

**POMPIDOU**

**OUTLAWS**

**FRENCH**

**TROTSKYISTS**

# The Ideology of ITT

The International Telephone and Telegraph Corporation, which went to such lengths to undermine the regime of Chilean President Salvador Allende following his election in 1970, has taken a different approach to the prospect of business deals with the Soviet Union.

"Freedom is dying in Chile, and what it means to Latin America and to us—to free men everywhere—is not pleasant to contemplate," warned Edward Gerrity Jr., ITT senior vice president, after Allende's election. "Allende has already moved to take over communications—the press, radio, TV—in Chile in emulation of his friend Fidel Castro, of the Chinese Reds and of the so-called proletarian dictatorships everywhere."

The giant conglomerate's crusade for ideological purity did not last long. Barely a year later it was quietly negotiating a massive program of business projects with the Soviet Union, according to a confidential memorandum written on December 14, 1971, by J.M. Garvin, an ITT executive in Europe, and made public at the end of June. Michael Jensen, writing in the June 26 *New York Times*, noted that it is clear from the memorandum that the Soviets showed "strong interest" in such ITT "activities" as housing, food, hotels, and rental cars. Moreover, "there were no ideological impediments to the Soviet negotiations."

One bureaucrat the memorandum said might help ITT in its negotiations was Dzherman Gvishiani, son-in-law of Premier Aleksei Kosygin. He was described as "an extremely effective, imaginative and knowledgeable Soviet technocrat, who is currently riding high on the tide of East-West detente."

In mid-June, ITT announced an agreement to exchange information with the Soviet Union in the fields of telecommunications, electronic and electromechanical components, consumer products, and publishing of scientific and technical information. □

A coming issue of *Intercontinental Press* will feature an exclusive interview with James P. Cannon, a founding member of the U.S. Communist party and of the American Trotskyist movement. Don't miss "The Radicalization Then and Now."

## In This Issue

FRANCE	819	Pompidou Outlaws French Trotskyists —by Jon Rothschild
	824	The "Antiwrecker Law"—A License for Frame-Ups
	825	Broad Meeting Called to Protest Ban
	827	What Is the Ligue Communiste?
	827	The Ordre Nouveau Fascists
	828	Ligue Communiste Open Letter to Secretary of Autonomous Federation of Police Unions
	829	Press Interview With Alain Krivine
	831	Solidarity With the Ligue Communiste!
IRELAND	832	The Elections in Northern Ireland —by Gerry Foley
CHILE	834	The Struggle Revives—by Hugo Blanco
	835	Attempted Coup Foiled—by David Thorstad
INDOCHINA WAR	837	Nixon, Sihanouk Move Toward Agreement
URUGUAY	838	Bordaberry Dissolves Congress, CNT —by David Thorstad
GREAT BRITAIN	839	London Blacks Protest Police Assault
	843	African Liberation Day in Britain
U.S.A.	840	Nixon Under Pressure to Testify on Watergate —by Allen Myers
	842	FBI Helped Organize Terrorist Group
CHINA	843	Signs of Detente Between Mao and Marcos
DOCUMENTS	844	Petition for Jailed Ukrainian Dissidents
	844	Four Bolivian Exile Groups Issue Call for Struggle Against "Fascist" Regime
	847	Withdrawal From Ireland Campaign
	826	Francois Mitterrand; 830, Alain Krivine; 832, William Craig; 833, Ian Paisley; 836, Salvador Allende; 837, Sihanouk; 841, John Dean; 842, Frederick LaRue; 845, Paz Estenssoro—by Copain

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

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.

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

COPY EDITOR: Lawrence Rand.

EDITORIAL STAFF: Candida Barberena, Gerry Foley, Allen Myers, Jon Rothschild, George Saunders, David Thorstad.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.

ASSISTANT BUSINESS MANAGER: Steven Warshell.

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

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

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

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

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 10 Impasse Guemeene, 75004, Paris, France.

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

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

Copyright © 1973 by Intercontinental Press.

## Pompidou Outlaws French Trotskyists

By Jon Rothschild

"The world today is being swept by a profound drift toward tyranny. We are wholly dedicated to preserving liberty. The defense of liberty requires firmness."

Thus did Georges Pompidou, French president and heir to the mantle of Gaullism, try to justify the suspension of one of the most basic democratic rights—the right to form a political party.

On June 28 the French Council of Ministers, acting on the recommendation of the notorious profascist Minister of the Interior Raymond Marcellin, outlawed the Ligue Communiste, French section of the Fourth International.

On the same day, the regime ordered the state security court to issue warrants for the arrest of known leaders of the Ligue. In the early morning hours of June 29 sixty-five apartments in and around Paris were raided by cops who broke down doors and ransacked houses looking for Ligue leaders. The dragnet managed to snare about a dozen persons, several of them members of the Ligue's Central Committee.

Among those seized was Alain Krivine, the Ligue's general secretary. He was taken into custody in the evening of June 29 and has been charged under the "antiwrecker" law with responsibility for violent incidents that occurred June 21 during a clash between antifascist demonstrators and police who were protecting a fascist meeting at the Mutualité in Paris. (Under the antiwrecker law, one can be charged with responsibility for violence that takes place in one's absence. See page 824 for an explanation of this piece of Gaullist legislation.)

