the release of internees and political prisoners in Ulster and Britain.

"For the same reason we condemn categorically the unprincipled and cravenly middle-class reformist attitude of the Official IRA and the 'Morning Star' to the breaking of the 'truce'.

"The Official Sinn Fein in Dublin have 'regretted' the Provisionals' decision to resume fighting. Their statement alleges that 'the resumption of offensive action will take the pressure off Mr. Whitelaw . . .' Having made their peace with imperialism, these reformist-nationalists have no desire to make Whitelaw's job any more difficult—or to embarrass Generals Ford and Tuzo.

"Whilst correctly reproving the Provisionals for having secret talks with Whitelaw and accusing the British army of employing *agents provocateurs* to kill innocent people and inflame sectarian passions, the Officials conclude by the most pathetic display of capitulationism:

"The close co-operation between the British army and the UDA over the last week surely should have warned the anti-Unionist forces against the position of confrontation."

"At least 16,500 British troops, aided by the most brutal police force in the British Isles, stand menacingly over the Irish workers and the Official Sinn Fein says 'Don't fight!' " (*Workers Press*, July 12, 1972.)

Once again the Healyites took the opportunity to morally condemn the Officials' policy without bothering to analyze it. This was a grave dereliction of duty on the part of a group that claims to be Marxist, because there was, in fact, a serious danger that the Officials' incorrect ideas would disarm them in the face of British repression and Orange terror.

The Officials were only following the logic of the position, put forward with such a show of dogmatic "conviction" by the SLL, that the same dynamic was present in the Protestant differences with the British army and the mobilizations of the nationalist-minded population. Therefore, their basic strategy was to split the Protestant militant groups away from the imperialist and proimperialist establishment and draw them into unity with their Catholic counterparts.

As a result, the healing of the split between the UDA and the British army in the period around Operation Motorman was seen as the ultimate disaster. In point of fact, it was extremely dangerous. Because what it represented was division in the ghettos and international isolation of the nationalist-minded people, which enabled Whitehall to take the "tough" policy against the nationalist

ghettos that the UDA demanded. The imperialists and the various proimperialist factions, no longer faced with unity of the anti-imperialist population and the widespread sympathy abroad for their cause, were able to overcome serious divisions over how to handle the threat presented by the protests and demands of the oppressed people.

Nonetheless, the policy of the Officials was the exact opposite of what was needed to stave off attacks on the nationalist people. By flattering the Protestant "activists" and blaming their fanaticism on the actions of the Provisionals, the Officials made it more difficult to arouse international public opinion to defend the beleaguered Catholics. This line in fact coincided with the position of the capitalist press that both sides were equally irrational and reactionary. Still worse, by portraying as the ultimate catastrophe the head-on collision with the Protestant militant groups that is virtually inevitable at some stage if the struggle for national liberation is to be carried through to victory, they paralyzed the will of the most conscious revolutionists in the Catholic ghettos. At the same time, by fostering the illusion that staving off counterrevolutionary pogroms depended on moderation by the Catholics, they fell into reformism.

There is no doubt that political errors by nationalist forces have made it easier for the rightists to rally larger sections of the Protestant community behind them. But the basic fact is that as long as the Protestants remain under the influence of reactionary ideology, that is, in the last analysis, under bourgeois political domination, their actions are dictated fundamentally by the policy of the bourgeoisie, or the sections of it that stand closest to the Protestant community. As four years of conflict have shown, the interests of these strata of the bourgeoisie lie in breaking the spirit of the Catholic population. The "moderation" of the Catholic people and the pessimism of its best leaders could have the precise effect of inviting more determined attempts to intimidate the oppressed population.

Moreover, while criticizing the Officials for "giving up the struggle" in the North, the Healyites commended the very rationale for doing so. In its November 30, 1972, issue, *Workers Press* said: "By this summer, although they had learned nothing, some Officials at least saw the reality of the position. Commenting on the resistance in the North, Sean Garland said: 'We are not on the brink of victory, but on the brink of sectarian disaster and sell out.'"

It is no wonder that the few Irish Healyites who get their direction from *Workers Press* seem to do nothing but engage in rambling and contradictory denunciations of every group and prominent individual involved in the struggle. What kind of guide does this offer? If you are against terrorism and for working-class unity at any cost, *Workers Press* is even more so than anyone else. No one can possibly be as virtuous as the Healyites on this. If on the other hand you favor striking out immediately at the repressive system at any cost and resorting to bombings and other forms of terrorism, you can't approach the SLL in revolutionism, and if your throwing arm gets tired you face the certainty of being condemned as a "traitor." The only consistent thread in the SLL's attitude is its striving to remain "above" the real struggle

and its duties. The SLL's course resembles the flight of a hot-air balloon that rises as the ground heats up.

