

# Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 11, No. 24

© 1973 Intercontinental Press

June 25, 1973

50c



## ***U.S. Capitalists Roll Out Red Carpet for Brezhnev***

## **Argentina Swept by Occupations**

## ***Nixon Implicated Further in Watergate***



# Campora Commutes All Prison Terms

As a wave of occupations swept across Argentina in mid-June, the question of the fate of the common prisoners also came to the fore. Ever since the political prisoners were amnestied following the assumption of power by the Peronists May 25, ordinary prisoners throughout the country have been expecting improvements in their condition, including reductions in sentence.

Their frustration at official inaction was expressed most dramatically in a rebellion June 11 in Olmos Prison in La Plata. Built in 1946 to house 1,700 inmates, it now contains 3,300 in unbearable conditions.

The rebellion, which broke out in the cellblocks for repeaters, lasted for five hours and spread to the women's prison a few blocks away. The apparent aim of the prisoners—a mass breakout—was not achieved.

A sign of the mounting concern over the potentially explosive situation of the country's prisoners was the visit June 10 by Minister of Justice Antonio Benítez to Villa Devoto Prison in Buenos Aires. During the storming of Villa Devoto by some 50,000 persons May 25, common prisoners had expressed support for an amnesty for political prisoners and had requested reductions in their own sentences.

During his visit, the minister and his delegation met with sixty prisoners in the prison chapel. The visit, reportedly made at the behest of President Héctor Cámpora, was intended to reassure the common prisoners that special measures would be taken in their behalf prior to the return of Perón a week and a half later.

By the end of the week, the executive branch had decided to commute the sentences of common prisoners, reported the Buenos Aires daily *Clarín* June 15. "Those sentenced to life imprisonment will have to serve twenty-five years. Sentences of more than five years will be reduced by 10 percent. Those sentenced to less than five years will see their time up after two years. Obviously, those sentenced to less than two years will be immediately freed." □

## In This Issue

ARGENTINA	754	Campora Commutes All Prison Terms
	755	Wave of Occupations Sweeps Argentina
	756	Peronists Threaten Crackdown Against the Left—by Gerry Foley
	758	Santucho Denies Interview
U.S.A.	760	U.S. Capitalists Roll Out Red Carpet for Brezhnev—by Dick Roberts
	762	Two-Thirds of U.S. Think Nixon Guilty in Watergate—by Allen Myers
INDOCHINA WAR	764	Nixon, Thieu Press Attacks on Indochina Liberation Forces—by Jon Rothschild
CHILE	765	Copper Workers Strike in Second Month
BELGIUM	766	Dockers in Eight-Week Strike
VENEZUELA	767	Warn of Mounting Repression
ICELAND	768	Iceland Uses NATO as Lever in Fishing Dispute—by David Thorstad
IRAN	770	Imperialist Capital's Penetration of Iran—by Parsi Zadeh
YUGOSLAVIA	773	Repression Stepped Up—by C. Verla
GREAT BRITAIN	774	Wilson Challenges Labour Executive
DOCUMENTS	776	Maoists Revive "Great Conspiracy"—by Gerry Foley
	778	"Great Conspiracy" of Sayers and Kahn—by Joseph Hansen
	782	Torres Forms New Bolivian Exile Group
	784	Greek Prisoners Call for Mobilization to Free Junta's Political Prisoners
DRAWINGS	755	Juan Peron; 757, Hector Campora; 761, Leonid Brezhnev; 762, Maurice Stans; 763, Jeb Magruder; 764, Henry Kissinger; 774, Josip Broz Tito; 775, Harold Wilson—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 Guemenee, 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.

## Wave of Occupations Sweeps Argentina

"During the past few days, the political and social tensions that built up over many years when there were no legal, effective channels for expressing them have given rise to a genuine popular explosion; the main form it has taken is the 'occupation,'" wrote the Buenos Aires daily *Clarín* June 12. "The permanent lack of funds that threatens public assistance or educational institutions, the problems of organization and operation that make plants and institutions function sluggishly, and the injustices or high-handed methods of transient officials of unstable administrations during the last few years are a few of the things that set off the outburst.

"It is a peaceful rebellion, respectful of the new constitutional authorities, but one that expresses impatience, a desire to collaborate, or a response to the 'power gap' created in many institutions where the former authorities are leaving their posts but where their successors have not yet taken over. There are 'preventive' occupations to prevent other groups from moving first to take over a place where some of these situations exist, and there are also 'preservative' occupations designed to express confidence in those running the institution and to point out that in such a case it will not be necessary to occupy it or make any demands, which pretty much amounts to a contradiction. . . .

"The 'occupationist' fever is gripping radio stations, educational institutions, hospitals, business establishments, industrial plants, public and national administrative offices, bureaus whose existence had been forgotten, pensions, hotels—the list is endless. There are also cases that, because so little preparation went into the take-over, might seem picturesque or pointless—until the reasons behind it are looked into and reveal painful or justifiable grievances."

The occupations, which reflected the almost universal attitude of expecting the new government to solve long-ignored problems, swept the entire country.

The Félix Hogar Residence in Buenos Aires, which provides tempo-

rary lodging for the unemployed, was taken over by its seventy residents in protest against the "inhuman treatment" to which they were subjected—thrown out on the streets every day at 5 a.m. and not allowed back until



PERON

late afternoon. They demanded better food and the resignation of the staff.

A Buenos Aires polyclinic was taken over by the staff as a show of support for the current administration. They also decided to begin digging in the garden for a bust of Perón that was buried there in 1955.

The Belgrano, Argentina, and El Pueblo radio stations were occupied by their staffs in order to "preserve their ideological orientation within the bounds of Justicialist [Peronist] doctrine." Statements by the "Military Command" of the Peronist Press Workers Association were broadcast, warning that "we will prevent ideological contraband from infiltrating into Argentine homes, which are overwhelmingly Peronist."

The Buenos Aires Municipal Sports Office was occupied in order to "see

to it that the Olympic champion Delfor Cabrera is included" in the leadership of the body.

A factory in Buenos Aires that produces canned goods and sweets was taken over by the workers June 12. They demanded the rehiring of workers who had been fired, the purchase of an ambulance, that medical assistance be available around the clock, and that temporary employees be hired on a permanent basis.

The following day, the offices of the San Martín and Mitre railroads were taken over in Buenos Aires. The occupiers raised a series of demands, among them that the rank-and-file railroad workers be given positions of responsibility and that workers who had been dismissed for political or trade-union activity be rehired. They also asked for a review of officials appointed since the military took over the government in 1966 and that top officials be accessible to the ranks.

The staff of the National Fund for the Arts took it over and then held a general meeting. Following it, reported the June 14 issue of the Buenos Aires daily *La Nación*, they "issued a statement in which they expressed their support for the present authorities until such a time as the national government makes a definitive decision on the matter, and they pointed out that the conditions that gave rise to occupations of other institutions do not exist in this case."

In Chaco Province, the daily newspaper *El Territorio* was taken over by the staff and members of the Peronist Youth.

In Mar del Plata, the National Institute of Epidemiology and two hospitals were occupied. The Regional Hospital was renamed for Eva Perón and Mar del Plata Hospital for the Trelew martyrs.

In Rosario, occupations swept through a whole series of technical and secondary schools, the harbor master's office for the Port of Rosario, the general revenue office, and the provincial department of labor.

Members of the Peronist Youth took over a hospital in Buenos Aires June 12 and demanded the resignation of the director. It was decided to poll the staff to see whether the director should resign. The vote showed support for him, so the occupiers left.

A common feature of the wave of occupations has been the take-over



of radio stations. According to the June 13 issue of the Buenos Aires daily *La Opinión*, in some cases the spearhead of this drive has been the Juventud Sindical Peronista (JSP—Peronist Trade-Union Youth). The JSP, it said, "is making a central focus out of its denunciations of 'Marxist infiltration' into the Social Justice movement."

Elements of the Peronist movement appear, in fact, to have used the occupations to help pave the way for a repression of guerrillas who refuse to close up shop under the Peronist government. The "Peronist Homeland Commando," for instance, which took over the National Office of Tourism, issued a statement of loyalty to Perón and expressed agreement "with the compañeros of Córdoba who stated that for every Peronist who is killed ten Trotskyists will be killed."

The Professor Doctor Ramón Carrillo Interunion Association, consisting of members of medical and union organizations in the National Institute of Mental Health, decided June 13 to take charge of it "in order to prevent Trotskyist and gorilla groups from carrying out their plans to take it over."

The Association of Professional Workers, the Union of National Civilian Personnel, and the Association of State Workers "symbolically took over Braulio Moyano Hospital" in Buenos Aires, according to the June 14 *La Nación*, "in order to protect the building and defend its present authorities from an attempt by Trotskyist groups to provoke chaos."

The attitude of the authorities to the wave of occupations was generally not to intervene forcibly, although the army did prevent a radio station in Paso de los Libres from being taken over. Nevertheless, there was clearly considerable uneasiness over the prospect that the occupations might get out of hand. Heavy security measures were taken June 14 to protect the Palace of Justice, for example. In anticipation of a possible attempt to occupy it, it was surrounded by police and military forces.

On June 14, the members of the Radical party in the parliament issued a statement expressing their concern over the occupations.

By evening the same day, Peronist Youth members who had taken part in the occupations began to evacuate oc-

cupied buildings in response to appeals from the leaders of the Peronist movement. The Peronist faithful were warned to end the wave of occupations in a joint statement by Juan Manuel Abal Medina, the general secretary of the National Peronist Movement; Lorenzo Miguel of the 62 Organizations; José Rucci, head of the CGT (Confederación General del Trabajo—General Confederation of Labor); the Partido Justicialista (Social Justice party); and the women's and youth wings of the Peronist movement.

"We know what a noble and unselfish spirit inspires the Peronist compañeros who are taking part in these 'occupations,' particularly because they are spontaneous actions," they said. "Nevertheless, we must warn that these acts, if carried out without guidance

and organization and without regard for a common strategy, provide cover for the provocation that the regime and its allies in the oligarchic press are looking for in order to develop a climate of collective fear that can only feed the reactionary forces that want to continue the old regime."

This does not exhaust the efforts of the Peronist leadership for putting an end to the occupations, however. One of the first things Perón is expected to do when he steps off his plane in Argentina is call on his followers to end the occupations. A United Press International dispatch published in the June 14 issue of the New York Spanish-language daily *El Diario-La Prensa* quoted Peronist sources as saying that "the only one who can reestablish order is Perón." □

## Whip Up Frenzy Over Return of 'El Líder'

# Peronists Threaten Crackdown Against the Left

By Gerry Foley

"In a few days the Argentine people will have at their side, and this time forever, their Leader. The final return of General Perón to the Fatherland—and with him Señora Isabel Perón, the continuer in her own right of the historic mission of Señora Evita—must find us living in Peronist order, with all our energies concentrated on the great task of Reconstruction and National Liberation, the task that has been taken up by 90 percent of the Argentines, the task whose fundamental protagonist is the Organized People."

That statement was published in the Argentine press June 15 and signed by all the major Peronist organizations; it made absolutely clear that *el líder's* return June 20 is designed to rally mass support behind a crackdown on all "undisciplined activities."

The unstable bourgeois order is to be buttressed by mass popular organizations tightly controlled by the Peronist party and trade-union bureaucracy and centered around the mythical personality of the "people's general," the "benefactor of the workers," and

the "great anti-imperialist leader," who for eighteen years has been the symbol of opposition to the successive pro-U.S. governments that followed his overthrow.

A statement issued at the same time by the Juventud Sindical Peronista (Peronist Trade-Union Youth), the "activist" organization that has spearheaded the offensive against "undisciplined" elements, made the intentions of the Peronist leadership even clearer.

"In everything we do, in every position we take, we must conform to the thought and feelings of our Leader.

"Any action will be to no avail if its protagonists try to carry it out independently and without conforming to the directives handed down from the highest levels of the Movement's leadership.

"Acting in such a way, acting with presumptuous independence or in pursuit of personal demands, means failing to recognize the leadership capacity of General Perón and thus separating yourself from what is essentially the monolithic unity of the Movimiento Nacional Peronista



[Peronist National Movement].

"The JUVENTUD SINDICAL PERONISTA, a part of the political trade-union sector of our movement, has always acted with respect for the vertical command structure of the organizations of which we are a part.

"This is the lesson taught by GENERAL PERON and the ever-present example of the immortal EVITA.

"June 20 must mark the culmination of this line of thought, which must be understood by every Peronist. This is the same as saying every Argentine.

"The reception of the Leader must take place in a climate of the most complete peace. This is the best submission, the best homage we can offer to the man who has suffered eighteen years of the most unjust Exile, working and struggling in the face of the worst insults, the worst affronts, in order to give his best to the Fatherland. PERON was the peace offering when he returned to the country for the first time in November. [This apparently refers to his agreement not to run for president and to his support for the junta's plan of a "Great National Accord."] We Argentines are obliged to respond to this uplifting gesture, culminating in his renunciation, by offering him an Argentina where industriousness and peacefulness are the distinguishing features of the people and their way of showing their love for the Leader."

The JSP statement called on all Argentine youth to "strain every effort to give the most clamorous welcome possible to GENERAL JUAN DOMINGO PERON. That day, when with devotion we pay the warmest homage to the blue and white banner, the irreplaceable symbol of the Fatherland [Perón's return is scheduled to coincide with Argentine Flag Day], must be distinguished by the joy and happiness of the People's reunion with Perón."

This demagogy is a key element in a campaign to gain tight control over the masses, just liberated from the straitjacket of open military dictatorship, to keep them from going too far in their demands, and to curb any independent initiative that could endanger bourgeois order.

In this campaign, the first objective is to mobilize mass opposition to the guerrilla groups and organize a



CAMPORA

broad network of "activists" that can serve as a kind of auxiliary police reaching into every sphere of popular life. The "armed groups" offer an initial test target and a focus for organizing a mass repressive apparatus that can later be applied to larger tasks.

The buildup for Perón's return has been marked by steadily increasing pressures against the left and the guerrillas. On June 11, the new minister of the interior, Esteban Righi, issued a warning to the ERP (Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo—Revolutionary Army of the People). The government would not tolerate continued command operations, even if they were ostensibly aimed at supporting the demands of the Peronist masses by attacking the still intact reactionary institutions and forces that upheld the dictatorship. "The government's answer to any kind of aggression, no matter under what rubric, will be to defend its institutions."

Righi was replying specifically to the points the ERP made in its June 8 news conference in Buenos Aires (see *Intercontinental Press*, June 18, for a full account of the guerrillas' statements), when spokesmen of the organization pledged that they would not attack the government as long as it did not attack the people or repress the guerrillas. They would concentrate their attacks on the forces that backed the military dictatorship, overthrew the last legally elected Peronist govern-

ment, and threatened to support a new military coup if the government proved unable to control the mass upsurge.

In his reply, Righi invoked the new government's obvious mass support: "If the condition for attacking the government is our threatening the people, it will be impossible for this organization ever to attack us because this government has arisen out of the people and will never attack the people."

At the same time, the new "democratic" minister of the interior argued that no separation could be made between the government and the armed forces. "After May 25 [the date of Cámpora's inauguration], the armed forces joined with the people and are moving toward a very necessary identification with the country. Given these two circumstances I think that in the future the armed forces, the custodians of our sovereignty, cannot be attacked by any sector without this involving an attack on the institutions of the state."

The new minister of the interior stressed that the state was an indivisible unit. The June 12 *Clarín* summarized his argument this way: "Righi noted a contradiction in the statement of Santucho [the ERP leader] that the army would be attacked but not the police, which are under the authority of the Ministry of the Interior. 'I would ask you to try to get Santucho to explain this contradiction,' he said. 'It is not my business to try to resolve the ERP's contradictions.'"

A report in the June 12 issue of another Buenos Aires daily, *La Opinión*, indicated that the Peronist movement was hard at work trying to solve its own contradictions.

"The majority group at the meeting sang 'Perón/Evita/la patria socialista' [Perón/Evita/the socialist fatherland] and waved the emblems of the Montoneros [a Peronist guerrilla group named after the partisans in the war of independence], the FAP [Fuerzas Armadas Peronistas—Peronist Armed Forces], the FAR [Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias—Revolutionary Armed Forces], the Juventud Peronista [Peronist Youth], the Juventud de Trabajadores Peronistas [Peronist Worker Youth], the Unidades Básicas [Rank-and-File Units], and other rank-and-file groupings. The opposing group chanted 'la patria peronista'

[The Peronist Fatherland] and had the emblems of the Juventud Sindical Peronista and the Brigades Juveniles [Youth Brigades].

"The first clash occurred between members of the Juventud Sindical Peronista, which were identified by green armbands and flags, and the youths who were holding up a banner hailing the FAR and the Montoneros.

"After a little brawling, one of the attackers took out a firearm, a small-caliber one, according to the witnesses, and fired three times, wounding a woman. The bystanders fled, while some members of the Juventud Peronista wearing red and black armbands chased the firer of the shots. He ran across the field to an automobile that picked him up immediately and left the place. During the chase, the youths shouted that he was 'one of the trade-union goons.'