Also in prison is Pierre Rousset, a member of the Ligue Communiste Central Committee. His crime was to have been present in the Ligue's headquarters on June 22 when it was ransacked by police.

But the regime's repression has not proceeded unopposed—far from it. A broad spectrum of political organizations have declared themselves op-

posed to the ban and in solidarity with the Ligue. Most important, the Socialist party and the Communist party have issued statements in support of the Ligue's democratic rights and have acted on those statements.

It was undoubtedly this initial support that induced the regime on June 30 to release all the Ligue members arrested in the June 29 dragnet with the exception of Krivine.

In fact, solidarity with the Ligue is growing so rapidly that even the police are divided on the government's action.

In an attempt to make the banning of the Ligue appear just and reasonable, the regime simultaneously outlawed the neofascist group *Ordre Nouveau* [New Order]. The ban is window dressing. There is no reason to believe that the special relationship *Ordre Nouveau* has maintained with the cops will alter.

In fact, that special relationship was itself at the root of the June 21 events.

For some time *Ordre Nouveau* had been trying to mobilize the French population against "wildcat [illegal] immigration." Using typically racist and anti-Semitic rhetoric, these fascists had succeeded on several occasions in provoking assaults on immigrant workers. As part of this campaign, they scheduled a "mass" meeting for June 21, to be held in the Mutualité in Paris.

All the leftist and antiracist groups in France demanded that the regime enforce its own laws forbidding racist agitation and ban the *Ordre Nouveau* meeting. The government refused.

In light of government inaction, the Ligue Communiste and a number of other far-left organizations (la Cause du Peuple [People's Cause], Révolution, the Alliance Marxiste Révolutionnaire [Revolutionary Marxist Alliance], and five other groups) called for a demonstration to protest the fascist meeting. Other organizations, including the Socialist party, the Communist party, and the major trade-union federations—all of which had asked the regime to ban the *Ordre*

*Nouveau* meeting—were invited to co-sponsor the demonstration, but they declined to do so.

*Ordre Nouveau's* usual practice when holding public assemblies has been to turn the meeting hall into an armed camp. This time was no different. In the morning and early afternoon of June 21, the fascists began delivering weapons to the Mutualité. Truckloads of people drove up and unloaded iron bars, sticks, and molotov cocktails.

The police, who were present, merely observed, functioning in effect as a defense guard enabling the *Ordre Nouveau* goons to turn the Mutualité into a fortress.

The anti-immigration meeting itself was a failure. Despite an energetic propaganda campaign and the selection of a meeting hall with a seating capacity of several thousand, not more than 1,000 persons showed up. Some reports indicated the turnout might have been as small as 500.

The antifascist counterdemonstration was estimated as being as high as 4,000 strong. Anticipating that the *Ordre Nouveau* goons would be armed, many of the counterdemonstrators wore helmets and carried sticks for defending themselves in confronting the fascists.

The Gaullist regime had mobilized more than 2,000 police to defend the racist meeting. The cops, who earlier in the day had functioned as guards, guaranteeing the fascists the opportunity to arm themselves, formed up in the evening in defense lines to protect the outnumbered fascists. At about 8:00 p.m. some clashes broke out between the counterdemonstrators and the police. As police attacks on the marchers escalated in intensity, the demonstrators fought back. Before long, fighting spread to various other sections of the Latin Quarter.

In some places barricades were built. The fighting lasted for more than four hours, during which time many incidents occurred that were clearly not under the control of the organizers of the demonstration. In the course of the battle several police were badly injured. Police sources reported June 21 that seventy-three police had been hurt, sixteen of them requiring hospitalization; nine police were seriously burned by molotov cocktails, two of whom reportedly were critically injured.

*Le Monde* reported June 23 that

about fifty demonstrators had been taken to police headquarters June 21 for identity checks; twenty-one of those were turned over to magistrates for possible prosecution.

The June 26 *Le Monde* published a report on the arrests made during the clashes. The list is an interesting one. Among antifascist demonstrators, four persons were charged with illegal possession of arms. Oddly enough, three of these were Arabs. Abdel Salam Boulbayim, a twenty-six-year-old Moroccan, was accused of having thrown some stones with a slingshot; he pleaded not guilty and was bound over for trial. Muhammed Soyah, Alain Goubaux, and Hédie Kheffi were also charged.

Among the *Ordre Nouveau* fascists, there were many more arrests for "carrying arms." But the penalties handed down—and this for people "caught in the act"—were less than severe. *Le Monde* reported the following sentences: François Lefèvre, who was carrying an iron bar and a bottle of gasoline, got sixty days in jail, forty-five of them suspended. The following persons received sentences of one month *suspended* and fines of 150 francs (about US\$35) for carrying illegal weapons: Michel Thibault (a retractable club, a slingshot, twenty-two ball bearings, and two bolts), Jean-Pierre Leteneur (a club), Benoît André (a club), Roland Poynard (brass knuckles), Guy Feisthauer (a club made of wound-up electric cable).

Also arrested was *Ordre Nouveau* member Jacques Bethèze, who had rented a panel truck in which were found molotov cocktails, iron bars, and bamboo sticks. The truck was parked in front of the Mutualité during the fascist meeting. Alain Robert, the head of *Ordre Nouveau*, was arrested during a search of the group's headquarters but was released.