Need to Campaign for Troop Withdrawal

The Healyites' calling for immediate withdrawal of British troops is a good example of their technique. This demand is probably the one raised most consistently by the Healyites. It is the demand that most sets them off from the bulk of the British left, which also spends most of its time trying to convince Irish republicans of the need for "working-class unity" based on "industrial action"—and in terms that (aside from the inimitable Healyite tone) must seem to an outsider almost indistinguishable from the SLL arguments.

There is no doubt that the demand is a hard one to put across. It is hard to explain its importance to the masses in the Catholic ghettos, who fear the fanatical assaults of the Protestant extremist gangs more acutely than the more drawn-out repression of the army. It is true that the British government is more sensitive to public opinion and more inclined to make concessions to the oppressed population than are the local clients of imperialism.

It is not so obvious that since the entire system of repression, including the Orange gangs, depends in the last analysis on British power, any suggestion that the troops can play even a limited or temporary positive role in the situation strengthens the hand both of the Unionist fanatics and the imperialist regime, which can maneuver to divide the communities and at the same time disarm the oppressed population and prepare the way for still more devastating pogroms whenever it suits Whitehall's interests. Naturally, the masses of the people feel the immediate threat of Orange outrages more acutely than the larger-scale dangers inherent in the operation of the imperialist system of control. Only a well-established and trusted revolutionary leadership could convince the people that they must rely on their own strength against both the British army and the proimperialist terrorists.

A small British group cannot do this. Among other things, it would be too easy to counter that while such a call might sound revolutionary, those who raise it in Britain do not face the same dangers as nationalists in Northern Ireland; or that they do not even really understand these dangers. But a British revolutionary group could help spread an understanding in Ireland of the need to demand immediate withdrawal of the troops if it patiently explained this need to the most conscious elements of the Irish movement. The SLL, however, is uninterested in doing this. Its approach is shown by the statement of the "International Committee of the Fourth International" (the Healyite "international" rubric) in the June 28, 1972, issue of *Workers Press*. Characteristically, it begins: "Only the Socialist Labour League and the International Committee opposed direct rule from a class standpoint." The declaration goes on to say:

"Only the International Committee and its sections came out unequivocally against the intervention of British troops in Ireland from the very first minute. Against every other tendency we asserted that this was a basic question of principle: the forces of the capitalist state were there to

enforce the protection of property and bourgeois order and on no account could they act in the interests of the working class."

The Healyites had no interest in educating the Irish vanguard, but simply in scoring debater's points in British sectarian circles. If they were seriously interested in getting the Irish people to understand the need for fighting the repressive system as a whole, why didn't they do something in Britain to show the Irish that they were not alone in their struggle against terror and systematic violence?

There is not the slightest indication that in the last four years the SLL has done anything whatever to defend the Irish people except to offer some purely propagandistic support through articles in its paper.

Moreover, while *Workers Press* blossoms with denunciations of every Irish tendency when explosions or dramatic turns of events occur in Ireland, it has never chronicled any attempts by the SLL to win support for the Irish struggle in Britain. The "Trotskyist daily" has called at various times for "armed" workers defense groups in Ireland and for immediate withdrawal of the British army, but it has never written anything aimed at the British soldiers themselves. It has never done anything to blunt the main instrument of imperialist repression, the army of its own country.

The SLL has organized no demonstrations calling for the withdrawal of British troops. It has not sought to create sentiment in the British troops to get out of Ireland. But in the September 30, 1969, issue of *Workers Press*, one of the first issues of the "first Trotskyist daily," published only a few weeks after the first troops were dispatched to Northern Ireland the following large action by the SLL was featured:

"'Workers' Press in! Wilson out!' Brighton's narrow streets rang with slogans like these on Sunday afternoon as 1,500 members and supporters of the Socialist Labour League, the Young Socialists and the All Trades Unions Alliance marched proudly through the town to celebrate the launching of our paper.

"Headed by the Socialist Labour League Central Committee, followed by a sea of red banners, contingents from all over Britain demonstrated behind the lead banner: 'Socialist Labour League. Forward with Workers' Press. First Trotskyist daily paper'.

"Leading trade unionists from many areas marched in step with young workers and students.

"The enormous potential of Workers' Press was expressed in the marchers' determination and the magnificent collection at the meeting which followed the demonstration."