"Minutes later, on the corner of the Avenida Márquez, a block away from the stands, a new clash occurred in which three persons fired weapons, resulting in the death of Romano [Aldo Rubén Romano, a textile workers leader], forty-two years old and the father of three children. The second incident is supposed to have originated when a group of trade-unionists surrounded a demonstrator, which led to a fight in which both sides used firearms. The participants took cover behind parked cars as did most of the public, while others simply threw themselves on the ground. More than twenty shots were exchanged, leaving one person dead and three wounded, one of whom, the textile worker Carlos Acosta, was gravely injured."

This battle took place at a ceremony at the José León Suarez garbage dump in honor of Peronists killed in the repression that followed the armed forces' "liberating revolution" that overthrew Perón in 1955. The affair was presided over by the governor of Buenos Aires Province, Doctor Oscar Raúl Bidegain, and attended by 3,000 persons.

After the pitched battle between the two Peronist factions, Bidegain tried to calm the crowd, calling for a "Peronist movement united, harmonious, and disciplined in its homage to the martyrs who died here and in so many other places." He appealed for "mutual tolerance" and affirmed his confidence in the ability of the

Peronists to overcome their "apparent differences."

Despite these appeals to unity, two Peronist groups issued sharply conflicting statements on the shoot-out. The Coordinadora de Juventud Peronista de Vicente López [Coordinating Committee of the Vicente López Peronist Youth] issued a communiqué claiming that the incident was the re-

### **Santucho Denies Interview**

In its report of the ERP news conference June 8 (see *Intercontinental Press*, June 18), the June 11 weekly edition of the Buenos Aires paper *La Nación* said that the guerrilla leader Roberto Santucho denied giving the interview that was attributed to him in the April 24 issue of the Milan daily *Corriere della Sera*.

Other reports of the conference in the Argentine press did not note this denial.

The full text of the *Corriere della Sera* interview, in which Santucho allegedly pledged "conditional support" for the Cámpora regime, was translated in the May 14 issue of *Intercontinental Press*. It was also widely reported in Argentina and given special prominence.

Santucho pointed out, however, according to *La Nación*, that the June news conference was his first recent meeting with the press.

result of an attack by "goons in the pay of the trade-union bureaucrats who collaborated with the successive governments from 1955 to 1973 and are now trying to divide the movement. They have an interest in assuring the perpetuation of the system and fear the loss of their ability to bargain with the sacrifices of the people. That is why they are attacking those who are struggling for the people's real interests."

The conservative Confederación General Nacionalista [General Confederation of Nationalists] blamed leftist "infiltrators" and vowed to see the country "cleared of militarists and Marxists."

The clash was "predictable," the June 12 *La Opinión* commented, because of the different objectives of the forces backing the new government. The rise of a constitutional government backed by the traditional reformist mass

movement and the trade unions raised political problems that had remained in the background during the period of opposition to the military dictatorship.

"Long before the elections, and even when the future of the country's institutions was still unsure—in the period between March 11 and May 25—these differences began to come out into the open.

"But then what was called the 'struggle against the dictatorship,' tactically unified the activity of the armed organizations, relegating their conceptual and operational differences to second place.

"Today on the left fringe, the ERP has taken a position outside the system, reiterating its refusal to recognize the leadership of Perón and its opposition to any social peace.

"From the center, that is, the orthodox Peronists, the Juventud Sindical Peronista seems to be getting ready to act as a shock group, basing its action on Perón's call to fight the 'militarist and Trotskyist' provocateurs." (The ERP guerrillas against whom Perón's statement was aimed reject the label of Trotskyist. But the *Wall Street Journal's* correspondent in Buenos Aires cleared this point up, writing in the June 13 issue of the U. S. capitalist organ: "The ERP guerrillas are described as Trotskyites, which in Argentina means mostly that they are tough and won't give up.")

Despite the pitched gun battle between the right and left factions of Peronism June 9, the Peronist guerrillas still seemed unable to assert political independence from the government, which is backing the right more and more openly.

On June 13, President Cámpora received a delegation of leaders from the three Peronist guerrillas groups, the FAP, the FAR, and the Montoneros. They were seen by journalists as they went into the president's office, where they remained for twenty minutes. But a request by reporters to attend the meeting was refused; Cámpora's secretary stated: "Officially we know nothing of the presence of these persons in the president's office."

After the meeting, journalists did interview the guerrilla leaders, who, according to the June 14 issue of the Buenos Aires daily *La Nación*, expressed their "support for the government of Compañero Cámpora." When



they were asked what they would do if the government did not keep its promises, they answered: "In that case we will support Perón."

In their press conference June 8, representatives of the Peronist guerrilla organizations did specifically disavow anti-Communist attacks on the ERP by allegedly Peronist right-wing commando groups popping up at various places in the country. But at the same time, they called on ERP to take note of the mass support for Perón, and warned it that there was no place for any revolutionary group independent of the Peronist movement.

The logic of this seems inevitably destined to make the Peronist guerrillas accomplices of Perón's crack-down, even though the process may have to be helped along by direct pressure from the goon squads of the right.

The present situation is a very difficult one for any revolutionary force, in view of the great popular illusions about the elected government that has succeeded the military dictatorship, the power of the entrenched Peronist bureaucratic machine, and the myth of Perón himself, who is remembered as the only president who ever fought imperialism or did anything for the workers.

But guerrilla groups that try to carry out armed actions independently of the will of the masses and in direct opposition to the policy of the government and the charismatic "lider," which for the moment have overwhelming popular support, are particularly vulnerable. The only way a revolutionary group can defend itself and expose the essential emptiness of the new government's promises is by identifying with the democratic impulses of the masses, stimulating their hopes to win important gains, and trying to push the mass upsurge out of the control of the Peronist machine.

The American business community, for its part, knows exactly what to expect from Perón, and one of the first things it wants from him is restoration of "law and order."

"Many businessmen here hope he will set his young Peronist organizations against the terrorists," Everett Martin wrote in the June 13 *Wall Street Journal*. "Already the Young Peronists helped win the release of one kidnap victim in the industrial city of Cordoba by threatening to kill the relatives of ERP members. We may

end up being onlookers in a battle between the ERP and the young Peronists, but it may be the only way," an Argentine executive says. "We should put them all out on a football field to kill themselves so that no one else will get hurt."

The big American firms can afford a little extra overhead cost, Martin pointed out:

"Ford's Argentine subsidiary set a precedent by agreeing to pay \$1 million of protection money to head off further violence against its executives. It happened after two Ford employees were shot and one was wounded seriously as they were driving away from the plant after work. The guerrillas telephoned to threaten others if Ford didn't donate ambulances to each of Argentina's 22 provinces, food and school supplies to slum areas, and \$200,000 in cash to each of two children's hospitals.

"Ford, which had been spending \$400,000 a year anyway to build schools in Argentina, gave in and defended its action by saying 25 other foreign firms have paid millions of dollars in ransoms for kidnapped executives since 1970."

The constant threat hanging over the lives of corporate executives, however, makes the business community edgy.

"Some Argentine businessmen don't trust their fellow countrymen to guard them, and it is said that they have imported former mercenaries who fought in the Congo and Biafra.

"Recently the men guarding the head of the telephone company fought off a kidnap gang, but many executives don't relish the idea of being caught in a crossfire of bullets."

So, there is strong pressure on Cámpora to crack down on the guerrillas to demonstrate his government's stability and provide a "good business climate." At the same time, the increasing numbers of common criminals imitating the guerrillas' actions, which have resulted in well-publicized payments of huge ransoms, are making it easier and easier to represent repression of the guerrillas as a mere law-and-order problem.

"... recognizing a good thing, common criminals have also joined in," Martin wrote. "As a result, the victims have included not only the wealthy but also a truck-driver's son, a young taxi driver, grocers and

schoolchildren. Ransom demands range from \$2 million to as little as \$50. 'We haven't paid a bank-robbery claim for two years now,' a local insurance man says. 'The robbers are all into kidnapping.'"

The Argentine press has also been tending to equate the guerrilla actions with common crime, as is shown, for example, in the June 15 *Clarín's* review of the latest kidnappings: "Closed Mouths, the Common Denominator in the Kidnapping Industry." The report said there had been no word from the kidnappers in any of the four latest cases, except that the ERP had denied kidnapping an eighty-two-year-old farmer in Corrientes. In the same column, a disappearance was reported: "Last Tuesday the schoolboy Roberto Rubén Bonel, eleven years old and wearing a cowboy suit . . . left his home and did not return. As a consequence, his mother suffered a grave collapse."

The June 12 *Clarín* devoted an article to the case of a thirteen-year-old girl still missing despite the payment of a large ransom, along with the case of the missing British executive Charles Lockwood.

Although it remains to be seen if Perón will succeed in firmly uniting the mass movement around him, it seems clear that the guerrillas, who already suffered heavy losses under the military dictatorship, are in a very dangerous position. □

#### Cannibals Beware

The Manchester *Guardian* reports: "Animals which have 7 parts for every million of DDT in their fatty tissue are judged in the U.S. to be unfit to eat. And it is now disclosed that the average American has 12 parts per million of the pesticide in his body."

#### Still Available

Complete Back Files (Unbound)  
**Intercontinental Press**

1966	42 issues	\$25.00
1967	42 issues	\$25.00
1968	44 issues	\$22.00
1969	43 issues	\$21.50
1970	43 issues	\$21.50
1971	45 issues	\$22.50
1972	47 issues	\$23.50

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



## U.S. Capitalists Roll Out Red Carpet for Brezhnev

By Dick Roberts

The task of presenting the views of the minority of the U. S. ruling class on the developing Washington-Moscow détente fell to Senator Henry Jackson, a Democrat from the state of Washington. Jackson is often called "Mr. Boeing," a reference to his role as mouthpiece for the Seattle-based bomber manufacturer.

Jackson opposes the détente. More specifically, he takes a dim view of Soviet Communist party General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev's visit to the United States. Because articulating the interests of weapons-makers like Boeing has become unpopular in the United States, Jackson found himself obliged to find some other peg for his opposition to the Kremlin's rapprochement with Nixon. That peg was the status of Soviet Jewry.

"I simply say that after a lapse of 25 years," Jackson said in an interview in the June 18 *U.S. News and World Report*, "it's high time they [Soviet leaders] implement the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which the United Nations adopted. It says, among other things, that a person shall have the right to leave a country freely. I would hope the Soviet Union would permit the people who want to leave to leave."

Jackson went on to extend his supposed concern for the Soviet Jews to concern for a more burning issue for his mentors. "The average American," he claimed, "gets the idea that our trouble in the Middle East stems from our support for Israel. Nothing could be further from the truth. . . . The problem in the Middle East is the have-not Arab countries against the haves.

"The two stabilizing factors in the Middle East are Israel and Iran. It's only Israel and Iran that could prevent an overrunning of the regime in Saudi Arabia. A key country that we're concerned about for oil for the U.S. is Iran. Iranians are Moslem, but they aren't Arab. They have a realistically close alliance with Israel. . . .

"Then there is Kuwait. What's the threat to Kuwait? Israel? Not at all. It is Iraq, backed by the Soviet Union. What's the threat to Saudi Arabia? The have-not Arab countries: Egypt, operating through Yemen as they did several years ago; Syria, and Iraq, a country with a lot of oil but with an extremist government in power."

Jackson's attempt to drum up opposition to the détente by raising the specter of threats to American companies' Middle Eastern oil interests fell flat. The major sectors of U.S. finance capital have already concluded that the Moscow détente will serve to protect, not endanger, imperialist oil holdings. And not only oil holdings.

Prestigious ruling-class representatives rose to the Senate floor to scold Jackson. "There have been several articles recently indicating important economic transactions with Russia are in the making," said Senator J.W. Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

"Goodness knows," Fulbright continued, "they are very important for this country, as they are for Russia. I think the country and, I would hope, everyone who is interested in the economic stability of this country would feel it would be to our mutual advantage."

And the next day Senator Hugh Scott, Republican leader and White House spokesman, said: "The coming Brezhnev visit is intended to be the epitome of more than a year's arduous preparation. . . .

"There are great opportunities in the coming summit, opportunities to improve the lot of Soviet Jewry, to increase the flow of information and of people between our great countries, to make progress toward greater trade to our mutual advantage, and most important, opportunities to take further steps along the road of strategic détente and arms control—the only realistic road to peace."

Scott was followed by Senator Mike Mansfield, the Democratic party ma-

majority leader: "I am in wholehearted accord with what the distinguished minority leader has said. . . .

"So far as President Nixon being taken in by the General Secretary is concerned, I certainly place no credence in such a thought."

Rarely has the U. S. ruling class—and its political representatives—been so united. Jackson's efforts to stir up the coals of the Cold War and thus heat up the weapons contracts for Boeing have garnered little support.

Long before the elected representatives of the U. S. Congress take votes, their positions have been determined. They have had a series of closed-door meetings to listen to the spokesmen of banking and industry. They have pored through official and semiofficial publications to learn the opinions of the ruling-class "think tank" experts.

These are the kinds of articles Senator Fulbright was referring his colleagues to. Typical is a June 10 report of the subcommittee on "National Security Policy and Scientific Developments" of the U. S. House of Representatives' committee on foreign affairs. The authors are John P. Hardt, a "senior specialist in Soviet economics," and George D. Holliday of the Library of Congress.

Hardt and Holliday trace the turn in Soviet-American trade prospects to the 1969 recession. "The U.S. domestic economic recession of 1969-70 and the recurring balance-of-payments deficits gave rise to a far-reaching review by the Nixon Administration of foreign economic policy. Expanded trade with Communist countries was considered as a means of increasing U.S. exports and stimulating domestic production and employment."

They quote the "Peterson Report" to emphasize this shift. This report was prepared in December 1971 by Peter G. Peterson, then a presidential assistant, to explain the economic motives of Nixon's "New Economic Policy." Peterson stated:

"Relations with the Communist

world are now opening up rapidly. The United States has a long way to go in matching the trade levels of East and West Europe with each other."

According to Hardt and Holliday, "the share of the United States in Western trade with the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe was about 3 percent of exports and 2 percent of imports—roughly unchanged from 1960. With a tripling of total Western exports to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe during the period 1960-1970 (from \$3.7 to \$10.0 billion), Western European and Japanese exports accounted for most of the increase."

This theme has been reiterated by the capitalist authorities. There are some gigantic trade and investment deals in the offing. But it is not mainly the absolute magnitude of prospective business with the East that is in question. It is a matter of which imperialist power gets there first. So far the United States is behind. "There comes a point at which we must face the fact that business is business, and if it is going to go on in any event, we might as well have a piece of the action," Peterson declared in August 1972 after a talk with Soviet economic authorities.

Hardt and Holliday are discreet about the political implications of the détente with Moscow. "Some observers argue that the Soviet Union acts as a moderating influence on North Vietnamese and Middle Eastern leaders and uses its leverage to dampen tensions and hostilities," they note. But they add (see Jackson's remarks above), "Others maintain that the Soviet Union fosters proxy wars to its own benefit, and that the continuation of the Arab-Israeli and Indo-Chinese conflicts are not incompatible with Soviet aims."

A lot less discreet on this question was the "Survey on East-West Trade" published by the British financial magazine, *The Economist*, January 6, 1973. According to *The Economist*, "... a dispute between Mr Henry Kissinger and the then Secretary of Defence, Mr Melvin Laird . . . ended with these two formidable men joining forces to insist (though to this day no American will formally admit it) that any trade agreement with Russia should be 'linked' to concessions from Russia on other fronts—arms limitation, Mr Nixon's visit to Moscow,

talks on force reductions, Vietnam: 'We naturally did not offer Russia \$1 billion credit if they in return would help get us out of Vietnam—there's little need for crudeness in Moscow.'"

In any event, it's all part of the well-understood rules of diplomacy. U.S. officials will not "formally admit" that they are gaining Moscow's aid in betraying international revolution because they might not get that aid if they did.



BREZHNEV

Another side of this is brought out by Hardt and Holliday. This is the belief that the Moscow leadership itself is split on the question of how far to go in the détente and that economic concessions to Brezhnev will promote military concessions from Moscow to Washington's advantage. Hardt and Holliday explain, "The General Secretary appears to have emerged from the 24th Party Congress with more power and responsibility than he enjoyed in the pre-Congress Brezhnev-Kosygin collegial leadership. At the same time, Brezhnev's future tenure in office and position of power are likely to depend to a large extent on economic performance. . . . A stronger power base might enable Brezhnev to overcome Party conservatives who oppose economic change and to resist greater military outlays to compete with the United States, to meet the Chinese threat, and to exploit the opportunities of Middle Eastern instability."

In any event, these experts downplay the economic significance of the détente in relation to its political significance. "By far the largest project envisioned at present is a bid by several U.S. and Japanese companies to help finance development of Soviet natural gas reserves. The transaction could reportedly result in repayment delivery of \$45.6 billion [milliard] of natural gas to the United States and Japan. Several other large projects for raw material development have been discussed. . . . For a number of years, large U.S. surpluses in the trade balance would be offset by outflows of U.S. credits. Some of the projects now being discussed would increase Soviet export capabilities only after an extended development period. . . ."

"The economic advantages of Soviet-U.S. economic relations are likely to be significant in particular sectors, rather than for the national economy as a whole. Grain traders and petroleum companies, for example, may benefit, but the overall effect on the national economy will be modest.