## Cops Raid Ligue's Headquarters

News of the June 21 clashes gave rise to vigorous reactions throughout France. The fighting was the most extensive since the May 1968 "night of the barricades." As will be seen, there is some evidence that the police authorities and the minister of the interior deliberately set up the situation so that the police would take inordinately high casualties and so that

this could serve as an excuse to launch repression against the far left.

The first step in that repression occurred the morning after the demonstration. At about 6:00 a.m. June 22 some 700 cops appeared in front of the building that houses the Ligue headquarters. The building was surrounded and police announced through speakers that they intended to enter the headquarters.

At that time there were twenty-five members of the Ligue present. This amounted to the normal defense guard left at the building each night and a few extra marshalls who had come to protect the headquarters from possible fascist attacks. One of those present was Pierre Rousset, the only Central Committee member on the scene.

The Ligue members decided to let the cops in. When the police entered, they announced that they had come to search the place. They had no warrant of any kind. When Rousset demanded his right—recognized under French law—to accompany the police on the search, he was refused. The twenty-five Ligue members were held in a room while the cops ransacked the headquarters, destroying literature, throwing typewriters on the floor, and so on.

The police later announced that they had found "arms." These, as it turned out, consisted of bars and sticks, and some molotov cocktails. In addition, the police claim to have found two hunting rifles and a hand grenade.

The twenty-five Ligue members were taken to police headquarters. Fourteen of them were charged with possession of arms. The others were released. Of those charged, thirteen were released the following day, June 23. Pierre Rousset, who is serving a ten-month suspended sentence for allegedly carrying explosives (and who therefore has participated in no demonstrations and has not even participated in street sales of *Rouge*, formerly the Ligue's newspaper), was held in jail, where he remains at last report.

## The Initial Reactions

On June 22, while the police were occupying the Ligue headquarters, various organizations began to express their views on the previous night's events. The PSU (Parti Socialiste Unifié—United Socialist party) issued a communiqué expressing its

"indignation at the behavior of the forces of order toward the demonstrators who were attempting to oppose the holding of the racist meeting of the *Ordre Nouveau* neo-Nazis.

"Not content simply to tolerate a meeting whose declared aim was to incite racial hatred, the French government makes its police forces the accomplice of the fascist gangsters."

The PSU turned its offices over to Alain Krivine to hold a press conference at which he told reporters about the police occupation of the Ligue's headquarters. Some of his remarks were reported in the June 24-25 issue of *Le Monde*. "It [the "search"] was totally illegal," Krivine said, "for the police ransacked our offices without any witnesses. I'm surprised they didn't 'find' machine guns and tanks. . . . The incidents that took place [on June 21] are not the main thing. The most important thing, and the most serious, is that a Nazi, fascist, racist, and anti-Semitic meeting took place right in the middle of Paris. The *Ordre Nouveau* meeting, protected by the regime, throws some light on the politics of the regime itself."

Also present at the press conference in the PSU headquarters was Michel Rolant, a member of the national bureau of the CFDT (Confédération Française Démocratique du Travail—French Democratic Confederation of Labor, the country's second largest trade-union federation). "The CFDT," Rolant was quoted as saying, "does not believe in the politics of molotov cocktails. But the holding of a racist meeting against the immigrant workers is in itself a provocation. The powers that be must bear the responsibility for the situation since they authorized such a meeting."

The June 24-25 *Le Monde* also quoted the initial responses of several other organizations to the June 21 events:

"It is appropriate to stress," declared the Mouvement Contre le Racisme, l'Antisémitisme, et pour la Paix (Movement Against Racism, Anti-Semitism, and for Peace), "that under the protection of the police a xenophobic, racist, anti-Semitic meeting took place in our capital, in flagrant violation of the law enacted just one year ago to repress such undertakings."

The Syndicat National des Enseignants du Second Degré (SNES—Na-



The Ligue Communiste's headquarters after the police "search" of June 22.

tional Union of Secondary-School Teachers) stated: "The government rounded out the *Ordre Nouveau* provocation by placing the meeting under the protection of the police force. . . .

"The SNES denounces the police violence and calls on all democrats to observe the greatest vigilance and united action against the fascist operations that are going on at the same time that the regime is trying to strengthen its authoritarian character."

Most significant was the initial response of the Communist party. The June 22 issue of the CP's daily *l'Humanité* laid the main blame for the violence of June 21 on the government: ". . . The regime bears the main responsibility in this business. It well knows that *Ordre Nouveau* is a fascist organization that includes helmeted and armed shock troops. The *Ordre Nouveau* meeting had an open xenophobic, racist character and was therefore against the law. While it was

aimed essentially at the immigrant workers, it also gave vent to anti-Semitic manifestations. Such a meeting should have been banned, as the left organizations asked.

"By authorizing the meeting and by granting *Ordre Nouveau* police protection, the government indulged in a deliberate provocation."

The Alliance Marxiste Révolutionnaire (which is headed by Michel Pablo), one of the sponsors of the June 21 counterdemonstration, stated: "What is a scandal [to the cops] is that the French police, known for their systematic brutality, had to go up against demonstrators who would not let themselves be clubbed. And this while they were openly protecting a fascist meeting and fascist activists. The revolutionary far-left must not fall into a 'Japanese-style' situation in which brawls become its main form of activity, but there is no reason for it to accept the precepts of a morality

that implies that it should demonstrate and accept the blows of the police and the fascists they protect."