In the almost four years since that time there has not been one demonstration or one campaign by the SLL in support of the struggle in Ireland!

It is true that the SLL at one time or another had published all the correct slogans (as well as a series of incorrect ones) for the struggle in Ireland. It is clear at the same time that these slogans were neither consistently followed nor advanced as a guide to action. The SLL's policy in fact is distinguished by repeated 180-degree turns designed to give the group the most "revolutionary" appearance possible.

Not only could such propaganda educate no one, but many of the formally correct statements of the SLL condemn their authors most effectively, such as this incontro-

vertible observation in the September 13, 1971, issue of *Workers Press*: "Impressionism is the hallmark of ideal-

istic thinking. In practice it leads to empirical and improvised adaptation to events."

Pledge of Common Defense of Workers Democratic Rights

Joint Declaration on Repression in Britain

[The following statement, and the introduction to it, appeared in the May 19 issue of *Red Weekly* (incorporating the *Red Mole*), newspaper of the International Marxist Group, British section of the Fourth International.]

* * *

We publish below a joint declaration by the Socialist Labour League, the International Socialists, and the International Marxist Group pledging defence of the democratic rights of the working class against the increasing repression. The Communist Party has refused to add its signature, justifying this on the grounds of the alleged "disruptive policy and actions" of the other organisations concerned. The IMG for its part sees the publication of this statement as the first step towards joint practical activity on specific questions, in which we hope that Communist Party militants will nevertheless be involved.

The three organisations below pledge themselves to jointly defend the democratic rights of the working class against the legislative attacks of the Tory government, which seriously affect the trade unions and the working class as well as all groups on the left of the labour movement.

We believe the threat against democratic rights arises from:

(i) Raids carried out by the police, the purpose of which they do not feel obliged to explain. These raids generally lead to large quantities of documents and addresses being taken away under conditions in which the work of the organisation can be disrupted.

(ii) Holding suspects for lengthy periods before they are brought to trial.

(iii) The secret decision to arm the police.

(iv) The use of telephone tapping, tape recording and letter opening by the police to illegally incriminate those

on the left who are under surveillance.

(v) Planting spies and provocateurs within the working class movement. This is based on the so-called theories of counter-insurgency developed by Kitson, Calvert and Clutterbuck with the support of the Tory Cabinet.

We believe that the fight for democratic rights must become an integral part of the struggle of the trade union movement and the working class to expose the operation of the Industrial Relations Act and all activities of the Tory government through laws which are directed against the democratic rights of the working class.

In the event of an attack involving

democratic rights by the Tory government or its agencies against working class organisations, we will together organise such public campaigns as are considered mutually necessary to protect these organisations and their membership from such attacks.

The fight to end all bans and prescriptions in the trade union and labour movement is an essential part of the struggle to defend democratic rights against the attacks of the capitalist state.

Socialist Labour League
International Socialists
International Marxist Group

'End the Bombing Now!'

Washington Antiwar March Set for June 16

The National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC) and the Student Mobilization Committee (SMC) announced May 21 that they are joining in the call for a national antiwar demonstration in Washington, D. C., June 16. The organizations said they would build the demonstration around the demands "End the bombing of Cambodia now! U. S. entirely out of Southeast Asia now!"

The date for the demonstration was originally proposed by the People's Coalition for Peace and Justice (PCPJ). NPAC national coordinator Abe Bloom said, "We welcome the People's Coalition's initiative in calling the demonstration, and we look forward to building a united action with them."

Bloom and Chuck Petrin, national coordinator of the SMC, both linked the need for the demonstration to the Watergate scandal.

"Nixon has no legal or constitutional right to bomb the people of Cambodia," Bloom said. "But he doesn't care. His Watergate mentality leads

him to believe he can commit the most flagrant crimes against humanity to maintain the most corrupt and degenerate regimes—and get away with it.

"The American people want an end now to the U. S. war against the peoples of Indochina. And they want an end now to the inflated high prices and cutbacks in spending for social needs, caused by military spending."

Petrin pointed out that the Watergate scandal has shown the government's fear of mass antiwar actions.

"As the Pentagon Papers revealed," Petrin said, "the antiwar movement has been a constant and powerful—and at times terrifying—factor in the minds of the warmakers."

"... Undercover agents and provocateurs were... hired to spy on and disrupt the antiwar movement. G. Gordon Liddy was reportedly paid \$100,000 to infiltrate demonstrations at the Democratic and Republican conventions."

He cited several cases of government harassment of antiwar forces. □