"U.S. trade with the Soviet Union represented less than 1 percent of total U.S. foreign trade in 1971. In 1972, trade turnover increased substantially. However, if U.S.-Soviet trade should increase in eight years to \$3 billion [millard]—a remarkable attainment—it would still be only about 2 percent of U.S. foreign trade. Currently, the United States imports as much in a week from Canada as it imports in a year from the Soviet Union."

In a paragraph of the report that was singled out for mention by the *New York Times*, Hardt and Holliday wrote: ". . . if the Soviet Union should reorder its priorities and permit more foreign decision-making involvement in domestic cooperative ventures, significant long-run benefits of a predominantly political nature might accrue to the United States, such as: a) the potential reduction of the Soviet threat to our security from reordered Soviet priorities; b) a degree of Soviet acceptance of the international system, implied by the U.S.S.R.'s permitting domestic involvement of foreign corporations as partners; and c) political advantages inherent in increasing international commercial and financial intercourse. Overall, such political gains might far outweigh the relatively modest economic returns." □

## Two-Thirds of U.S. Think Nixon Guilty in Watergate

By Allen Myers

Two-thirds of the U.S. population believes that Richard Nixon was involved in the planning of the Watergate burglary or its subsequent cover-up, according to a Gallup poll released June 16. Only 19 percent of those questioned believed Nixon completely innocent in the scandal.

Gallup found that 8 percent believed that Nixon participated in the actual planning of the Watergate bugging; 28 percent thought he did not plan the operation but that he knew of it before it occurred; and 31 percent said he did not find out about the crime until after it happened but that he tried to cover it up.

The poll was taken June 1-4, before some of the most damaging testimony was presented before the Senate committee investigating Watergate. Since the poll was concluded, documents showing that Nixon approved an illegal domestic espionage plan have been published; memoranda have been released showing that Nixon's top aides directed the cover-up to protect his chances for reelection; a high campaign aide has admitted committing perjury at the trial of the Watergate burglars; and Hugh Sloan, the campaign chairman, has testified that the Committee to Re-elect the President (CREEP) paid the burglars hundreds of thousands of dollars and that he was encouraged to lie about it in court testimony. And on June 14, Jeb Stuart Magruder gave the most far-reaching testimony so far, linking all levels of the Nixon administration to the Watergate conspiracy.

### 'Give Him a Quarter of a Million'

Magruder is a typical member of the Nixon gang, or as John Herbers put it in the June 17 *New York Times*, "He was a prototype of the earnest young men who graduated from the best colleges in the 1950's and who, pursuing their concepts of the American dream, attached themselves to Richard Nixon."

From 1969 to 1972, Magruder

worked in the White House, holding a rank just below the top Nixon aides, H. R. Haldeman and John Ehrlichman. In 1972 he became deputy director of CREEP, second in command under former Attorney General John Mitchell.

When the Watergate cover-up began to crumble and it became clear that many of those involved were likely to go to prison, Magruder made a deal with the prosecutors, who are permitting him to plead guilty to only one count in exchange for his promise to testify about the involvement of others.

Magruder told the senators—and millions watching the proceedings on television—that the Watergate break-in was planned during a series of three meetings in January, February, and March 1972. Present at some or all of the meetings were Magruder, Mitchell, G. Gordon Liddy, who was convicted in the January 1973 Watergate trial, presidential counsel John Dean, and Frederick LaRue, a former White House aide who was Mitchell's assistant at CREEP.

As originally proposed by Liddy, the illegal operations involved far more than the Watergate burglary and wiretapping. Included was a plan to kidnap radicals, Magruder testified.

There were "projects, including wiretapping, electronic surveillance, and photography. There were projects relating to the abduction of individuals, particularly members of radical groups that we were concerned about on the convention. . . . Mr. Liddy had a plan where the leaders would be abducted and detained in a place like Mexico and that they would then be returned to this country at the end of the convention."

Another Liddy plan was to use prostitutes to entice Democratic politicians "aboard a yacht in Miami set up for sound and photographs."

This overall plan and a second one worked out by Liddy were rejected as insufficiently "realistic" and too expensive. On March 30, a version cost-

ing "only" \$250,000 was approved by Mitchell. Magruder quoted Mitchell as endorsing Liddy's proposals with words to the effect: "Okay, let's give him a quarter of a million dollars and let's see what he can come up with."

Magruder also provided strong circumstantial evidence that Nixon must have known of the plot. Magruder said he sent daily reports, including



STANS: Denies everything.

plans for the Watergate crimes, to Gordon Strachan, H. R. Haldeman's assistant in the White House. Haldeman, chief of the White House staff, was assigned by Nixon to watch over the campaign and to keep him informed of important matters.

When CREEP received the first results of the wiretap at Democratic party headquarters, Strachan went to the CREEP offices to read them.

Other high-level members of the Nixon gang were also aware of the illegal plans and anxious for them to go into effect, Magruder indicated. Between the second and third meetings to discuss Liddy's proposals, Ma-



gruder got a telephone call from presidential counsel Charles Colson:

"Mr. Charles Colson called me one evening and asked me in a sense would we get off the stick and get the budget approved for Mr. Liddy's plans, that we needed information, particularly on Mr. O'Brien."

(Lawrence O'Brien was then the chairman of the Democratic National Committee. Magruder said that CREEP was looking for evidence of illegal contributions by corporations to the Democratic party. Last July, three weeks after the arrest of the Watergate burglars, burglars broke into the home of Robert Strauss, who was then the Democratic party treasurer. Strauss says that the burglars ignored valuable jewelry; apparently they were looking only for financial records.)

The March 30 meeting at which the bugging plans were approved was held in Key Biscayne, Florida, presumably on the Nixon property there. The senators, however, refrained from asking Magruder to be more precise on this point.

After the June 17, 1972, arrest of the burglars, other members of the Nixon gang helped to cover up the original conspiracy. Magruder testified that they included Hugh Sloan; Robert Mardian, a former assistant attorney general in charge of the Internal Security Division of the Justice Department; and Herbert Kalmbach, Nixon's personal attorney, who raised hundreds of thousands of dollars to buy the silence of the burglars.

Magruder also contradicted the testimony of Maurice Stans, who had appeared before the committee June 12-13, after unsuccessful attempts to have the courts quash his subpoena. The former secretary of commerce, who headed fund raising for the Nixon campaign, denied any knowledge at all of the Watergate break-in or the cover-up. But Magruder said that Stans had met with Mitchell for an explanation of why Liddy was being given so much money. And he added that he himself had told Stans on June 17 that the Watergate burglars were carrying money from CREEP when they were arrested.

### 'That Ass, Nixon'

Even more damaging testimony against Nixon is expected when John

Dean appears before the Senate committee June 19. With the exceptions of Haldeman, Ehrlichman, and Mitchell, Dean probably knows more about Nixon's role in various crimes than anyone else in the Nixon gang. He has indicated to the press that he will tell it all.

Like Magruder, Dean is one of those earnest young criminals attracted to Nixon like flies to a dung heap. After graduating from law school, he joined a Washington legal firm from which



MAGRUDER: Confesses.

he was fired six months later for "unethical conduct" that consisted of applying for a television station license in his own name when he was supposed to be securing it for a client.

After a brief period as staff lawyer for a congressional committee, Dean entered Nixon's Justice Department, where his primary job was sabotage and spying directed against the antiwar movement and radical organizations. Prior to the massive antiwar demonstration of November 15, 1969, in Washington, Dean was assigned to negotiate with the demonstration's organizers over permits and the route of march. He deliberately postponed issuance of the permits to the last moment, even leaving town for a vacation in the middle of the discussions in the hope of creating a climate that would intimidate potential demonstrators.

Dean was brought into the White

House as "legal counsel" in 1970. His real job, however, continued to be sabotage, espionage, and concealment of the Nixon administration's crimes. This included participation in the cover-up of ITT's \$400,000 contribution to Nixon's reelection, which the corporation gave in exchange for a favorable settlement of an antitrust suit.

Dean appears to have been a member of the Nixon gang more out of devotion to his own advancement than out of strong right-wing beliefs. *Newsweek* magazine reported of him: "His only political comment, as far as anyone can recall, came while watching the 1960 Presidential debates: 'Look at that ass, Nixon.'"

The very highest levels of the Nixon gang—Ehrlichman, Haldeman, Mitchell, and the boss himself—have attempted to paint Dean as the central culprit in the whole affair and themselves as innocent bystanders injured by the excesses of a subordinate now blaming them for his own independent actions. This argument is not very convincing, but the top gangsters have very little else left in the way of defense.

In the May 24 *Washington Post*, John Hanrahan described Dean as a rather timid bureaucrat unlikely to exceed his authority:

"In interviews with some friends and former associates of Dean, a general picture that emerges is one of a person who, once an assignment is given to him, pursues it diligently, but always keeps his superiors informed out of a concern that a misstep might displease them. . . ."

"Ambitious and hard-working, Dean is not one to be out of step with what his superiors want, his acquaintances say."

*Newsweek* reported that Dean has already told the Senate staff that Nixon knew of the Watergate cover-up and has frequently lied about it. Speaking of Nixon's May 22 statement excusing the cover-up on grounds of national security, Dean told the magazine: "I suspect that most of it will become inoperative soon." □

### Ecumenical Pioneers

Researchers in Texas have been looking for the remains of a "spaceman" who, according to an 1897 newspaper report, died when his spaceship exploded. The report said that local residents gave him a Christian burial.

# Nixon, Thieu Press Attacks on Indochina Liberation Forces

By Jon Rothschild

"They must have made a secret agreement as well," the June 17 *New York Times* quoted an anonymous American official in Washington as saying, "because otherwise the exercise would have been pointless." The official was commenting on the June 13 communiqué declaring yet another cease-fire in Vietnam.

The communiqué was released in two versions—a four-party text signed by the Saigon regime, the U.S. government, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and the South Vietnam Provisional Revolutionary Government, and a two-party text signed only by Washington and Hanoi with the "concurrency" of the other two parties.

The Byzantine, two-stage signing ceremony was not the only thing the June 13 communiqué had in common with the January 27 cease-fire agreement that it was supposed to concretize. Like the earlier accord, the June 13 document was negotiated in secret, settles nothing, and has already been violated by the Saigon gang.

The piece of paper in question is the fruit of some seventy-five hours of talks between Henry Kissinger and Le Duc Tho. It consists of fourteen points, many of which in turn consist of quotations from the January 27 accord.

The first two points, the only really specific ones in the communiqué, state that the U. S. military, "in conformity with article 2 of the [January 27] agreement," must "cease indefinitely aerial reconnaissance" over the territory of the DRV and must resume mine-sweeping operations in DRV waters. By affixing his worthless signature to the communiqué, Kissinger, in the name of his boss, tacitly admitted what Washington had hitherto denied: that the Nixon regime has been violating the Paris agreement by flying spy planes over North Vietnam and by failing to clear mines from the port of Haiphong and the rivers of the DRV.

In Point 3, the "two South Vietnam-

ese parties" agree to issue new cease-fire orders to their respective military forces, the truce to go into effect June 15. Point 4 states that the "two South Vietnamese parties" will observe articles 2 and 3 of the earlier agree-



KISSINGER: There is nothing in the communique but what's in it.

ment, which delineate the specifics of the nonexistent cease-fire.

Point 5 explains that the "Two-Party Joint Military Commission" (JMC), which in reality has never functioned, should immediately begin its task of determining "the areas controlled by the two South Vietnamese parties." Point 6 says that military field commanders should meet so as to avoid new incidents of fighting, which has never stopped.

Point 7 repeats the January 27 accord's assertions prohibiting the introduction of military equipment into South Vietnam except on a one-for-one basis. Point 8 repeats the January

27 accord's assertion that civilian prisoners should be released, something Thieu refuses to do. Point 9 reiterates the January 27 accord's provision on establishing democratic rights throughout South Vietnam. Point 10 repeats the call for "free elections" and the formation of a National Council of National Reconciliation and Concord. Point 11 states that members of the JMC should have diplomatic status—another provision already contained in the first cease-fire accord that Thieu refuses to implement. Point 12 states that the International Commission of Control and Supervision, which does not function, should be accorded cooperation by both sides.

Point 13, in its entirety, states: "Article 20 of the [January 27] agreement regarding Cambodia and Laos, shall be scrupulously implemented."

Point 14 states that Washington-Hanoi talks on reconstruction of the DRV should resume.

When Henry Kissinger was asked what there was in the communiqué, besides the goodwill and seriousness of the people who negotiated it, that would make it work any better than the first cease-fire agreement, he replied: "There is nothing in any communiqué that makes a communiqué work. The communiqué works because the parties concerned intend to implement it."

This could be considered to be one of Kissinger's less dishonest statements—provided the word "because" was changed to "if." And both the Saigon government and the Nixon gang have proven that they have no intention of implementing the communiqué, any more than they implemented the cease-fire accord itself.

The Saigon regime openly proclaimed its intention of violating the terms of the communiqué within twenty-four hours of its signing. On June 14 it issued a booklet entitled "The Paris Joint Communiqué of June 13: Analysis and Observations." Even the *New York Times* (June 15) was compelled to admit that Saigon "appeared to have all but repudiated several of the key articles" of the communiqué. "Well-placed [Saigon] Government sources explained this by insisting that Thieu would not honor articles he deemed to be "contrary to the spirit" of the January 27 agreement.

For example, the booklet states that

Saigon and the PRG must set the date for elections before a National Council of National Reconciliation and Concord is formed and before wartime restrictions of democratic rights are lifted. That is, Thieu insists that the PRG must agree to hold an "election" before the several hundred thousand political prisoners are released from Saigon's jails and while Thieu's military rule continues to deny all political forces except his own the right to function.

And there was some evidence that Thieu did not even intend to go through the formalities of ordering his troops to cease firing. "Periodically throughout the day yesterday," Fox Butterfield wrote in a June 16 dispatch to the *New York Times*, "the Communists broadcast orders to their soldiers to stop fighting, and the [Saigon] Government announced that its field commanders had been instructed by radio and telephone to

observe the new truce. However, reports from the field indicated that many Government soldiers had not yet [sic] received such orders by noon, when the truce was to begin."

As for the U.S. government, there is no more dramatic proof of its intention of disregarding the communiqué than the bombing raids still being conducted against the Cambodian liberation forces and civilian population.

When Kissinger was asked by reporters whether the section of the communiqué reaffirming Article 20 of the cease-fire agreement (which prohibits foreign military operations in Cambodia) meant that American bombing raids would stop, he answered that "there is nothing that commits the United States to cease such operations." The day the communiqué was signed marked the one-hundredth consecutive day that American bombers had been in action over Cambodia. □

## Chile

### Copper Workers Strike in Second Month

[The following article is translated by *Intercontinental Press* from the June 7 issue of *Avanzada Socialista*, the weekly organ of the Argentine Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores (PST—Socialist Workers party).]

\* \* \*

For more than forty days the workers at "El Teniente" copper mine have been on strike. This is the largest copper mine in the world. It employs 13,000 workers and personnel and constitutes one of the most important sources of foreign exchange for the Chilean economy.

The strikers say that the aim of their movement is to defend the sliding scale of wages won after hard struggles with the previous Yankee bosses. The workers at another big mining center, Chuquicamata, observed work stoppages in solidarity with them, and, as this issue went to press, the possibility of a general strike was under discussion.

The Allende government is accusing the movement of "economist" deviations, that is, of being more concerned

with their own problems than with those of the country. He says that it is being led by the right wing and has launched a campaign of false stories to the effect that the majority of the workers have returned to work. He also attempted to intimidate the strikers by declaring a state of emergency in O'Higgins Province and by authorizing more than 500 carabinieri and two armored cars to go into action. The result was more than thirty wounded.

The right wing, for its part, is trying to take political advantage of the conflict by giving it verbal support. The president of the Senate turned up in the zone, and a right-wing student leader made a speech to the miners in which he expressed his "solidarity."

What is really happening is that the cost of living in Chile is skyrocketing and threatening to wipe out the substantial increase in the standard of living that the workers received when the Popular Unity government came to power.

There are a number of reasons for this. First, the sabotage of produc-

tion by the big capitalists and the refusal of the government to take the necessary steps to confront the problem, namely, the nationalization of their companies. Second, the fact that most trade remains in private hands while at the same time the government rejects the only possible solution—workers control of distribution. Finally, the blockade by Yankee imperialism, to which the government continues to make payments on the foreign debt, patents, and other forms by which Chilean wealth leaves the country.

In view of this situation, not only the miners, but also other sectors that are not under the control of Popular Unity or the leadership of the Central Unica de Trabajadores [CUT—Workers Central Union], such as the public works employees and the collective transport drivers, have begun to mobilize around the demand for higher wages without waiting for the debates in the parliament to run their course. These are debates, moreover, in which the right wing, which enjoys a clear majority in the congress, is not going to give in unless forced to by the mobilization of the workers themselves.

The fact that the right wing might take advantage of these struggles to fight the Allende government is not the responsibility of the workers but, above all, of the government itself. This is a government perched atop a parliament in which the bosses constitute a majority, a judicial power where the same thing holds true, and an army that stands ready to arbitrate the situation and makes no moves against the "legal order" because it is saving itself as the last line of defense for the capitalist system. In short, this is a reformist government that is taking positive anti-imperialist measures but is not tampering in any basic sense with the two foundations of rule by the owning class: property and weapons.