The OCI-AJS (Organisation Communiste Internationaliste—Alliance des Jeunes pour le Socialisme—Internationalist Communist Organization—Alliance of Youth for Socialism, the Lambertist groups) stated in a joint communiqué that they "do not share the politics of the ultraleftist organizations. . . . To a large extent the political errors committed by the Ligue allowed the provocation to take place [but] . . . the OCI and the AJS will not accept the attempt to place on the same level the Hitlerite organization *Ordre Nouveau* and the Ligue Communiste, a workers organization like the SP, the CP, the CGT [Confédération Générale du Travail—General Confederation of Labor, the country's largest trade union federation, dominated by the CP], the CGT-FO [Force Ouvrière], the Fédération Nationale d'Enseigne-

ment [National Education Federation], the OCI and the AJS."

Even the statements of the various unions of policemen, while objecting to the actions of the antifascist demonstrators, accused the government of responsibility. The police federation affiliated to the CGT announced that it "condemns the attacks and aggression committed by certain groups and individuals against the police, attacks that struck even police first-aid cars. But it asserts that the government bears a heavy responsibility in regard to these incidents because it allowed a demonstration by a fascist grouplet to take place."

The CFDT's police federation issued a statement in which it "denounces the attitude of state authorities who, by authorizing under a democratic pretext the holding of a meeting of an openly fascist far-right movement in violation of the July 1, 1972, law on the fight against racism, could not have been ignorant of the obvious risk that this meeting entailed.

"Since they allowed this meeting, the authorities bear a heavy responsibility for the distressing ordeal of the several dozen police who suffered serious or grave bodily injury."

One of the few strong statements *against* the antifascist demonstrators came from Gérard Monatte, secretary of the Fédération Autonome des Syndicats de Police (Autonomous Federation of Police Unions). On June 22 he declared that his organization "unanimously condemns the attacks directed against the police assigned to assure freedom of expression at a meeting authorized by the Prefecture of Police. Without at all wanting to pass judgment on the opportuneness of this or that demonstration, it considers it impermissible that uncontrollable and irresponsible elements can abandon themselves to such attacks, that nothing can justify them other than the absolute lack of judgment displayed by these same elements who seem to be nothing but provocateurs and professionals at demagoguery and unprovoked violence against officers who were only doing their duty within the framework of established institutions."

On June 23 the leadership of the Ligue Communiste responded to Monatte's statement by sending him an open letter calling attention to the fact that under similar circumstances in 1971 (when an *Ordre Nouveau*

meeting was protected by police), Monatte had protested the government's use of the police in this manner. The letter also cited evidence that the police authorities had deliberately placed the police in position to sustain many injuries, in the hope of using those injuries as a pretext for repression. (For the full text of the Ligue's open letter, see page 828.)

The Ligue's response to Monatte's initial communiqué, combined with further evidence of police provocation, soon convinced Monatte to change his attitude toward the June 21 events. That shift encouraged opposition among the police to the regime's attempt to portray the antifascist demonstrators as bloodthirsty "cop-killers."

### The Ban Comes Down

By the weekend after the June 21 demonstration, it was becoming clear that the regime was preparing a big repressive move. At a press conference held June 24, *Ordre Nouveau* head Alain Robert demanded that the government outlaw the Ligue Communiste and arrest Alain Krivine under the antiwrecker law.

On June 26 Minister of the Interior Raymond Marcellin issued a virulent denunciation of the antifascist demonstrators in which he made demagogic use of some of the uncontrolled incidents that had occurred on June 21.

The Ligue, meanwhile, was waging a propaganda campaign of its own. On June 25 Alain Krivine held a special press conference in the sacked headquarters of the Ligue. (See page 829 for a summary of Krivine's remarks.) In the name of the Ligue, Krivine detailed the violent and terrorist acts organized or instigated by *Ordre Nouveau*. He announced that the Ligue would wage a vigorous campaign to win the release of Pierre Rousset and would press forward its antifascist struggle. The Ligue called for a broad antiracist, antifascist meeting to take place June 28 and urged all workers organizations to participate.

On June 27, Prime Minister Pierre Messmer announced that on the following day the Council of Ministers would hear a report from Marcellin, who had recommended that the Ligue be banned (and, so that the government might maintain a "balanced" image, the *Ordre Nouveau* as well). "Under democracy," said the Gaullist

minister, "the rule is freedom of thought, of words, and of writings. But freedom stops at the limits set by the law, and as for acts, these must stop if they are in contradiction with the law. It is not the words, but the acts of *Ordre Nouveau* and the Ligue Communiste that concern us."

Also on June 27, Marcellin issued a decree banning all activities and meetings of the Ligue, and of the *Ordre Nouveau*. The scheduled June 28 meeting was outlawed, and was canceled by the Ligue.

The ban was declared on June 28. The "legal" basis for it is a 1936 law, passed under the popular-front government of the time, giving the regime the right to dissolve "combat groups and private militia." The law also gives the regime power to dissolve groups or associations that "provoke armed demonstrations in the streets" or that form armed groups or militia that attack "the republican form of government."

Krivine responded to the ban immediately. Part of his reply was reported in the June 30 *Le Monde*:

"This ministry of police-spies has banned the Ligue Communiste. This measure sets a precedent that threatens the entire workers movement.

"Behind the pretext used—the antifascist demonstrations of June 21—the regime wants to make the Ligue pay for its growing role in the workers struggles, in the mobilizations of youth, in antimilitarist actions. For revolutionists, this piece of brutality from the regime is a form of homage. This act will not fail to anger millions of workers and democrats. It will add to the discredit of the caretaker regime.

"We launch a solemn appeal to all organizations of the workers movement, to all democrats who will not stand for seeing communists and aspiring Nazis treated the same: Organize in the field the necessary response, and demand, through a mass campaign, the repeal of this measure!

"This vicious decree will perhaps fill up a few prison cells. But it will not prevent Trotskyist militants and their sympathizers—whom neither Nazi repression nor Stalinist repression have been able to break or discourage—from continuing to think and to act . . . This is only the beginning; the fight goes on."

Reaction to the ban on the Ligue supported Krivine's estimate that the

measure would arouse widespread indignation. All the far-left organizations declared their support for the Ligue. Civil liberties groups such as the League for the Rights of Man came out in support of the Ligue's right to exist.

But most significant were the reactions of the Socialist party and the Communist party.

### The CP Joins the Defense

The Political Bureau of the Communist party held a special session to discuss the ban on the Ligue. The June 28 issue of *l'Humanité* published a statement adopted by the Political Bureau after its discussions. The Communist party, the statement said, "has always denounced the complicity the government has shown toward *Ordre Nouveau*.

"The French Communist party protests against the dissolution ordered against the Ligue Communiste. Our party's opinion of the activities of the ultraleftist groups is well known. On the political level, it fights their adventurist acts, which the regime uses as an excuse to attack civil liberties and to try to deal blows to the workers and democratic forces and their organizations.

"The measure against the Ligue Communiste is part of the schemes of the regime, which is aiming at intensifying the authoritarian character of its policies and is casting about seeking a way out of its difficulties.

"The dissolution of this leftist group, which by a false symmetry the government is seeking to justify with the banning of *Ordre Nouveau*, sets a grave precedent for democratic rights and freedoms in our country.

"Profoundly wedded to freedom and democracy, the French Communist party believes that after the powerful demonstrations of June 20 [against repression], the fight for the defense and extension of freedoms must continue to develop."

In an article published in the June 30 issue of *Le Monde*, Thierry Pfister called attention to the novelty of the CP's support for the Ligue: "It will be recalled that a few years ago the Communist leaders spoke of 'the leftist and rightist fascists,' making no distinction. Now, not only do they find a difference in character between the far right and the far left, they also come to the defense of the Ligue, even

while taking exception to the Ligue's methods and analysis. The Political Bureau of the CP moved toward this position in a series of articles that have been published in *l'Humanité* during the past few days—articles aimed at proving that the police in fact had set a trap for the Trotskyists on June 21. The *Mouvement de la Jeunesse Communiste* [Movement of Communist Youth], whose language is not marked by the same prudence as the Political Bureau's, did not even hesitate to speak of 'the [regime's] deliberate organization of the June 21 provocation.'"

### An Assist From Mitterrand

The Socialist party's reaction to the ban was equally significant. On June 29, after the dragnet against the Ligue leadership had been set in motion, at a time when there was a warrant out for the arrest of Alain Krivine, the Socialist party opened its headquarters to him for a news conference.

In addition to a significant section of the Paris press, François Mitterrand, the head of the SP, attended the press conference. Police, who were waiting at the door, declined to enter and arrest Krivine in the SP headquarters.

When the news conference ended, Mitterrand left the headquarters along with Krivine and the two, followed by cops, walked away together. Again, the police declined to take Krivine into custody, apparently fearing that they might have to arrest Mitterrand as well.

It is obvious that Mitterrand's gesture of solidarity could not have indefinitely postponed Krivine's arrest. But it is equally obvious that the symbolic effect of the action was not lost on the Pompidou gang.

### What Will Be the Extent of the Repression?

"At this point," Thierry Pfister commented in the June 30 *Le Monde*, "the question that arises is, How extensive will the repression be? Will the government be satisfied, as it was in 1968, with the dissolution and with a few symbolic arrests and then allow the Ligue to be reorganized in a fairly short period of time? Or will it instead undertake a systematic dismantling of the movement, which

would necessitate outlawing the activities of the cadres and would therefore necessitate the arrest of at least two or three hundred militants? The Ligue Communiste has, for example, about thirty headquarters. In Toulouse alone, our correspondent reports, the government's decision outlaws 300 persons. Further, it can be asked how the government will be able to prevent the Ligue members organized in trade-union tendencies, whether in the FEN or in the CFDT, from continuing their activities.

"An intermediate sort of repression is also possible, one that would be asserted through prosecutions of the members of the Ligue's Political Bureau.

"Nevertheless, the Trotskyist leaders have decided to defend themselves point by point. Basing themselves on the statements of Pierre Messmer, who explained that 'it is not the words but the acts of the extremist movements that concern the government,' they want to keep alive their weekly, *Rouge*. To do this, they are counting on using the legislation guaranteeing freedom of the press. Further, they maintain that the seat of the Ligue belongs to a commercial company, the Société Internationale d'Édition [International Publishers], and that it therefore cannot be affected by the decision of the Council of Ministers. The bookstore, especially, must be allowed to continue to operate, even though it was sacked during the police search, pamphlets and books being covered with paint, for example."