This policy of the government, together with the line of class harmony pushed by the leadership of the unions and the parties in the Popular Unity coalition like the Socialist and Communist parties, is leaving the workers movement disarmed; it could lead to splits within its own ranks, and it is endangering not only the advances that have been made but the Allende government itself. □



## Belgian Dockers in Eight-Week Strike

[The following article appeared in the June 8 issue of *Rouge*, weekly newspaper of the Ligue Communiste, French section of the Fourth International. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

\* \* \*

JUNE 1—In Belgium, the employers, the government, and the leadership of the FGTB [Fédération Générale des Travailleurs de Belgique—Belgian General Federation of Workers] are all exponents of the same idea: "social peace." The PSB [Parti Socialiste Belge—Belgian Socialist party], the ultrareformist outfit that leads the FGTB, has been invited and welcomed into the government to guarantee social peace.

The UBOT [Union Belge des Ouvriers du Transport—Belgian Union of Transport Workers] presents a striking image of trade-union integration and of class collaboration. Its program? Sign sweetheart contracts behind the backs of the workers and then ask the workers to "be good."

The result is that the working class pays the costs of this fool's game. Concentration and privatization of port facilities has been put through on the backs of the dockers with the benevolent complicity of the union leadership. And the result of this: infernal speedups, lack of security and cleanliness, frequent workplace accidents, increase in unemployment, and so on.

But there came a day when the workers' anger exploded. On April 6 the Ghent dockers walked out. On April 9 they drew their comrades into the struggle. The strike has now lasted for more than eight weeks.

From the outset, the Ghent dockers put forth clear demands: a weekly pay increase of 1,000 francs [about US\$23]; increase in unemployment compensation of 50 francs a day; recognition of the workers job qualifications; revision in the hiring system; improvement of the cost-of-living escalator.

The general secretaries of the FGTB and the CSC [Confédération des Syn-

dicats Chrétiens—Confederation of Christian Trade Unions] answered: "We will never recognize this strike." The strikers answered this by setting up a strike committee, forming strike pickets, and organizing solidarity with workers in Antwerp.

Also from the very beginning, the employers and the government set in motion everything they could to break the strike. All assemblies are banned in Antwerp, which is crawling with cops and gendarmes and where troops were called out to unload the ships. Clashes between the strikers and the



Dockers meeting in Antwerp during strike.

repressive forces broke out. On April 27 gendarmes in Antwerp assaulted the workers. On May 21 in Ghent a cop shot at the workers.

As for the union leaders, their attitude was worse than disgraceful. After having refused to recognize the strike, they proposed (two weeks into the strike) that the strikers give up the struggle, in return for which the union tops would take up the workers demands—when the contract comes up for renegotiation. A week later, they proposed setting up a Vigilance Committee that could exert pressure on the union federation—on the condition that the strikers go back to work! And during the whole time, they tried

to break down the solidarity between the Antwerp and Ghent workers.

The Communist party also played a role, its Antwerp branch having been entrenched there for a long time. The CP straddled the fence. On the one hand, it tried at all costs to maintain a friendly relation with the union leaders. On the other hand, it could not crudely demobilize for fear of losing a portion of its electoral support.

The bourgeois press fulminated against the strike. It insisted that port traffic was "normal," minimized the number of strikers, exaggerated every little incident, and denounced "professional agitators." *Libre Belgique* even went so far as to denounce three members of the LRT [Ligue Révolutionnaire des Travailleurs—Revolu-

tionary Workers League, Belgian section of the Fourth International] who allegedly "sacrificed their vacations to interfere in things that were none of their business."

Newspapers affiliated to the unions were no better. *Het Volk* defended the scabs; *Volksgazet's* headline on a story about a dockers demonstration read: "800 Persons at Communist Demonstration."

In face of this powerful antistrike campaign, which was trying to line up other workers and public opinion against the dockers, solidarity took on decisive importance. And it was organized, despite the opposition of the FGTB leadership, which did every-

thing to prevent it. In other factories, such as at Verlica, union delegations and workers assemblies voted motions affirming their solidarity with the dockers and their indignation at the police attacks; they asked the trade-union leaders to recognize the strike immediately. In Brussels, young trade unionists set up a unified support committee. The militants of the LRT carried out many activities to popularize support. In France, in Cherbourg, Ligue Communiste-LRT solidarity leaflets were handed out to the dockers.

This Friday [June 1], the dockers strike finished its eighth week. A long time. The strike is at a difficult phase and it is hard to say if it will be able to continue. But already some preliminary lessons can be drawn.

In January 1970, the massive spontaneous strike of 23,000 miners in Limbourg shattered "social peace." It revealed a thrust of workers militancy that outflanked the trade-union apparatuses. The setting up of a strike committee expressed the miners' desire to control their own struggle.

The radicalization and politicization process of the workers vanguard has gone on slowly in an underground fashion. Today, the dockers strike stands at the center of the organized

workers movement. Beginning as a struggle for a set of specific demands, it broadened, and through its breadth and political dimension it has posed basic questions for the workers movement; in the first place, that of trade-union independence from the bourgeois state.

This is in no way a temporary diversion. Whether it results in victory or defeat, the dockers strike has powerfully contributed to a realignment within the workers movement. The gap between the rank and file and the top leadership, which was spectacularly manifested in 1970, has widened and deepened. In hundreds of factories around the country, financial solidarity was organized, sometimes against the union apparatus. From Wallonia and from Flanders, many workers delegations came to express their solidarity: Cockerill, Petrole, ACEC, FN, shipbuilders, etc.

An opposition is being constructed and strengthened against the policy of the ultrareformist union leaders who have shown their real strike-breaking face. The battle for union democracy, for a militant trade-unionism being led by the workers of Nouvelle Défense [New Defense] is beginning to bear some fruit. □

three months after having spent three years in San Carlos Prison.

3. On Thursday, March 1, another former political prisoner, Jesús Márquez Finol, was gunned down in the middle of the street by agents of SIFA [Servicio de Inteligencia de las Fuerzas Armadas — Armed Forces Intelligence Service]; this was confirmed in an official communiqué from the Ministry of Defense.

4. On the same day, Compañero Arnaldo Monjes, a former political prisoner who had been in San Carlos Prison, was arrested and taken by a commission of SIFA to the SIFA headquarters.

5. On the same day, the home of Compañero Omar Dalmasas, another former prisoner from Modelo Prison, was searched; it is still not known what police organization is holding him in custody.

6. The same day, Compañera Margarita Oviedo, a former political prisoner, disappeared. She is presently in the custody of SIFA.

7. On February 26, after learning about the death of Compañero Reina, the political prisoners in all of the country's prisons went on an indefinite hunger strike to protest it and to demand that responsibility for it be determined.

8. It was after the hunger strike began that the above-mentioned arrests and the shooting of Compañero Jesús Márquez Finol on a public street took place.

These incidents fully justify the alarm and concern that prompt us to issue this warning regarding the significance of the repression that is being directed against the country's political prisoners, their relatives, and their friends; to express our full and unconditional support for the hunger strike by political prisoners in the various prisons throughout the country; and to urge the population to express their solidarity with them.

(Signed) Astrid Fischer, Domingo Tiamo Castro, Alfonso Contreras, Laura de Prada, Gustavo Galarraga, Pompeyo Márquez, William Fajardo, Idulfo Rojas, Gregorio Castro, Julio C. Gúzman, Euclides Monasterios, Virgilio Briceño, Ernesto Virla, Gregorio Galarraga, Freddy Muñoz, Epifania Sánchez, Luis Barrios, Eloy Torres, Raquel Reyes. □

## Former Political Prisoners Issue Appeal

# Warn of Mounting Repression in Venezuela

[The following appeal to world public opinion was issued March 3 by several hundred former Venezuelan political prisoners. It was published in the April-May issue of *Voz Marxista*, published by the Grupo Trotskista Venezolano (GTV — Venezuelan Trotskyist Group). *Voz Marxista's* partial listing of signers follows the text. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

\* \* \*

The country's former political prisoners are turning to public opinion, trade-union sectors, students, professional, intellectual, and artists' organizations, political parties, legislators, etc., in order to voice our alarm and concern over the following incidents:

1. Last November, two former political prisoners, Plinio Rodríguez Acosta and Caricote Agreda, were killed by state security agents under alarming circumstances; proven innocent after having spent three years in jail, they were free when they were killed.

2. Recently, under circumstances reported to the public by the Committees for the Defense of Human Rights and the United Committee for Amnesty, Compañero Argelio José Reina, a former political prisoner, was arrested in the city of San Juan de los Morros, turned over to the command of the National Guard, and then killed under conditions that clearly involved the use of torture. At the time of his arrest, he had been free for barely

## Iceland Uses NATO as Lever in Fishing Dispute

By David Thorstad

The May 31-June 1 summit meeting in Reykjavik between Presidents Nixon and Pompidou was a disappointment to the Icelandic government, which had hoped to elicit some sign of support from them in its dispute with England over its fishing boundary. The presidents refused to be drawn into the dispute between the two NATO member countries.

Just two days prior to the opening of the summit, Icelandic Foreign Minister Einar Agustsson had explained that his government was not calling on NATO to seek to bring about a reconciliation between Iceland and England but to intervene to force Britain to pull its warships out of Icelandic waters: "We don't want NATO mediation. We have not referred the fishing dispute to NATO, but have asked it only to arrange for the withdrawal of Britain's warships." Three British frigates are protecting the three dozen or so trawlers in the British fleet that are raiding fishing grounds inside Iceland's fifty-mile limit.

In the nine and a half months since Iceland extended its fishing limit from twelve to fifty miles, its dispute with Great Britain has grown increasingly sharp. While West German trawlers also continue to raid Icelandic waters, the dispute has focused on Britain because of London's belligerent decision to dispatch warships to defend its fleet. The situation has reached the point that it is considered possible that Iceland might pull out of NATO.

The so-called cod war became perceptibly hotter as the Nixon-Pompidou meeting approached. On May 20, Iceland went beyond mere coast guard harassment of violating trawlers (cutting trawllines, firing across British bows, and so on) and banned all British military planes from landing at the NATO airfield at Keflavik. British reconnaissance planes had been using the base to refuel and then keep an eye on the trawlers.

Iceland's coalition government, consisting of the Progressive party, the Communist-led People's Alliance, and the Radical Liberal party, accused

Britain of carrying out an invasion. On May 21, the People's Alliance called for Iceland's withdrawal from NATO and demanded the severance of all diplomatic ties with Britain.

On May 23, the Icelandic government extended its ban on British aircraft to prohibit all British military planes from landing at Icelandic airports or flying over Icelandic jurisdiction. The only exemptions will be planes in distress.

In the next few days, a series of incidents occurred that served to dramatize and call world attention to the Icelandic case. Several thousand Icelanders stormed the British embassy in Reykjavik May 24, smashing most of the building's windows. The government was quick to apologize; it delivered a note to the British ambassador describing the outraged protesters as a deplorable mob.

On May 26, the Icelandic coast guard gunboat *Aegir* shelled the British trawler *Everton*, causing it to spring a leak. The *Aegir* reportedly first steamed up to the *Everton* and ordered her to stop fishing, according to a Reuters dispatch. "The *Everton* refused and made off. At first, the coast guard said, the gunboat fired blank warning shots but the *Everton* steamed on.

"For an hour the chase continued. Then the *Aegir*—armed with a 57-mm. gun—opened fire with live ammunition. Two or three shells hit the *Everton*, the coast guard said. But the trawler still kept going and eventually the *Aegir* gave up the chase."

The director general of the British Trawler Federation termed the shelling "an act of war." Iceland's Premier Olafur Johannesson, however, described it as "a natural and inevitable law-enforcement action" and warned that such incidents "can always repeat themselves."

On June 1, Icelandic Information Secretary Hannes Jonsson took advantage of the presence of some 400 foreign journalists in Reykjavik to call a news conference in which he de-

nounced what he described as an attack by ten to twenty British trawlers and an oceangoing tug, the *Irishman*, on the Icelandic lighthouse-repair vessel, the *Arvakur*. The *Arvakur* was rammed. Jonsson said the incident "gives you a very clear picture of what kind of aggression we, an unarmed country, have to face."

Similar incidents have occurred since then, with a flurry of charges and countercharges.

The specific bone of contention between Britain and Iceland is the amount of fish England should be allowed to take out of Icelandic waters, which currently supply 25 percent of the product that gives the British their fish and chips. Negotiations between the two governments broke down over the British refusal to agree to limit the catch to 117,000 tons; the British want the limit set at 145,000 tons.

For Iceland, however, the underlying issue is really one of survival. It is a poor and barren place. Seventy-six percent of its territory consists of uninhabitable glaciers, lava fields, lakes, sands, and mountains. Only 1 percent can be farmed. It has no valuable resources, neither timber, nor coal, nor minerals. Its 220,000 inhabitants are entirely dependent upon fishing. More than 80 percent of its exports consist of fish products.

This dependence on fish makes Iceland vulnerable to two phenomena: the increasing depletion of the fish supply, and the increasing sophistication of modern fishing techniques.

"As the fish become scarcer," noted Robert Alden in the June 3 *New York Times*, "the techniques to fish them out have become more sophisticated. Electronic equipment hunts down the schools with deadly accuracy. It is estimated that even though there are fewer fish in the waters, the catch in one hour of a modern vessel is 30 per cent larger than it was 10 years ago.

"The modern fishing factory vessels, employed by the Russians and the



Japanese move across the seas like vacuum cleaners, sucking up all living things. They process the fish into fillets, press the oil, produce fish meal — and leave the seas barren."

This problem is worldwide. "Marine organisms supply 70 per cent of the world's oxygen, and marine biologists already warn that if what they call the plunder of the deep continues, all biological life might be killed off by early in the next century," Alden wrote.

Whatever the long-range threat to the world as a whole, the threat to the Icelanders is more immediate:

"Simply put, less fish are being caught. In 1965 the volume of Iceland's herring catch was 763,000 tons. Now it has dropped to about 60,000. The herring have just been fished out of the sea. As a result, the fishermen of Iceland and of Britain are casting their nets deeper to catch the species found close to the seabed, haddock and cod.

"But the combined haddock catch in Icelandic waters was 110,000 tons in 1961. Now it is just over 40,000 tons. As for cod, Iceland's fishermen took 308,000 tons in 1970, 255,000 tons in 1971 and even less in 1972. The British fishermen took 210,000 tons of cod in 1971 and, in an effort to reach some kind of international agreement with Iceland, have offered to limit their catch to 145,000 tons this year. But nobody knows how long the supply will last."

This was the general background to the decision of Iceland's popular-front government to extend its fishing boundaries. All parties, including those of the bourgeoisie, back this decision. In a sense, it could be said that the economic policy of the government since its election in June 1971 has been to support the Icelandic bourgeoisie against the international bourgeoisie, observed Thröstur Olafsson, writing in the May 4 issue of the Danish socialist fortnightly *Politisk Revy*.

"The so-called left governments [in recent Icelandic history]," he wrote, "have found themselves in a contradictory situation. On the one hand, they have attempted to reduce the privileges of the bourgeoisie and to put a brake on speculative profits. On the other hand, they have supported the bourgeoisie economically, for example through introducing improvements in the means of production.



Iceland coast guard vessel (rear) keeps watch on British trawler.

This new government started out just like earlier left-wing governments by renovating the trawler fleet. To this end it purchased forty new trawlers, which were resold to communities or individual capitalists throughout the entire country.

"The extension of the fishing boundaries to fifty nautical miles had two aims: On one hand, to preserve the fish supply, and on the other, to increase the catch for Icelanders. At the same time, comprehensive plans were drawn up for rebuilding the country's industry, which was in a state of decay and far from being able to compete with foreign industrial goods, which, in the wake of the entry into EFTA [European Free Trade Association], flowed duty-free into the Icelandic market."

There has been no rush among the world's nations to recognize the fifty-mile limit. Few countries have done so, and there is considerable opposition to the approach of Iceland and various Latin American nations of extending claims of exclusive fishing jurisdiction. The entire question is to be taken up later this year at a United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

For the moment, the Icelandic government is using its membership in NATO as a lever in its effort to win support. On June 12, it formally asked

the United States to revise the 1951 defense treaty under which American forces are stationed at the Keflavik air base. And it announced that a similar letter would be sent to the Council of NATO later in the month.

NATO's ability to keep an eye on Soviet ballistic-missile submarines rounding Norway's North Cape on their way to the Atlantic or the Mediterranean depends almost entirely on use of the Keflavik base. The government of Norway, another NATO member, offered to mediate the Iceland-Britain dispute, in part out of concern that an Iceland pullout might have annoying repercussions inside Norway, where louder-than-usual voices can already be heard demanding that it follow Iceland's example and extend its own fishing limits. The mediation offer was rejected.

Meanwhile, within Iceland the "cod war" is producing increasing disenchantment with NATO. U.S. officials are already studying alternate plans for surveillance of Soviet naval and air movement in case the imperialists get booted off the Keflavik base. □

#### 57% Chance of Survival

A survey by the U.S. Department of Agriculture found 43 percent of meat and poultry plants operating under conditions sufficiently unsanitary to endanger the health of consumers.

## Imperialist Capital's Penetration of Iran

By Parsi Zadeh

[The following article appeared in the May 30 issue of *La Brèche*, fortnightly newspaper of the Ligue Marxiste Révolutionnaire (Revolutionary Marxist League), the Swiss Trotskyist organization. The introduction to the article is by *La Brèche*. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

\* \* \*

In October 1972 Chinese Premier Chou En-lai received Farah Pahlavi, wife and empress of the butcher of Teheran, in the People's Republic of China for an official visit. On this occasion, Chou declared in the name of the proletarian government of China: "At the present time, under the leadership of his Imperial Majesty the Shahinshah Mohammed Reza Pahlavi, the Iranian government and people are working resolutely to safeguard state sovereignty, protect national resources, bring about a blossoming of national culture, and enlighten the country; and they have registered some success in this regard."

Thus would open an era of friendship between People's China and the reactionary Iranian regime, which despite that friendship would not cease its bloody repression against the revolutionists in its country. The article that we are publishing below on the role of foreign capital in Iran clearly reveals the mystifications that Peking's assertions about the self-styled "independence" of the Iranian regime were based on and shows that, contrary to Peking, a fusion exists between imperialism and the Iranian bourgeoisie, linked to imperialist capital.

\* \* \*

Imperialist capital's domination of the peoples of the underdeveloped capitalist countries, which began at the turn of the century, has been increasingly intensifying during the past decade or so. The growing integration of the underdeveloped economies into the world market has facilitated the entry of imperialist capital into these countries and the export from these countries of the profits realized. Nevertheless, account must be taken of changes that have been going on for some time in the orientation of foreign investments.<sup>1</sup> The case of Iran is a striking example of "the development of underdevelopment." In fact, since 1955, penetration of world capital into Iran has been growing ceaselessly; between 1955 and 1965, more than seventy foreign factories were set up in Iran. Capital imported in 1965 was six times greater than what was imported in 1955. By setting up mixed corporations foreign capitalists have gained control of the greatest possible number of branches of the Iranian economy with the expenditure of a small amount of capital.

1. In this regard, see P. Salama, *Le proces du sous-developpement*.

To facilitate its penetration of Iran, international capital needed to set up financial institutions capable of making flexible the ebb and flow of capital (this apart from instituting a phony agrarian reform). It was especially after the August 19, 1953, coup that the Iranian bourgeoisie—which was trying to link up with imperialist capital—sought to fill out the gaps. In 1955, the "law on attraction and protection of foreign investments in Iran" was passed. The benefits that this law extended to foreign capitalists can be summed up as follows:

1. Each year, after handing in his balance-sheet, the investor may export his net profits.

2. Complete exemption from taxes over a five-year period for any new factory established outside a 100-mile radius of the capital.

3. Exemption from customs duties of all imported machinery and raw materials.

4. Tax exemption for half the net profits of foreign industrial firms.

5. Guaranteed assurance to all foreign capitalists that they will be accorded all facilities for export of their profits and capital, and so on.

Linked to this law, and with the aim of implementing it, a "center for attraction and protection of foreign investments in Iran" was created; its purpose was to establish the necessary ties between foreign capitalists and the various ministries and to promote the establishment of foreign companies in Iran. In addition, in 1969 the Iran Bank for Industrial and Mining Development was set up; since its founding, its capital has risen to 400 million rials [about US\$5.22 million]. This bank plays an essential role in the growth of foreign investments in Iran. It is the intermediary between the Iranian market and world capital, and it orients the latter toward sectors that correspond to the needs of the imperialist countries. Another function of this bank is to control the country's foreign trade and industry (in line with the interest of world imperialism) by means of granting credits. Although officially controlled by Iranian capitalists, who hold 60 percent of the capital, the bank is in reality operated by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Agency for International Development, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and the ODIC.

The greater and greater demands of imperialist capital, rapidly rising since 1972, have given rise to new banking institutions. Toward the end of 1972 several world banks (on the initiative of the Iran Bank for Industrial and Mining Development) came to agreement on founding the Bank for World Investment in Iran (YESBA), which is based in London. These are the banks that participated in its founding: Bank of America, Bank of Tokyo, the German Central Bank, the Japan Industrial Bank, Midland Bank, the Société Général de Paris, the

BPDMI.<sup>2</sup> This bank's mission consists of granting short- and long-term credits to industrialists wanting to invest in Iran and of orienting the investments toward key sectors of the economy producing for the internal and regional markets.

The latest creation of this type is the Shahriar Bank, which was just founded with a capital of 5 thousand million rials.<sup>3</sup>

With the aid of the above-mentioned institutions, world imperialism is consolidating its hold on the Iranian economy, and through it on the Middle East market.

### Where Does Imperialism Invest?

Since the 1953 coup d'etat, and especially since 1959, foreign investments have turned more and more to manufacturing sectors that produce for the internal, and even regional, market.<sup>4</sup> In fact, the sectors that have "profited" from foreign investments since 1959 have been essentially industries necessitating a large capital investment, industries with a high productivity like chemicals, pharmaceuticals, assembly plants, mining, and rubber. The table below shows the development of foreign investments in strongly capitalist sectors.

#### Investments in Machine and Equipment Industry (at current prices in millions of rials)

Year	Capital Imported	Internal Capital
1963	4,417	119
1964	5,966	203
1965	10,665	465
1966	13,433	511
1967	19,176	562
1968	24,712	641

Source: Bank Markazi Iran, Annual Report, 1969.

Now, looking at the second table, one sees that the investments tend to flow ever more strongly toward sectors producing for the internal market and for the whole Middle East: rubber, pharmaceuticals, etc.

#### Foreign Private Investment in Iran by Type of Activity, 1965-1968 (investments directed by the Center for Attraction and Protection of Foreign Investments, in millions of rials)

Rubber	1,204
Pharmaceuticals	756
Mines	692
Metals	317
Electricity	285
Oil Refining	165
Transport Equipment	157
Petrochemicals	156
Construction	114
Foodstuffs	78

Source: Same as Table 1.

Finally, imperialist capital directs itself toward areas in which national investors invest the least. The third table shows that national investments flow rather toward construction.

#### Share of Imported Capital in Domestic Investment (in millions of rials)

##### Public and Private Investment in Machinery:

	1959	1968
Total	23	39.5
Imported	22	30.1
Internal	1	9.4

##### Public and Private Investment in Construction:

	1959	1968
Total	26.6	81.6
Imported	—	11.4
Internal	—	70.4

Source: Same as Table 1.

Consequently, foreign investment flows toward the machine sector, for there "national investors" have penetrated only marginally. The results of this new tendency are on the one hand that production is growing in industries requiring heavy investments in capital (technologically advanced sectors)<sup>5</sup> and on the other hand, as the fourth table illustrates, that a decline is developing in employment in the agricultural sector (due to the effects of industrialization on part of agriculture, accelerated pauperization of the poor peasants who are leaving the countryside, etc.), and this is creating unemployment among the peasants, who cannot be absorbed because of insufficient industrial employment.<sup>6</sup>

#### Percentage of Agricultural and Industrial Workers Among the Active Population

Year	Agricultural Workers	Industrial Workers
1906	90%	—
1926	85%	1%
1946	75%	2%
1956	56%	2%
1966	46%	3%

Source: Same as Table 1.

### Send the Profits Home!

The profits reaped by foreign firms set up in Iran are

4. As opposed to English capital before 1953, which was invested primarily in oil.

5. Between 1962 and 1970, production in automobile assembly went from 1.5 million to 30 million metric tons; production of cement went from 53 million metric tons in 1953 to 2,577 million metric tons in 1970.

6. Most of the unemployed are directed toward unproductive sectors, which are being increasingly swelled; in Teheran it is shocking to see the growing number of people selling lottery tickets or watching over automobiles.

2. *Keyhan* magazine, October 19, 1972; *Talash Revue*, March, 1973.

3. *Teheran* magazine, January 23, 1973.



growing without end. (The rate of profit stands at about 25 or 30 percent.) *The tendency to repatriate these profits has been growing since 1960.* As P. Salama remarked, "profits that are sent back home flow into productive activities based in other parts of the world." The fifth table shows the increase in profits repatriated (based solely on official reports of the "center for the attraction and protection of foreign investment in Iran").

**Flow of Foreign Investments** (includes those investments managed by the Center for Attraction and Protection of Foreign Investment in Iran for the years 1956-1968, in millions of rials)

Year	Outflow	Reinvested in Iran
1956	31	0
1957	63	0
1958	25	1
1959	135	0
1960	138	0
1961	198	5
1962	396	15
1963	193	144
1964	253	90
1965	808	451
1966	958	265
1967	668	153
1968	1583	586

Source: Same as Table 1.

## Sharing Out the Market

Up until the 1953 coup d'etat, the majority of capital investments in Iran came from Britain; British imperialism dominated the Iranian economy. Since then, American capital has penetrated more and more. Nevertheless, the share held by German, Japanese, French, and British capital is far from negligible. The sixth table shows the share held by each country (over the period 1963-67) in the total private investment in Iran.

### Division of Investments

Country	In percent	In millions of rials
USA	54	1,609
Germany	8	230
Great Britain	7	196
France	6	173
Holland	6	168
Belgium	6	160
Switzerland	5	135
Mixed	4	124
Other	5	176
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2,971</b>

Source: Central Bank of Iran, Annual Report and Balance Sheet, 1968.

Now, since 1967 investments have grown enormously. Other countries, like Japan, joined in. Briefly, the development of participation by various countries since 1970 went like this:

In January 1972 a conference on American investments in Iran was opened in New York by Spiro Agnew. During this conference, American capitalists agreed to invest \$543 million in Iran. Union Carbide invested in chemicals, American Metal Climax in the mining industry, Goodyear in rubber. As far as agribusiness investment is concerned, in 1971 Shell acquired a 15,000-hectare area in the Khoisistan region. In 1972 American capital was also invested in construction (of big hotels). Finally, the Cabot Corporation's contribution to the construction of a carbon factory ran to \$10 million.

On October 15, 1972, a delegation of German capitalists arrived in Teheran. Among the "guests" were a representative of the Association of German Industrialists, the president of the administrative council of Weba, a member of the administrative council of Siemens, the director of the Benz factories, and finally, a member of the administrative council of the Deutsche Bank. By the beginning of 1972 capital invested in Iran by German capitalists had risen to 98 million marks, which represents 15 percent of German investments in Asia.

As for investment in agriculture, the agribusiness Basic works an area of 2,500 hectares in Ahvaz. One should also note the construction of an aluminum factory in Arak by the Basicodre company, the setting up of a Benz factory in Tabriz, the participation of German capital in the construction of the Berlin-Iran Chemical Company, etc. It is interesting to note that during the October 1972 Iranian-German negotiations it was proposed to the German investors that they produce commodities in Iran (at a low cost) for sale on the world market. These German investors declared that they would invest \$240 million in the Iranian five-year plan.<sup>9</sup>

After their arrival in Teheran in November 1972, representatives of British capitalists (four members of the Confederation of British Industrialists) affirmed their intention of sinking big investments into heavy industry in Iran. In another connection, in November 1972 a consortium of English, French, and Belgian investors was set up with a view toward investing \$300 million in the construction sector.

The first conference of Iranian-Japanese investors, at which a large number of Japanese capitalists gathered, was held in Teheran August 25-29, 1972. During this conference, it was decided to invest in petrochemicals, textiles, heavy industry, electricity, tire manufacture, naval construction, etc. The goal of future investments would be as high as \$1.5 thousand million. Further, since 1971, Japanese capitalists have been participating in exploitation of the iron mines of Gol Gohar and Sangzagh in Kerman. They have also participated since 1971 in exploitation of the copper mines at Ghelen Zari (a \$6 million share).

Japanese capital is especially active in the tire industry. In fact, the Japanese expect to monopolize tire supplies in the Middle East and export the products to Yugoslavia, Holland, South Africa, and Greece. Toward this end, the Japanese company Bridgestone is in the process of building a big tire factory that will cost 1 thousand million rials.

## Protecting Imperialist Capital

In an interview granted the TLM on June 25, 1972,

*Intercontinental Press*

the shah of Iran declared: "In the West, one can insult a chief of state without incurring any great punishment. . . . But in the East, it is different. A single spark can trigger off a powder keg. This must be prevented. . . . Faithful to our international commitments for a good thirty years, we will remain oriented toward the free world. That is what I just told President Nixon. . . . We are the first power in this zone and we intend to remain so. The West can only help us in this, even if it does not make our Arab neighbors happy."

In reality, in order to make imperialist investments as profitable as possible, in order to make sure that Iranian oil and labor power remain at the service of imperialism, it is necessary for the Iranian bourgeoisie to maintain "order" and stability not only in Iran, but throughout the Persian Gulf as well. To fulfill this mission, the Iranian regime needs more and more aid—political, financial, and military—from American imperialism and its European allies.

The nomination of Richard Helms, former director of

the CIA, to be U.S. ambassador to Teheran; the holding in Teheran (April 23-25, 1973) of the conference of U.S. ambassadors and chiefs of diplomatic missions in the Asian countries; the furnishing of modern arms to the Iranian army<sup>7</sup>—all these facts clearly reveal the intention of the United States: to make Iran the base of intervention against all revolutionary movements in the Middle East.

In this context, the task of Iranian revolutionists, after the many lessons of the struggles of 1963 and 1970-71, is to define more clearly a revolutionary strategy and to forge the instrument necessary for the development of the anti-imperialist struggle and the socialist revolution in Iran. □

7. The March 13, 1973, *Le Monde* reported that according to the arms deal arrived at with the United States, Iran would pay for military material valued at 12 thousand million francs. Apart from the delivery of the most modern weapons, the contract also involved "furnishing" Iran with 300 American advisers for training the Iranian army.

## As Titoites Turn Away From 'Decentralization'

# Repression Stepped Up in Yugoslavia

By C. Verla

[The following article appeared in the June 8 issue of *Rouge*, weekly newspaper of the Ligue Communiste, French section of the Fourth International. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

\* \* \*

The May 31 *Le Monde* reported the opening of a trial against another Yugoslav communist, Danilo Udovichi, who is accused of "having ties with the Fourth International." Based on earlier trials on the same charge—the proceedings a year ago against Milan Nikolic, Pavel Imsirovic, and Jelka Klajcic, for example—it can be assumed that behind the formal charge there lies but one reality: the accused is a communist who opposes the regime.

All the trials that have come down during the past two years, whether they be around charges of Trotskyism, anarcho-liberalism, pro-Westism, or nationalism, have been marked by the same neo-Stalinist features: amalgams are made by the prosecution; there is no real possibility for defense;

there is imprisonment without trial.

This massive repression (there have been dozens of trials) has occurred as part of a political turn in Yugoslavia. The turn is the bureaucratic response of a section of the Yugoslav leadership around Tito to the social tensions that their own policies have produced. And the aim of the turn is to take the League of Communists of Yugoslavia in hand in order to make it play a role that it has gradually abdicated since the break with Stalin in the early 1950s: the role of bureaucratic centralizer of all social, political, economic, and cultural life.

This was the orientation laid down in the "Tito letter" at the end of 1972 that was sent to the rank-and-file organs of the party and was combined with a call to the laboring masses to bring under control and denounce the "corrupt billionaires." This was followed by a small-scale "cultural revolution" (that's what the May issue of the French business magazine *l'Expansion* called it), in the course of which dozens and dozens of cases of corruption piled up in the courts, a fair number of factory managers

were deposed (in Zagreb there are about thirty factories that still have no managers), and many small-time operators shut down their operations throughout the country—they could make more money in the West.

Despite official proclamations to the contrary, this new policy represents a counterblow to the previous decentralization and is in contradiction with the measures for protection of private property that were part of the logic of the 1965 reform. This new policy goes hand in hand with a return to criticizing all theories about the withering away of the state (Kardelj's self-criticism, general critiques of Djilas, the scapegoat for all deviations) that were put forward when decentralized self-management was first instituted after the break with Stalin.

But the "dictatorship of the proletariat" that the Titoists want to revive is conditioned by the history of Yugoslavia. It will be a pervasive bureaucratic dictatorship that will try to make it look as though the workers are being given a bigger role in the organs of decentralized power (at least at first), while at the same time,

the League of Communists will again become the monolithic transmission belt of real power.

It is for this very reason that the main repression of various opponents of this line is going on among communists. The main leaders of the Slovenian, Serbian, and Macedonian parties, who are hostile to the centralization line, have gotten the ax, as did the Croatian leaders during the December 1971 purge. The "Tito letter" unleashing the hardening up was issued and publicized in the name of



TITO: Reacts to the problems his own policies created.

the Supreme Presidium, even though the advocates of a liberal policy were still in a majority there. But the letter was not ratified by this body until after the major opponents were purged.

At the same time, there was the ascendancy of the "veterans," old-line centralist Communists, especially officers in the army (which had remained strongly centralized).

The ideological repression has been exacting. The magazine *Praxis* has just had its subsidies lifted. Its main contributors, among them L. Tadic and S. Stoyanovic, Communist members of the faculty at the University of Belgrade, have been repressed. As if by accident, at the same time, journalists who previously had been promoted to their posts for their anti-Soviet positions (like Marovic, Moscow correspondent for *Politika*), have today been demoted—for the same reason. Soviet aid, also as if by ac-

cident, suddenly dropped by millions of dollars worth of equipment.