The leaders of the Ligue have already tried to test some of the issues indicated by Pfister. According to French law, when an organization is banned, it has twenty-four hours "grace time" in which to wind up its affairs. During that twenty-four-hour period, an issue of *Rouge* appeared—no longer denoted as the "weekly of the Ligue Communiste," but listed instead as a "journal of communist action." It is not yet known whether the regime will try to suppress that issue of *Rouge*. It is also not yet known whether the regime will forbid further publication of the newspaper.

The former headquarters of the Ligue remains temporarily closed. But the police occupation of it has ended. Will the regime try to close down the bookstore located in the building? Will the Société Internationale d'Édition be shut down?

Pompidou may decide the answers to such questions in relation to the strength displayed—nationally and internationally—by the movement of solidarity with the Ligue Communiste.

The regime's desire seems clear enough. When the ban was first declared, much of the French press speculated that the government might not intend to get really tough, that the far left as a whole and the individual far-left groups in particular had been banned in the past and had very rapidly reconstituted themselves. But on June 29, Marcellin spoke out against any such interpretation of the present ban. This ban, he said, is quite serious. He explicitly stated that this was *not* the same as the 1968 ban. He said that any individuals attempting to reconstitute the Ligue Communiste in some other form could expect to be arrested immediately.

On June 30, he repeated his threat.

The "justice" carried out against the Ligue leadership, he said, should be severe, and not merely symbolic, in order to discourage any attempts to reconstitute the organization.

The regime's will is one thing. Its ability to impose that will is quite another. "The dissolution of a grouplet can be easily put up with," Thierry Pfister wrote in the June 30 *Le Monde*, "while the dissolution of a party creates a political crisis. Well, the Ligue Communiste is not a party properly so-called; but it is already more than a grouplet."

Pfister's observation is accurate. The support that the Ligue has gotten—from the whole far-left, from nearly all civil liberties groups, and even, unprecedentedly, from the traditional mass workers organizations—proves that Pompidou is not dealing with an insignificant grouplet.

On the other hand, the Ligue has

not sufficient strength directly to mobilize masses in its own defense.

The central question at this point is whether the Ligue will be able to bring sufficient pressure to bear on the Socialist and Communist party leaderships to convince them to extend their support beyond the level of statements to the level of action. At this early phase of the struggle, there are three encouraging signs in this respect: the initial responses of civil liberties groups and the mass workers parties to the defense effort; the division within the ranks of the police themselves over who was responsible for the injuries they suffered during the June 21 clashes; and the initial signs of international solidarity with the Ligue.

The first major public defense activity has been scheduled to take place in Paris on July 4. On that date, a meeting will be held to protest the

## Pompidou's Weapon Against the Left

# The 'Antiwrecker Law'—A License for Frame-Ups

The "loi anti-casseurs" (antiwrecker law) was passed by the lower house of the French National Assembly on April 30, 1970 by a vote of 368-94. On June 4, 1970, it was approved by the Senate and became law. It is a masterpiece of witch-hunt legislation giving the regime the right to arrest leaders of organizations for "crimes" they are not even alleged to have committed.

The law states: "When acts of duress or violence are committed against persons, or property is destroyed or damaged as the result of an overtly violent action conducted by groups, the heads or organizers of such groups, as well as those who have participated in these acts, shall be punished without prejudice to stronger penalties provided by the law, with imprisonment of one to five years.

"When, as a result of an assembly that is illegal or that has been banned by administrative authority, acts of force or violence or destruction or damage that qualify as crimes or misdemeanors are committed, the following shall be liable to punishment:

"1. The heads or organizers of this assembly who shall not have given orders to disperse after the beginning of the violence or destruction, to imprisonment for six months to three years;

"2. Those who shall have continued to participate voluntarily in this assembly after the beginning of and with knowledge of the violence or destruction, to imprisonment for three months to two years.

"Persons found guilty of the offenses defined in the preceding paragraphs are responsible for the damage to persons or property mentioned in the same paragraphs. Nevertheless, the court may limit reparations to only a part of these damages and may establish the part [of these damages] to which each person sentenced is liable, without this limitation ruling out any [civil] action instituted by the victim under terms of Articles 116 through 122 of the common administrative code."

When the law was passed by the lower house, the *New York Times* (May 1, 1970) cut through some of the legal jargon and commented:

"... the penal code will hold that all persons who participate willingly in an illegal demonstration or terrorist attack are responsible criminally and civilly for any harm that may ensue to persons and property.

"It will no longer be necessary to identify the actual authors of the damage, thus introducing the notion of collective guilt into the legal system in the case not only of commando raids whose principal aim is violence but also in the case of any peaceful demonstration that may later get out of hand."

The effect of the law—which was not at all designed to cope with "terrorist attacks" or "commandos"—is that if a group sponsors or calls for a demonstration at which any violence is done—whether provoked or unprovoked, committed by police agents or by unaffiliated demonstrators, whether offensive or defensive in character—any leader of the sponsoring organization can be sent to jail for up to five years, even if that leader was not present at the scene of the demonstration, let alone responsible for any violence. □



ban on the Ligue. It will be chaired by the League for the Defense of the Rights of Man. Groups that have announced their support of the meeting include the Socialist party, the CFDT, the PSU, the CGT, the Communist party, and the FEN, among others. One of the leaders of the Ligue is scheduled to speak at the meeting.