Formally, none of the main orientations adopted in the 1965 reform have been challenged. And the Yugoslav leaders will continue to balance the aid received from the East with aid from the West in order to keep up a certain diplomatic balance. But the ideological concessions already made to the Soviet Union (in particular, the silencing of any criticism of the occupation of Czechoslovakia,

which, it has been officially declared, raises no problems) are the inevitable corollary of the bureaucratic impasse. Police repression is an expression of this. But it will resolve nothing.

We add our name to the appeal for international socialist solidarity that is now circulating against the repression that is hitting Yugoslav communists.

Long live socialist Yugoslavia!  
Free the imprisoned Yugoslav communists!

## Dispute Over Nationalization

### Wilson Challenges Labour Executive

London

"Mr. Harold Wilson yesterday served notice that he did not intend to lead the Labour Party into the next election with a commitment to nationalise 25 of Britain's largest companies hanging round its neck," wrote Manchester *Guardian* political staff writer David McKie on June 1.

Two days earlier, on May 30, the twenty-nine-member National Executive Committee (NEC) had approved by seven votes to six a commitment not only to nationalise twenty-five of Britain's largest companies, but also to create a National Enterprise Board with far-reaching powers of intervention and acquisition in private industry.

The small vote was due to the fact that thirteen of the NEC members either did not attend or drifted out during the debate. Three members abstained, including Wilson, who as party leader apparently always abstains in NEC debates.

The proposal to nationalise the twenty-five companies will now be part of a policy document to be published and debated at the next annual conference in October. If it is approved by two-thirds of those voting at the party conference, those responsible for drafting the next election manifesto will be hard put to justify its exclusion.

According to Michael Hatfield's report to the London *Times* on May 31, during the debate Wilson twice told the NEC that the party's manifesto committee, when it eventually meets,

has the right to veto the NEC's decision.

On the day after the NEC's decision, Wilson issued a public statement making it clear that as far as he was concerned the shadow cabinet would not be dictated to by the NEC, or by the party conference for that matter, when it came to drawing up a general election manifesto. The way the statement was received gives an indication of the divisions that could manifest themselves at the party conference.

According to the June 1 *Times*, Renée Short, a member of the NEC who was absent during the vote, accused the party leader of attempting "to preempt Labour conference decisions on policy documents in an unseemly manner.

"The whole Labour and trade union movement," she said, "is painfully aware of the stark fact that the policies of the right wing have been tried and found wanting every time we have a Labour Government."

The shadow chancellor, Denis Healey, who voted against the proposal, felt obliged to cover up the rift when speaking in York June 2. In a speech "aimed at setting the record straight," Healey blamed the hostile press for suggesting a major party split and said the disagreement over the twenty-five companies was not about nationalisation in principle or in practice.

"Healey's speech," wrote Ivan Yates in the *Observer* on June 3, "is a skillful attempt to take the heat out of Labour's still-burning dispute. But the



price he has paid is the need to reassure the left wing of the party by re-emphasising all the opportunities for further nationalisation contained in the policy document—apart from the proposed '25.'

The same day that Healey was attempting to soothe the wounds, the shadow secretary for education, Roy Hattersley, was tactfully advised by Transport House, the Labour party headquarters, that he should not deliver a pro-Wilson speech at a party meeting in Durham. According to a report by James Margach in the June 3 London *Sunday Times*, "The draft of the speech was . . . referred to Ron Hayward, general secretary of the party, who decided that it should not be circulated to the media by the Transport House machine."

The wide press coverage of this incident stimulated Hattersley—with the cooperation of the party general secretary—to deliver his speech against nationalising the twenty-five companies in a Sunday meeting in Cramlington.

Perhaps the most telling comment came from Lord George-Brown, former deputy leader of the Labour party, who could not understand why Wilson had issued the statement.

"All he had to do yesterday, really," said George-Brown, according to the June 1 *Times*, "was to rally the colleagues, say he was going to vote against it, and to vote against it."

This suggests that the rift is perhaps deeper than it appears. Certainly Wilson's difficulty now, which he undoubtedly was conscious of, is that he has reawakened the important argument about who should run the Labour party—conference or the parliamentary leadership.

In his challenge to the authority of the conference, Wilson is claiming that the manifesto committee, which is composed of the shadow cabinet and the NEC, has a veto over what goes into the election manifesto. Supporters of this veto "right"—the party right wing and the bourgeois press—base their argument on an ambiguity in the party constitution, which gives the conference control over the programme but does not mention the election manifesto.

The constitutional ambiguity, however, merely reflects the tension inherent in the Labour party because of its working-class base and its bourgeois programme. After electoral de-

feats, and more especially in periods of radicalisation, this underlying conflict tends to become manifest. In its June 1 editorial, the *Times*, which reflects the interests of the British ruling class, underlined the inherent source of conflict inside the Labour party:

"The Labour Party, unlike the two other parties now represented in Parliament, was created after the formation in Britain of mass political organizations including trade unions. The



WILSON: Doesn't want commitment to nationalization.

mass party was not organized as an electoral adjunct to a parliamentary interest. On the contrary a parliamentary organization was formed to advance interests that were already organized outside Parliament. This gave the extra-parliamentary organization a sense of sovereignty; and that was embodied, along with various fruitful ambiguities, in the party constitution."

Over the years, this conflict between the party's base and its parliamentary adjunct has frequently asserted itself, albeit distortedly, in internal power struggles. The immediate source of the current dissension is not difficult to locate. "The present struggle," notes even the *Times* editorial, "the usual amalgam of personal ambition and political conviction, goes back to the disillusionment of politically active

trade unionists and constituency members with the Wilson administration in its later years."

Wilson's response would be inexplicable if he did not feel a potential challenge to his conservative leadership. But he must also have sensed that he was not at this stage seriously threatened by the party's "left wing."

This so-called left wing restricts its "challenge" to maneuvers within the party's upper echelons. Some left-wingers, such as Anthony Wedgewood Benn, held major offices in the last Labour government and themselves bear responsibility for the Tory victory in the 1970 general election. Their own interests are thus more closely aligned with the party's electoral course than with the real needs of the working class.

Even the proposal to nationalise twenty-five large companies frightened Michael Foot, the most outspoken Labour "left winger." Foot argued against specifying the number of companies, apparently believing it would be exploited by the Tories and be detrimental to Labour's electoral chances.

And to be sure, by the time of the Labour party's conference in October, expert devisers of formulas will be at work. Among them probably will be Judith Hart, the NEC member and former minister who with Wedgewood Benn has been the "champion" of the "twenty-five" proposal. Wedgewood Benn, the former party chairman and minister of technology in the last Labour government, said in a television programme on June 3 that his "left wingers," in the twenty-five companies proposal, were really looking ahead over ten to fifteen years.

Clearly, what motivates the "left wing" as well as the rest of the Labour leadership is a keen sense of what is the least risky road to winning the next general election. Wilson, still the best defender of the party leadership's narrow interests, understood this point, and it is this that prompted his statement asserting that the shadow cabinet would not be bound by the NEC decision. □

#### Corruption Cure

John Diefenbaker, former Canadian prime minister, says a Watergate-type scandal couldn't happen there because the head of state, the queen, isn't elected. We thought that was what Nixon was aiming for in the U.S.

## Maoists Revive 'Great Conspiracy'

By Gerry Foley

One of the results of renewed efforts to popularize "Mao Tsetung thought" has been the reappearance of references to the "Trotskyite plot" fabrications of the Moscow Trials, which had been largely dropped or drastically remodeled by the pro-Kremlin Communist parties in the aftermath of Khrushchev's 1956 secret speech admitting Stalin's role in the frame-ups.

In particular, *The Great Conspiracy*, a sort of "spy story for progressives" by Michael Sayers and Albert E. Kahn, has enjoyed a certain new vogue among the Scandinavian Maoists at least, and in the last months it has been pushed by an Irish Maoist sect, the Communist party of Ireland (ML). The odyssey of this Stalinist muck is not without its interest and its lessons.

There was little in the style or content of *The Great Conspiracy* to distinguish it from innumerable Stalinist falsifications and slanders in the period of the Moscow Trials. This passage commenting on Yagoda's "confession," for example, is representative:

"But the murder of Kirov was only one of a number of murders carried out by the Bloc of Rights and Trotskyites with the direct aid of Henry Yagoda [Stalin's chief of the secret police during the first phase of the Moscow trials and later himself a victim]. . . .

"Behind his quiet, efficient exterior, Yagoda concealed an inordinate ambition, ferocity and cunning. With the secret operations of the Bloc of Rights and Trotskyites depending more and more on his protection, the Vice-Chairman of the OGPU [Ob'edinennoe Gosudarstvennoe Politicheskoe Upravlenie pri Sovete Narodnykh Komissarov SSSR—United Political Bureau under the authority of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR] began to conceive of himself as the central figure and dominating personality of the entire conspiracy.

"Yagoda had his own ideas about

the kind of government which would be set up after Stalin was overthrown. It would be modeled on that of Nazi Germany, he told Bulanov. Yagoda himself would be the leader; the 'philosopher' Bukharin, as Yagoda put it, would be 'Dr. Goebbels.'"

The "confessions" made by prominent victims of the great Stalin terror trials are quoted as gospel truth by the authors. For instance, they feature passages cooked up by the secret political police for Pyatakov to make in court:

"Yes I was a Trotskyite for many years! I worked hand in hand with the Trotskyites. . . . Do not think, Citizen Judges . . . that during these years spent in the suffocating underworld of Trotskyism, I did not see what was happening in the country! Do not think that I did not understand what was being done in industry. I tell you frankly: at times, when emerging from the Trotskyite underworld and engaging in my other practical work, I sometimes felt a kind of relief, and of course, humanly speaking, this duality was not only a matter of outward behavior, but there was also a duality within me. . . . In a few hours you will pass your sentence. . . . Do not deprive me of one thing, Citizen Judges. Do not deprive me of the right to feel that in your eyes, too, I have found strength in myself, albeit too late, to break with my criminal past!"

This passage is cited by Kahn and Sayers to show how stubbornly the defendants pleaded their cases.

Pyatakov was shot. But his testimony served to prove that he had been framed. The most glaring discrepancy was his "confessed" flight to Norway for a discussion with Trotsky, a key element in the OGPU script on Pyatakov's position in the "Trotskyite-Zinovievite conspiracy."

It was proved by the Dewey Commission, which investigated the Moscow Trials, that the flight did not occur. Pyatakov claimed that he flew

to Norway in a German plane in December 1935. The official in charge of the Oslo airport declared that no foreign plane whatsoever had landed there in December. Moreover, the regular military patrols reported no evidence of any unauthorized landings, traces of which would have been clearly visible in the snow.

Nor could a plane have reached the place where Trotsky was staying, as his host, Konrad Knudsen, a member of the Norwegian Labor party, explained:

"Oiangen is situated in the middle of a thick forest. At that time there was one meter of snow on Oiangen; I am not an expert on flying, but this much I know, that it would be impossible to land an airplane without skis and no airplane which came from Berlin would have skis. . . . An automobile was waiting, said Pyatakov. It is, however, an absolute impossibility for an automobile to reach Oiangen in snow one meter deep. The roads are not open in the winter. When in addition we know that the cabin is near Oiangen—about ten minutes' walk—how can it then be explained that he drove half an hour before he reached the place? . . . Pyatakov did not remember much in court, but if he had landed on Oiangen in one meter of snow and had had to get through the snowdrifts in an automobile, he would have remembered that. . . ."

In one respect, *The Great Conspiracy* does stand out in the mass of propaganda produced at the apogee of Stalin's career. The classical Stalinist propaganda lies originated in the

\**Not Guilty: Report of the 1938 Commission of Inquiry into the Charges Made Against Leon Trotsky in the Moscow Trials*, 2nd ed. (New York: Monad Press, 1972), p. 187. This new edition (hardbound; 422 pp.) is distributed by Pathfinder Press, 410 West St., New York, N. Y. 10014, and 47 The Cut, London SE1 8LL. Price \$10 or 4.15 pounds.



period of bureaucratic consolidation, when the last remnants of the Bolshevik party that made the revolution were liquidated, including every member of Lenin's Central Committee except Stalin.

This book — written during the wartime alliance between the Soviet Union and the Western "democracies," an era of "peaceful coexistence" that the Kremlin hoped would be permanent — makes the counterrevolutionary purpose of these concoctions exceptionally clear.

On the jacket of the mass-circulation paperback edition of *The Great Conspiracy* printed in 1946 is an endorsement by Henry A. Wallace, vice-president under Roosevelt from 1940 to 1944, and secretary of commerce until 1946, when he was fired by Truman. This prominent liberal capitalist politician, who returned to anti-Communism after a brief period as the head of a "peace" ticket backed by the American Communist party, is quoted as saying: "Everyone who is interested in the present and future welfare of the world should read *The Great Conspiracy*."

The flyleaf contains an endorsement by the liberal senator from Florida, Claude Pepper: "I do not know of a greater contribution which has been made to world peace through better international understanding of Russia, her present as influenced by her past, than Albert E. Kahn and Michael Sayers have made through their great book, *The Great Conspiracy* . . ."

"A continuation of the disastrous policies of anti-Soviet intrigue so vividly described in this book would inevitably result in a third world war. That is why this book should be read and studied by all those eager to see peace durably established in the world."

It is not surprising that antisocialist liberals saw much to praise in *The Great Conspiracy*. They had no interest in the fate and much less the honor of Lenin's companions, who had devoted their lives to fighting for what these liberal philistines considered a "utopia" or worse. And Sayers and Kahn's picture of Stalin's policy could not help but look attractive:

"On April 9, 1947, Harold E. Stassen, Republican presidential candidate, met with Premier Joseph Stalin at the Kremlin in Moscow. Stassen asked the question which was upper-

most in the minds of the American people. 'I would be interested to know,' he said, 'if you think these two economic systems can exist together in the same modern world in harmony with each other?' 'Of course, they can,' replied Stalin. 'If during the war they could cooperate, why can't they during the peace?' . . .

"The Soviet leader added:

"'Let us not criticize mutually our systems. Everyone has the right to follow the system he wants to maintain. . . .'

"'Sitting there looking at Stalin,' subsequently related Jay Cooke, banker and former Philadelphia Republican chairman, who accompanied Stassen on his trip to Europe, 'I thought to myself, "Can this be the man who has been called ogre and menace to the world?" It was difficult to imagine him as such.'"

Another "liberal" capitalist Sayers and Kahn call on for a testimonial is Colonel Raymond Robins, who was attached to the American embassy in Russia at the time of the October Revolution and actively opposed the Bolsheviks' rise to power. In his later years, however, the colonel found the Stalin regime more congenial than he had the revolutionary government of Lenin and Trotsky. Stalin's policy of coexistence with capitalism apparently soothed the bitterness of the old defeat. "The Russian people have always wanted peace. Education, production, exploitation of a vast and rich territory engage all their thoughts and energies and hopes."

In any case, whereas Robins saw only cause for fear in the revolutionary government of October, he was inclined to view the Stalin dictatorship through rose-colored glasses. The authors conclude their book with a quotation from Robins: "Stalin's policies have wiped out racial, religious, national and class antagonisms within the Soviet territories."

When the fundamental antagonism between the capitalist and postcapitalist world inevitably reappeared in the Cold War, the capitalists found it convenient for their own purposes to recall the mass butchery of the Stalinist regime, its all-pervasive atmosphere of Byzantine servility and terror, and its lying propaganda cut to suit the passing needs of the top circles of the bureaucratic caste. They found no difficulty in forgetting that

they themselves, in many cases, had applauded Stalin when he liquidated the institutions, the leaders, and the heritage of the revolution.

The willingness of the capitalists to prettify a Stalinist dictatorship when it suits their purposes has been shown again by the shift in the attitude toward China after Nixon's visit. The horror stories that were the standard fare in the capitalist media in the period of the "cultural revolution" have been replaced by sugarcoated travelogues and reports that evoke a kind of Spartan Shangri-la.

The capitalist attitudes toward the bureaucratized workers states are in fact contradictory. On the one hand, the ruling caste shares many of their values, including opposition to any new revolutions. On the other, it administers a state based on the destruction of capitalism and the establishment of a planned economy.

These contradictions can lead to confusion in the minds of those unacquainted with the facts. The most bizarre result of this confusion is probably the cult of Stalin among young rebels critical of the Kremlin. There has been a tendency for soured New Left utopians to turn to Stalin as the symbol of the "practical revolutionary," to regard the counterrevolutionary hangman as a "tough-minded" revolutionist. Thus, after a first flush of anarchist idealism, the student movement in Germany broke up into a variety of Mao-Stalin sects, and Peking Stalinism became largely dominant in Scandinavia.

The Mao-Stalinism of these young rebels has a source different from that of the models it has appropriated. The Stalin cult and the anti-Trotskyist slanders were originally designed to brainwash a generation directly influenced by the Russian revolution, to convince it that what it had regarded as red was really white, and vice versa. This was the period when the materialistic rationalism of the Bolsheviks was turned into metaphysical obscurantism.