It remains to be seen whether the government will attempt to ban the meeting, to prevent the member of the Ligue from speaking, or otherwise to interfere. The regime's reaction to the meeting will be an important test of how far it feels it can go. But it is quite possible that Pompidou's apparent decision not to hold most of the Ligue leaders arrested in the June 29 dragnet was at least in part determined by the support given the Ligue by other organizations.

### Division Among the Police

"Some police assert that they were victims of manipulation" read a headline on the first page of the June 30 *Le Monde*. The article began: "Some days after the incidents that followed the June 21 Mutualité meeting of the far-right movement *Ordre Nouveau*, in the course of which seventy-one members of the forces of order were injured, various organizations of Paris police assert that they are certain that the turn of events during the confrontations that night did not occur just by accident: there had been, they believe, too many incoherent orders, false reports, and carelessness in interpretation and utilization of intelligence."

Feelings on the part of the police that they had been set up by their leaders to sustain heavy injuries broke dramatically onto the front pages of French newspapers when Marcellin went to visit one of the cops who was seriously burned in the June 21 events. "You see before you, Mr. Minister," the injured policeman said, "a victim of your policy."

*Le Monde's* reporter James Sarazin explained some of the peculiarities about the night of June 21 that have come to light since the clashes themselves. He summed them up in one sentence: "Everything happened as though someone had wanted the police to sustain a bad setback that could lead the majority of them to revise their conception of maintenance of

order." That is, to become supporters of the "strong state" policies Marcellin represents.

Sarazin asks why it should be that the mobilization of 2,600 cops on the night of June 21 was insufficient to contain a counterdemonstration of only several thousand (only 1,000 according to official figures). The answer, Sarazin reports, is that the police were consistently misinformed by their superiors about what to expect from the demonstrators.

The police were told that 200 or 300 leftist demonstrators were protesting the *Ordre Nouveau* meeting and that there was no great danger of violence. Some police consequently went into areas where pitched battles were already under way without taking their usual equipment. "They asked for tear-gas grenades that could be launched," Sarazin wrote. "Instead they first got hand grenades, then they got the projectiles they had first asked for, but without the launching cartridges. In the meantime, their ranks had been breached."

The troubling questions raised by this sort of evidence and the obviously provocative way the cops were used to protect the fascist demonstration apparently led Gérard Monatte to consider some of the questions raised by the Ligue's Political Bureau in its letter to him. By the end of June, Monatte had in effect reversed his original condemnation of the anti-fascist demonstrators and had begun calling for a full investigation of the June 21 events, the investigation to include publication of the police radio logs for that night.

It may yet be shown that the whole

June 21 incident was prearranged by Marcellin and Pompidou as a deliberate attempt to instigate a battle with the far left, precipitate large numbers of police casualties, and then use the incident as an excuse to launch a repression. But even if the regime's provocative conspiracy was not that extensive, the fact that significant sections of the police are prepared to seriously consider the possibility at tests that the regime, rather than the Ligue Communiste, may find itself politically isolated. If even some of the police who were attacked refuse to swallow the propaganda about "cop-killer" leftist demonstrators, what section of the population can be expected to do so?

### Initial International Reaction

The government's ban on the Ligue has made headlines in most newspapers in capitalist Europe. The ban is seen generally as an important political event, and great reservations have been expressed about Pompidou's ability to enforce the dissolution.

The fact that the ban has been recognized as an issue that goes beyond French borders in its import has already helped create conditions favorable to an international extension of the movement of solidarity with the Ligue Communiste. Initial demonstrations at French government offices have occurred in Denmark, Switzerland, Sweden, West Germany, and Japan.

These first demonstrations must be extended both geographically and numerically. Isolating the Gaullist regime internationally will be as important as isolating it inside France. □

## Groups Proclaim Solidarity With Ligue Communiste

### Broad Meeting Called to Protest Ban

[The July 1-2 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde* provided additional details on the meeting scheduled for the evening of July 4 to protest the banning of the Ligue Communiste.

[Some twenty organizations affiliated to the Collectif de Défense des Libertés (Coalition for Defense of Freedoms), *Le Monde* reported, met June 30 at the headquarters of the League

for the Rights of Man and decided to sponsor the meeting, which will be held at the Cirque d'Hiver in Paris.

[Members of the Collectif and sponsors of the protest meeting include the Communist party, the Socialist party, the CGT, the CFDT, the FEN, and the PSU, among others.

[In addition, *Le Monde* published excerpts from statements issued by

twelve groups protesting the decree banning the Ligue Communiste. Below are the excerpts that appeared in *Le Monde*. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.

[*Le Monde* noted that other organizations also protested the ban. Those listed as having done so were the Organisation Révolutionnaire Anarchiste (Revolutionary Anarchist Organization), the Organisation Communiste Révolution (Revolution), the Organisation pour le Communisme (Organization for Communism, formerly a tendency in the PSU), the Organisation Communiste Internationale (International Communist Organization), and the Parti Communiste Révolutionnaire (Revolutionary Communist party).]

\* \* \*

*Socialist party:* The dissolution of the Ligue Communiste is a new attack on democratic rights. In placing the Ligue on the same level as the fascist *Ordre Nouveau* the government is playing a symmetrical game whose only aim is to deceive public opinion. The SP condemns the government's attitude and asks the Coalition for the Defense of Freedoms to take this matter, as quickly as possible, to all democratic and workers organizations.