It is apparently the by-products and trappings of this big-lie campaign that attract some romantic young rebels today — the feeling of dogmatic conviction that bureaucratic propaganda instilled into the ranks of the Stalinized Communist parties, the impressive image of tens of thousands of deluded or regimented workers march-



ing in tight ranks carrying the picture of the "great leader."

It has been a common phenomenon, for example, to see Catholic groups that are moving to the left find a comfortably airtight new home under the Mao-Stalinist roof. A case in point is the *Acção Popular* in Brazil. This group, which was opposed to adventurist guerrillaism for a period, developed quite naturally from social Catholicism through populism to come to rest in Maoism.

As a result of this naive dogmatism, it has become common to see young Maoist groups dredge up and parade all the old Stalinist slanders of Trotsky and his ideas. The pro-Moscow parties, in contrast, are now quite wary about repeating these slanders — one reason being that when Khrushchev admitted in his 1956 speech many facts about the Stalin terror that had been denounced up till then as "fabrications of the Trotskyite Fifth Column," the ranks of the Communist parties were deeply shaken. Stalin, then, had been guilty of organizing frame-ups! This knowledge destroyed the cult of Stalin. The worst slanders went down the drain, too.

For the Mao-Stalinists, the reaction among the ranks of the pro-Moscow parties is no problem. They say that Khrushchev's speech marked the completion of a counterrevolution that turned the Soviet Union into a "capitalist" or even a "fascist" country. To them Stalin stood for socialism. And so did the cult of Stalin. This has blocked them from gaining any substantial influence among the ranks of the pro-Moscow parties, but they have been indifferent to this.

The latest country where *The Great Conspiracy* has been revived is Ireland. It is being used as a prime morsel by the Communist party of Ireland (Marxist-Leninist). Although none of the orthodox Maoist sects has succeeded in winning much influence in Ireland, the influence of Maoism is rather widespread in both the Official and Provisional republican organizations.

Stalin's "tough" image seems to have a peculiar attraction in Ireland. Historically, an essentially moral criterion, acceptance of the use of force, has set off the more radical wing in the Irish nationalist movement. Thus, to some the gravedigger of the Russian revolution seems to be a prominent



The New York Daily News, August 22, 1940.

advocate of "physical force."

The Maoists' forthright glorification of Stalin the butcher is morally more appealing than some other methods used to try to put across basic Stalinist ideas in the republican movement. There is something peculiarly repulsive, for example, about the cryptic little sentence in an Official republican education bulletin, appropriately entitled "Ways and Means," that says simply that the Trotskyists were "politically defeated" in the USSR. It skips over the fact that 50,000 "Trotskyists" were liquidated in death camps and untold tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, more were sent to concentration camps on the accusation of being "Trotskyist." This anonymous "educator" not only slandered the Bolshevik party that was physically destroyed by Stalin; he slandered the republican movement itself, whose forebearers were "politically defeated" by the Free State counter-revolutionists in much the same way the Trotskyists were defeated by the bureaucratic machine of Stalin.

But the Irish Maoists and the "physical force" nationalists they influence do not seem to see that if Stalin was "tough" in dealing with anyone who showed a spark of revolutionary integrity (among other things, he carefully liquidated CP members who volunteered to fight in Spain), this was only to prepare the way for conciliation with world capitalism.

This fact, of course, has been obscured by the Cold War propaganda that took advantage of the crimes of the dictator to depict them as the inevitable "evils of Communism." So, it seems useful to make available the answer of the American Trotskyists to *The Great Conspiracy* when it first appeared, in the last year of the wartime alliance between Moscow and Washington. The book was discussed in two articles in the August 31 and September 7, 1946, issues of *The Militant*, the weekly newspaper reflecting the views of the Socialist Workers party. They originally appeared as installments in a fourteen-part series on the Moscow Trials.

## Stalinist 'Protocols of Zion'

## 'Great Conspiracy' of Sayers and Kahn

By Joseph Hansen

[As Gerry Foley explains in his article above, the Maoists in Scandinavia and Ireland have recently revived *The Great Conspiracy*, a book of 160 pages by Michael Sayers and Albert E. Kahn that was first printed in the United States in February 1946.

[The immediate purpose of the book, as noted in the review reprinted below, was to divert attention from the fact that in the 1945-46 Nuremberg trial of the Nazi war criminals not a single shred of evidence was adduced to show that they had plotted against the Soviet Union in collusion with the defendants in the Moscow Trials as charged by Stalin. In fact this topic was not referred to by a single word at the Nuremberg trial.

[Natalia Trotsky and a number of prominent figures demanded that the Nazi war criminals be questioned on this and that the archives of the German government be searched for material relating to the Moscow Trials. The prosecution refused to respond — no doubt to safeguard the Kremlin from embarrassment.

[*The Great Conspiracy* was translated by Stalin's propaganda machine into dozens of languages and circulated in millions of copies at give-

away prices (as low as \$.25 in the United States).

[Along with what was claimed to be the verbatim court proceedings on the chief frame-up trials, *The Great Conspiracy* remained a featured item in Stalinist bookstores for ten years. Then it suddenly vanished. Khrushchev's speech in 1956, admitting some of Stalin's crimes, destroyed the cult of the dictator and along with it the concoctions of the OGPU, which Sayers and Kahn had sought to popularize.

[Another irreparable blow was dealt *The Great Conspiracy* when Jacson, the murderer of Leon Trotsky, was released from prison. Sayers and Kahn had pictured him as a member of the Trotskyist movement who had become "disillusioned" with Trotsky. Among other things, Jacson claimed that Trotsky had asked him to hijack the China Clipper, fly it solo to the Soviet Union, and commit "sabotage." Because of his "disillusionment," Jacson said, he decided to kill Trotsky.

[But Jacson was not handled like an ordinary murderer. When he had almost completed his prison term, he was turned over to the Czechoslovak government. Czechoslovak officials met him at the prison gates May 6, 1960, handed him a new passport, and accompanied him by plane via Havana to Prague. In short, Jacson received the special treatment due an OGPU agent who had successfully completed his mission of assassinating Lenin's comrade-in-arms. In the world of Stalinism he ranked as high as, if not higher than, Sayers and Kahn.

[Today an effort to revive *The Great Conspiracy* amounts to a curiosity comparable to the effort in certain ultrareactionary circles to keep alive *The Protocols of Zion*.

[The review of *The Great Conspiracy* reprinted below appeared originally in two installments in the August 31 and September 7, 1946, issues of *The Militant*.]

\* \* \*

The Kremlin undoubtedly hopes that the recently published book, *The Great Conspiracy*, will divert the attention of rank and file Stalinists from the failure to bring up the Moscow Trials at Nuremberg.

But unfortunately for the Kremlin frame-up machine, this book only succeeds in further exposing the falsity

of the Moscow Trials. To unravel all the lies and distortions of the authors, Sayers and Kahn, would require a shelf of books the size of the Encyclopedia Britannica. However, consideration of a few paragraphs in the first chapter will show precisely how the Stalinist lie machine operated in composing this latest piece of Kremlin propaganda.

### Lie Machine

The lie machine opens its "colorful tale" by introducing Raymond Robins, whom they make out to be a kind of Ambassador Joseph E. Davies in the days of the Bolshevik revolution. This man with an "outdoor mind" and a "passionate concern for the welfare of the common man" sees facts straight even if he does favor capitalist exploitation over the Soviet system. And so begins the "carefully documented evidence" with which the lie machine constructed the book.

Immediately after the Bolsheviks took power, declare Sayers and Kahn, "Robins wasted no time. He drove out to Smolny and asked to see Lenin." Get that! — *Lenin*.

"I was for Kerensky," said Robins frankly, 'but I know a corpse when I see one and I regard the Provisional Government as dead. I want to know whether the American Red Cross can serve the Russian people without injury to our national interests. I am against your domestic program, but it is none of my business what happens in domestic Russia. If Kornilov, or the Czar or anyone else had the power I would be talking to him!'"

Now here is how it was told in *Raymond Robins' Own Story*, as printed in 1920: "Robins went to see Trotsky shortly after the Bolshevik revolution had put Trotsky into office." Get that! — *Trotsky*.

The original source then describes how Robins had been "in support of Kerensky and therefore against the Bolsheviks."

"When Robins came to Trotsky's door, there were soldiers there; and when he got inside, there was a man standing by Trotsky's desk who at once showed much excitement. 'Kerensky-ite,' he cried, pointing to Robins. 'Counter-revolutionary.' He had heard Robins addressing the Russian soldiers against peace and in favor of fighting Germany. 'Counter-revolutionary,'" he continued.

"Robins raised his arm in a gesture he hoped was commanding and calm and said to his interpreter:

"Tell Commissioner Trotsky it is true I did everything I could to help Kerensky and to keep the Commissioner from getting into power.'

"Trotsky frowned.

"But tell the Commissioner,' said Robins, 'that I differ from some of my friends. I know a corpse when I see one, and I think the thing to do with a corpse is to bury it, not to sit up with it. I admit that the Commissioner is in power now.'

"Trotsky looked mollified.

"But tell the Commissioner,' said Robins, 'that if Kornilov or Kaledine or the Czar were sitting in his place, I would be talking to them.'

"Trotsky looked less mollified. Robins hastened to state his whole errand.

"Tell the Commissioner,' he said, 'that I have come to ask him: Can the American Red Cross Mission stay in Russia with benefit to the Russian people and without disadvantage to the Allied cause? If so, it will stay. If not, it will go.'

"Trotsky looked at Robins steadily, and considered."

We have quoted this entire section in order to show how "carefully" Sayers and Kahn have documented *The Great Conspiracy*. All their documentation is of the same lying type. Yet the fly leaf of the book brazenly proclaims: "None of the incidents of dialogue in *The Great Conspiracy* has been invented by the authors!"

Take the very next two paragraphs on the same page 16 of *The Great Conspiracy*:

"Lenin took an immediate liking to the dynamic, outspoken American. He tried to explain to Robins the character of the new regime.

"They say I am a dictator,' Lenin declared. 'I am for the moment. I am a dictator because I have behind me the will of the mass of the peasants and workers. The moment I cease to do their will, they will take the power from me, and I would be as helpless as the Czar.'"

*Raymond Robins' Own Story* gives a different version. There, in a chapter on Lenin, following the exceedingly interesting one on Trotsky, Robins quotes at great length from Lenin on the character of the new regime, how the Soviet system extends democracy into economy and how Communism



must replace capitalism on a world scale.

Did Sayers and Kahn present Lenin as a personal dictator because that would please Stalin more than Lenin's real explanation about the new regime? Are they afraid to print anything that would reveal how far Stalin has gone in betraying Leninism?

Perhaps that is why Sayers and Kahn decided not to print such explanations of Lenin as the following on page 2 of *Raymond Robins' Own Story*: "The flame of the Socialist revolution may die down here. But we will keep it at its height till it spreads to countries more developed. When you see a Council of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies in Berlin, you will know that the proletarian world revolution is born."

Robins' 1920 book tells more about Leon Trotsky than any other Bolshevik except Lenin. This was only natural since Robins acted as an "unofficial" ambassador for the United States, and Trotsky was then head of the Foreign Commissariat of the Soviet Union. Today, however, Sayers and Kahn quote Robins as having had a conversation with Lenin in which the head of the Bolshevik Party "spoke of his and Stalin's plans" in regard to the nationalities in Russia "and told me that Stalin had just been elected Commissar of Nationalities."

### One Catch

There is one little catch. To get Stalin's name even mentioned like this in connection with the Bolshevik revolution, Sayers and Kahn had to get really "careful" with their documentation. A footnote explains that "Robins wrote the authors" of *The Great Conspiracy* on this point in *November 1943!* That is, 23 years after he set down his first impressions of the Bolshevik regime!

Let Sayers and Kahn explain how it happened Robins did not even mention Stalin in his 1920 book, while filling chapter after chapter with the inseparable names of "Lenin and Trotsky!"

Robins' 1943 praise of Stalin should be judged in the light of the following boast he made to the American anti-Bolsheviks of 1920: "I was fighting Socialism before some of you ever thought of it, and I shall be fighting Socialism when some of you have quit."

Thus far we have considered the outright lies and distortions in only five paragraphs and a footnote on two pages of the first chapter of this product of the Kremlin frame-up artists. Imagine the task of similarly exposing all the lies in the entire book!

The jacket claims that *The Great Conspiracy* is "more strange and startling than the most sensational spy fiction." It is indeed "strange and startling."

Some of the most obvious blunders in the Moscow frame-ups are repeated without any change. Other blunders are not to be found even with the most diligent probing into these pages of Kremlin sewage. Pyatakov's airplane, for instance, is still flying in *The Great Conspiracy*. Yet it was *proved* nine years ago that Pyatakov never landed in Oslo in an airplane and consequently *lied* about talking with Trotsky! This airplane crashed through the structure of the frame-up in the Second Moscow Trial while Pyatakov was still on the stand. That didn't stop Stalin from shooting Pyatakov, or Sayers and Kahn from repeating his lie.

*The Great Conspiracy* repeats in the text that "Leon Trotsky, accompanied by his son Sedov, crossed the Franco-Italian border on a false passport and met Krestinsky at the Hotel Bavaria in Merano," Italy. A footnote explains that "Trotsky was then living at St. Palais, a small village at the foot of the Pyrenees in the South of France." Let Sayers and Kahn look at a map. The Pyrenees are on the border of Spain and *not Italy*. Thus at the time of the alleged meeting, Trotsky was some 600 miles away. This blunder of the GPU frame-up machine was called to the attention of the world more than eight years ago!

### Hotel Bristol

*The Great Conspiracy* carefully avoids other blunders of the GPU frame-up machine. We will mention one, probably the most notorious blunder of all in the Moscow Trials, the one about Holtzman meeting Sedov in Copenhagen in the Hotel Bristol years after it was torn down and while Sedov was in another country. This famous incident, one of the main pillars of the Moscow Trials, is not even mentioned by Sayers and Kahn.

Holtzman is not even listed as one of the defendants, although he was shot after making this "confession." The Kremlin's frame-up artists really burned their fingers with the non-existent Hotel Bristol. It seems they decided not to burn their fingers on it again in this book.

All the propaganda about *The Great Conspiracy* peddled by the Stalinist press hammers on the theme of its "careful" documentation. It is not necessary however to wade very far in this reeking Kremlin bilge to see what the highly touted "documentation" is actually worth. Sayers and Kahn bungled the job before they finished the first chapter.

\* \* \*

Joseph E. Davies, wealthy capitalist assigned by the Roosevelt administration as ambassador to Moscow, lauds *The Great Conspiracy* as a "very valuable" book. He endorses it as "exhaustive, authentic and fully documented."

This is the technique used by capitalist advertising agencies in peddling a product: "Chew Barnyard Plug Tobacco. Exhaustive, authentic and fully a mouthload!" Get a public figure to vouch that he knows from personal experience it's really true. The advertising agency operates on the theory that no matter what junk went into the product, you can sell it to a gullible public if you just use the right slogan and get the right endorsement.

### Hailed Frame-Ups

The worth of Davies' endorsement can be judged from the fact that his own book, *Mission to Moscow*, hailed Stalin's frame-up trials and applauded the murder of Lenin's general staff of the socialist revolution. When *Mission to Moscow* was made into a film, a group of liberals headed by the venerable philosopher and educator, John Dewey, protested its lies. The Stalinists tried to brazen it out by defending these lies on the grounds of the "license" generally permitted artists!

*The Great Conspiracy* was composed with the same type of "license." Last week we cited a number of instances where the Kremlin lie machine repeated long-ago exploded lies, the "documentary" source being noth-



ing but the unsupported "confessions" wrung from the victims of the GPU in the Moscow frame-up trials.

The lie machine likewise exposed its hand by conveniently overlooking any exposures of the GPU murder machine. Thus this "exhaustive" work does not tell how the GPU machine-gunned one of its operators, Ignace Reiss, on September 4, 1937. Nor does it tell how he was led into a trap by another GPU agent, Gertrud Schildback. It does not mention that his "crime" was breaking from the Stalinist regime, denouncing the Moscow frame-up trials, and calling on all genuine defenders of the Soviet Union to "save socialism" from the butcher in the Kremlin.

### More Silence

This "exhaustive" work does not describe the mysterious circumstances of Leon Sedov's death. It is silent about the GPU agents who trailed him, rented apartments next to him, and missed assassinating him on at least one occasion solely by accident.

This "exhaustive" work does not recount the kidnapping of Rudolf Klement, secretary of the Fourth International, in 1938. It does not tell how letters forged with Klement's signature were sent to Trotsky—letters modelled on the pattern of the "confessions" in the Moscow frame-up trials. Nor does it tell how Klement's body was found floating in the Seine River, head missing. The GPU does not care for too much publicity on jobs like that.

Likewise strangely missing from this book that pretends to be "exhaustive" is the May 24, 1940, assault on Leon Trotsky and his wife, Natalia. The reason is only too obvious. The machine-gun artists were apprehended by the Mexican police. They proved to be members or sympathizers of the Mexican Communist (Stalinist) Party. The gang of murderers was headed by David Alfaro Siqueiros, who recently applied for admission to the Mexican CP. Siqueiros confessed the assault.

Also missing are the facts about the murder of Robert Sheldon Harte. The Siqueiros gang kidnapped this young American Trotskyist, on guard the night of the May 24 assault, took him up into the mountains, shot him in the head through the temple and

buried him in a shallow grave packed with lime.

### Quote Jacson

*The Great Conspiracy* "overlooks" this job of the GPU, where Stalin's hand was exposed to the light of day, because the authors, Sayers and Kahn, have a "line" on Trotsky's assassination. To talk about the May 24 assault would contradict this "line." The version they present of the murder of Trotsky is the version of the GPU assassin, Jacson.

They quote Jacson with sympathy. They present him in a favorable light. They document their story of Trotsky's assassination with judiciously selected quotations from the murderer.

This is a typical instance of the way Sayers and Kahn set "the record straight."

*The Great Conspiracy* is not a unique book. It falls into the foulest type of propaganda known—the propaganda of a counter-revolution that sets out to dirty the names of the great leaders in the preceding revolution. In the counter-revolution that followed the French revolution, for instance, the Jacobins were slandered as "agents" of the enemies of France. The principal task of *The Great Conspiracy* is to dirty the name of Leon Trotsky and to smear his followers as "fascists."

In the second chapter of this book, brief mention is made of the campaign carried on by "American newspapers" against Lenin and "his associates." The "Soviet leaders," says the book, "were being universally denounced . . . as 'paid agents' of the Germans, 'butchers,' 'assassins and madmen,' 'blood-intoxicated criminals,' and 'human scum.'" This campaign was waged against Lenin and Trotsky, a fact not mentioned by Sayers and Kahn.

### Old Trick

But this was not the first campaign of this type. In the summer of 1917, the Kerensky government accused Lenin and Trotsky of being "German agents." Trotsky was even thrown in prison by Kerensky on this lying charge. Kerensky cooked up "documents" to "prove" the charge in order to make the frame-up stick. Only the

rise of the revolutionary workers saved the Bolsheviks.

It turned out that Kerensky was a rank amateur in this foul business of slandering the Bolsheviks, however. Stalin utilized the same technique on a far greater scale, slandering Trotsky as an agent of British capitalism, French capitalism, Wall Street, or Hitler, depending on the needs of his foreign policy.

Vyshinsky, the Kremlin prosecutor, slandered Lenin's comrades in language that makes the 1918 American newspaper campaign sound like a Sunday School teacher at work. *The Great Conspiracy* is simply the latest product of this lie machine. Its central theme is the same as that of the American newspapers in 1918, and Kerensky in 1917—that Trotsky was an agent of German imperialism.

In the attempt to link Trotskyism with "fascism," the authors go to extraordinary lengths. "Even after Trotsky's death," they say, "the Fourth International continued to carry on its Fifth Column activities." What "Fifth Column" activities?

"In Great Britain, in April 1944," answer the authors, "Scotland Yard and police officials raided the Trotskyite headquarters in London, Glasgow, Wallsend and Nottingham, after discovering that Trotskyites were fomenting strikes throughout the country in an attempt to disrupt the British war effort."

### Supported Workers

The facts are different. The British Trotskyists were not "fomenting" strikes, as the red-baiters claimed when strikes swept Britain, although they supported all workers' struggles. The British Trotskyists opposed the war and advocated socialism. That is why the Churchill regime arrested them and threw them in prison. The British Stalinists meanwhile loyally supported the Churchill regime and opposed strikes.

"In the United States, on December 1, 1941," continue Sayers and Kahn, "eighteen leading American Trotskyites were found guilty in a Federal District Court in Minneapolis of conspiring to undermine the loyalty and discipline of American soldiers and sailors."

"Convicted along with Trotsky's lawyer, Albert Goldman, were James

P. Cannon, national secretary of the Socialist Workers Party (the name under which the Trotsky movement operated in the United States); Felix Morrow, the editor of the Trotskyite newspaper, the *Militant*; Jake Cooper, one of Trotsky's former bodyguards in Mexico, and fourteen other leading members of the American Trotskyite movement. They received prison sentences ranging from a year and a day to sixteen months."

These declarations are sandwiched into a whole mass of material about fascists, Adolph Hitler, Martin Dies, the Gestapo, postwar Fifth Column, and such items as: "This formation of groups of red terrorists is Himmler's most recent policy, aimed at creating a fourth international, amply contaminated by Nazi germs."

### Minneapolis Case

The true story is quite different from the impression Sayers and Kahn seek to create. The leaders and members of the Socialist Workers Party were railroaded to prison for opposing imperialist war and for advocating socialism. They were accused among other things of seeking to emulate "The Russian Revolution of 1917." Included in the evidence were books by Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky—and the Communist Manifesto of 1848, which was burned by Hitler's regime and banned by Mussolini and the Mikado.

The American Civil Liberties Union, *The Nation*, and *PM* were among the liberal organizations and newspapers that denounced the prosecution. The trade union movement from coast to coast considered it the outstanding labor case of the war. Organizations representing more than 5,000,000 members came to the defense of the Minneapolis prisoners.

The Stalinists under Earl Browder joined reaction in gloating over the imprisonment of the Trotskyists. The Stalinists were busy making the no-strike pledge, breaking strikes where they could, and backing Wall Street. But Earl Browder's line on the Minneapolis case was not peculiar to him. That line originated in the Kremlin. The fact that Browder's wartime slander of the Minneapolis defendants is repeated by Sayers and Kahn is proof enough of that.

*The Militant* likewise gets a heavy forkful of filth thrown in its direction

by *The Great Conspiracy*. During the war, the Roosevelt Administration tried to bar *The Militant* from the mails for its uncompromising opposition to imperialist war and its advocacy of socialism. Sayers and Kahn present this persecution of *The Militant* as part of the "documentary" evidence.

*The Great Conspiracy* repeats one of the dirtiest charges of the Moscow frame-up trials against Trotsky. "It was Alfred Rosenberg," say Sayers and Kahn, "the one-time Czarist emigre from Reval, who first established secret official Nazi relations with Leon Trotsky. It was Rudolph Hess, Hitler's deputy, who cemented them . . ."

*The Great Conspiracy* claims all its charges are based on "carefully documented evidence." If this is so, why has the Allied prosecution been silent about this "evidence" throughout the ten months of the Nuremberg trial? Hess was in the dock. Rudenko, the

Stalinist prosecutor, faced him. Yet not one of the charges levelled in the Moscow frame-up trials and repeated by Sayers and Kahn was brought up at Nuremberg!

Natalia Trotsky, the widow of Leon Trotsky, demanded that her attorney be permitted to question Hess and the other Nazi prisoners about these slanderous charges. No response was made to her demand.

A wide group of liberal and labor figures in England, America and other countries likewise demanded the Moscow trials be brought up at Nuremberg. Among those making this demand were H.G. Wells and Norman Thomas. This demand likewise was ignored.

Does it take much intelligence to conclude that *The Great Conspiracy* was intended to cover up the Kremlin's inability to drag the Moscow frame-up charges into the court at Nuremberg? □

## Torres Forms New Bolivian Exile Group

[The following interview with former Bolivian president General Juan José Torres González was obtained in Buenos Aires and published in the May 24-30 issue of the Argentine weekly magazine *Panorama*. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

\* \* \*

*Question.* What brings you to Buenos Aires?

*Answer.* I came essentially for two reasons. First to visit my relatives, and second to accept the invitations of many of my countrymen who wanted to share their concern with me.

*Q.* What has been the result of these meetings?

*A.* The formation of a new political instrument, which we have decided to call the Alianza de la Izquierda Nacional [AIN—Alliance of the National Left]. I am convinced that political groups do not spring from the heads of leaders but that, if they are to be genuine, they must respond to the needs of the people. In the case of

Bolivia, we have seen that in spite of the heroic popular resistance to the regime in power, the masses have lacked an axis around which they could come together and which could channel their dissatisfaction.

*Q.* Yet, if we are not mistaken, you belong to a so-called Frente Revolucionario Anti-imperialista [FRA—Anti-imperialist Revolutionary Front], together with other Bolivian politicians living in exile in Santiago. What has become of the FRA?

*A.* I took part in founding the FRA with one basic proposal: to achieve unity of the Bolivian left. Unfortunately, each of the organizations belonging to it attempted to make their own doctrinaire principles prevail, thereby turning it into a forum for Byzantine debates. In reality, the FRA ceased to function a year ago, more or less.

*Q.* What is AIN based on?

*A.* The Alianza de la Izquierda Nacional is entering the political arena as an expression of this great mass of men and women who tried, unsuccessfully, to hold back the reactionary

coup of August 21, 1971. The people could tell that my overthrow was going to mean economic surrender, political repression, and greater exploitation of the working people. Unfortunately, certain sectors of the left, instead of helping me to hold back the right-wing coup, ferociously fought me and thus contributed to overthrowing me. I believe that these sectors must make a thorough self-criticism so that once the anti-imperialist process has again got underway they will not repeat such serious errors.

AIN is also coming into being as a logical continuation of the process of liberation initiated two centuries ago by the peasant insurrections of Túpac Amaru and Túpac Katari. This process continued with the guerrillas who fought for independence, and it was fertilized with the blood of the earliest martyrs. In contemporary history, those heroic fighters are entwined with the military nationalism of Busch and Villaruel. The former earned the hatred of the tin barons by placing currency controls on mining exports in 1939; the latter was repudiated by the feudal oligarchy for decreeing the abolition of feudal serfdom in agriculture in 1945. Both ended up tragically, but they were the precursors of the great national, popular revolution of April 9, 1952, which, as everybody knows, was betrayed by the MNR [Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario—Revolutionary Nationalist Movement].

With the nationalization of oil by General Ovando, this process was resumed. It was deepened during my government with the nationalization of the "Matilde" Mine, the tin tailings and mounds, with the restitution of the mine workers' wages, and with a firm industrial policy designed to set up and increase the scale of tin, zinc, antimony, and bismuth smelters.

The new political instrument that has just been organized holds in its hands all these banners of glory and combat as it continues the struggle for the political and economic liberation of Bolivia.

*Q. Who has responded to your call?*

A. In the first place, the youth, that is, the new generation of politicians who have no mistakes to be ashamed of in their past, as well as honest politicians who have been



TORRES: Founds new organization.

around for a long time and were able to distinguish between a coup led by Colonel Banzer with the backing of imperialism and a government like the one I headed with its unquestionably popular, democratic, and revolutionary roots.

*Q. Do you believe agreement with any sector of the MNR is possible?*

A. I consider it essential for the old and honest fighters of the MNR who were able to lead the great popular event of April 9, 1952, to join the Alianza de la Izquierda Nacional. But in order to demonstrate this honesty they will have to abandon that name, which is today identified with the Banzer government.

*Q. What will be the strategy of the Alianza de la Izquierda Nacional?*

A. History has shown that a semi-colony like Bolivia can only liberate itself through a front between the classes oppressed by imperialism. The proletariat must play the preponderant role in this front, but if it is to accomplish its aims, it must raise national and democratic banners that will make it possible for it also to lead the other oppressed classes, which are numerically larger. Only in this way will we build a qualitatively dif-

ferent society, by pursuing a noncapitalist path of development.

*Q. Do you exclude the possibility of carrying on a dialogue with other political forces already in existence?*

A. Not at all. While the priority must go toward working to maximize the impact of the instrument that has just been formed, it goes without saying that the political tasks that must be carried out require working together with other related organizations.

*Q. How do you view the current situation in Latin America?*

A. Latin America is in a state of upheaval. The deepening of the Peruvian revolutionary process, the increasing vitality of the Cuban regime, the heroic resistance of the Chilean people in the face of the preparations for a rightist coup, the spectacular victory of Peronism in Argentina, and the determined struggle of the Panamanian people to regain their sovereignty over the canal zone show us that the Latin American homeland that Bolívar, San Martín, and Artigas dreamed of has ceased to be a far-off ideal and is turning into a marvelous reality.

*Q. Do you plan to settle down in Argentina?*

A. My plans for the immediate future are to remain in Buenos Aires. I believe that this country is getting ready to launch a great revolutionary process that will provide experience to politicians in various places, who, on the basis of the specific reality of their own people, are also trying to unfurl the banners of national and social revolution. □

### Way Out for Consumers?

U.S. consumers upset by inflation can take comfort in the remarks of Amos Dunn, president of the National Funeral Directors Association. Dunn says the cost of dying is increasing more slowly than the cost of living. According to his figures, the average funeral in the U.S. costs \$987 today, compared with \$820 five years ago.

And if you have the time to shop around, Dunn says you can still get a good funeral for as little as \$395 or \$400.



# Greek Prisoners Call for Mobilization to Free Junta's Political Prisoners

[The following statement was issued May 25 by the Greek political prisoners Theodoses Thomadakes (sentenced to life plus eight years), Stergios Katsaros (life), Triantaphyllos Metaphides (life), Theodoros Nikas (life plus twenty years), and Giannes Phelekes (eight years). The translation from the Greek is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

\* \* \*

Under the pressure of the mass mobilizations of students for trade-union and democratic rights and the insistent demand of the oppressed popular masses for immediate and unconditional release of the political prisoners, the head of the junta, in his annual apology for the violence of his regime [the speeches marking the anniversary of the coup], once again had to resort to his constant tactic—demagogic promises.

The premier called to mind the "principle of equality before the law" that was crushed under the treads of his tanks and, by baptizing the system of slow physical and moral annihilation of his political opponents as "granting the right of appeal before the Military Review Tribunal," he tried to deceive the broad masses in order to prolong their oppression.

To the masses starving for freedom, he threw a crumb. His law legitimized the *state of siege*, and whatever it granted was canceled by other provisions; or at least it contained a plethora of qualifications that left the way open for arbitrary interpretation and application (for example, the Panaghoulis case, the officers, the soldiers, and all those who worked with them).

But no sooner had the junta's mouthpieces started to hymn their master's "generosity" and "lenience" in every register than the political prisoners denounced this obvious and revolting deception. Once again they pointed out how such a perversion of the truth represents the essential corollary of the raw force that the mercenaries of the junta have made their principle.

But the deception did not stop there. They topped it off by depriving the overwhelming majority of the political prisoners of the right of appeal.

To justify this, the absurd claim was made that "no appeals were brought before the review hearings in 1969 and 1970." But, according to their own rigged laws, the prisoners did not have the right of appeal (and all requests that were made were rejected), because the offenses of those concerned were considered to be "against the public order and safety."

But the fact that the junta has been forced to resort to demagoguery and deception, at the same time that it is bringing to bear every means of repression as strongly as possible in order to forestall a further sharpening of the crisis that has convulsed its regime, shows not only how impotent this government is, how profoundly undermined and isolated. It shows once and for all how the problem of the political prisoners, like all the other problems of the oppressed, can be solved only by mobilizing the working class and the other exploited masses to struggle for the overthrow of the antipopular dictatorship and the system that produced it. We stressed this in our preceding denunciation of the junta's measures "in favor of the prisoners." It has been confirmed by the struggles of the students.

But our "democrats" cannot, or do not want to, understand this.

On the one hand, we have bourgeois liberals who fear the mobilization of the popular masses. They have made the problem of the political prisoners into a kind of bank note that they are carrying around trying to get cashed. Sometimes they take it to the American Congress, other times to NATO or the Council of Europe. Likewise, they make it a condition for adjusting their relations with the junta and thus make it easier for the dictatorship to deceive the workers.

On the other hand, we have the Stalinists. They have made the release of the prisoners into a purely legal problem, which supposedly can be solved by the appropriate maneuvers and behind-the-scenes pressures (for example, getting the cases retried by the five-member courts of appeal). The leading clique of the KKE (esoterikou) [Kommounistiko Komma tes Ellados—Communist party of Greece (Bureau of the Interior)] has gone at least as far in this self-deception as to

press almost all the activists it influences to enter "pleas for clemency," calling this de facto capitulation "utilizing legal recourse."

We repeat again: Immediate and unconditional release of the junta's political hostages cannot be won by lawyers' tricks, because it is not a judicial question. It is an issue that calls for mobilization, struggle, and for joining our forces. Only a mass mobilization of the workers to overthrow the junta can break the chains of all the political prisoners, who for six years have been rotting in the dungeons and prisons of the dictatorship.

We denounce the junta's deception and the deals the bourgeois liberals are cooking up behind the backs of the prisoners.

We denounce the degenerate leadership of the KKE (esoterikou), which by its noninternationalist, reformist, and capitulationist policy is leading its imprisoned activists to adapt and subject themselves to the dictatorial regime.

We denounce the bankrupt leadership of the KKE (Omada Phlorake [Phlorakis Group]), which by its conciliationist policy has blunted the struggle for the release of the political prisoners.

We call on the working class and all the exploited to step up their struggle for:

- trade-union and democratic freedoms;
- immediate and unconditional release of the political prisoners;
- building an independent revolutionary leadership of the working class;
- the overthrow of the junta and the system that produced it and sustains it. □

## London Invents New Weapon

The British government has developed a new "riot control" gas that makes its victims feel as though they are on fire and that can cause temporary blindness.

The gas, known as CR, can be sprayed on a crowd by a water cannon. Within a minute, it causes a painful burning sensation on the skin. Temporary blindness results if the gas touches the eyes. A government spokesman claimed that it causes no permanent harm.

"There was immediate speculation," the Associated Press reported June 9, "that the gas was intended for use in Northern Ireland. . . ."