*The PSU:* The decision shows to what extent the government uses its own legality in a reactionary way . . . The Parti Socialiste Unifié does not intend to accept such a decision.

*Lutte Ouvrière:* To arbitrariness has now been added hypocrisy, for this decision includes the banning of the fascist organization *Ordre Nouveau*, whereas eight days ago this same government placed all its police detachments at the service of *Ordre Nouveau's* racist meeting. This claim of equal repression should fool nobody.

*League for the Rights of Man:* By proclaiming a false symmetry between those whose possible success would lead us back to times we hoped had passed away and a group that expresses the confusion and the hopes of many young people—even if it uses methods worthy of condemnation—the government has created an ambiguity that nonetheless should fool no one.



MITTERRAND: SP head comes to Krivine's defense.

*Front des Jeunes Progressistes (Front of Young Progressives):* At the moment that the scandal around telephone tapping reminds us that a police state nearly exists in France, the government has intensified its repression by proclaiming the dissolution of a far-left movement . . .

We have also demonstrated against racism. So, Mr. Marcellin, do you dare to prosecute antifascist Gaullists, which is what you were thirty years ago.

*Movement of Young Left Radicals:* The dissolution of the Ligue Communiste and *Ordre Nouveau* has more to do with repression than with prevention, while the government should have, as the law demands, prevented *Occident* from re-forming itself. . . . It is conceivable that a movement might want to express itself on immigration, which is a real political problem. But it is inadmissible for this to serve as a pretext for propagating xenophobic, racist, and neo-Nazi ideas.

*The CGT:* As regards *Ordre Nouveau*, the CGT has continually called for banning the fascist groups . . . As for the Ligue Communiste, it is well known that the CGT disapproves of the orientation and methods of this organization as well as of the other ultraleftist groups . . .

Having noted this, the Executive

Commission points out that the CGT has always intended to deal with such agitation by means of mass struggle supported by the workers.

Therefore, the Executive Commission lodges a firm protest against the banning of this group.

*The CFDT:* Taking advantage of the fact that the Ligue Communiste fell into the trap of a provocation, the government has just banned this organization. As it has done in the case of previous measures of this type, the CFDT protests against this decision, which represents a new escalation in the assault on our freedoms . . .

*The Fédération de l'Education Nationale (National Federation of Teachers):* The pretext chosen and the false symmetry displayed in the simultaneous banning of the fascist movement *Ordre Nouveau* cannot deceive anyone. Liberty is indivisible; the banning of a far left organization is a new threat to all the opposition organizations.

*The CGT, CFDT, and FSU locals of radio-television personnel:* They expressed "their indignation at the deceitful way the Ligue Communiste was presented in the television reports June 28."

*The Union des Etudiants Juifs de France (Jewish Students Union of France):* The UEJF notes that it called for a demonstration against the rally held by *Ordre Nouveau* and intends to assume all the responsibilities flowing from its commitments.

The UEJF assures the Ligue Communiste of its full solidarity and calls on all the workers and democratic organizations to block the maneuvers of the government, which is using agents provocateurs to pursue its aims of dismantling all authentically democratic opposition.

*Veterans of the Resistance:* Jean Cassou, Order of the Liberation; Jacques Debù-Bridel, former senator; Maurice Clavel and Vladimir Jankélevitch; In fact, the Ligue Communiste was banned for opposing in action the resurgence of neo-Nazism. It did so by a counterdemonstration that, exercising our democratic rights, we ourselves called for.

*Intercontinental Press*

## What Is the Ligue Communiste?

The Ligue Communiste (Communist League), French section of the Fourth International, was founded in April 1969. It arose out of a fusion of militants active in the Parti Communiste Internationaliste (PCI—Internationalist Communist party), formerly the French section of the Fourth International, the Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire (JCR—Revolutionary Communist Youth), and unaffiliated young militants who had been through the revolutionary upsurge of May-June 1968. The composition of the Ligue represents a fusion of the long-standing cadres of French Trotskyism with the most advanced elements of the radicalization of the 1960s.

The JCR had been founded in 1966 by a group of students who were expelled from the Union of Communist Students for refusing to follow the Communist party in supporting François Mitterrand in the presidential elections that year. JCR militants played a major role in the May 1968 events, helping to spark and organize the student protests that triggered the general strike of 10 million French workers.

On June 12, 1968, the JCR, along with the PCI and a number of other far-left organizations, was dissolved by government decree. Toward the end of 1968, many of the militants of the May-June struggles—some of them former JCR and PCI members—began putting out *Rouge*, a weekly "communist action" newspaper. In April 1969 militants around *Rouge* founded the Ligue.

"This formation [the Ligue]," commented the June 29 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde*, "has as its objective working for the construction of a revolutionary party of the Leninist type." The Ligue became nationally known soon after its formation when it ran Alain Krivine, one of the organization's main leaders, for president in the 1969 elections. Running an intense revolutionary campaign, Krivine got nearly 200,000 votes.

Since that time, the Ligue has been in the forefront of all major struggles in France—from the high-school and

university mobilizations to the fight against repression. This past spring it was instrumental in organizing the massive struggle against the Debré law, a government measure aimed at intensifying the militarization of youth.

Concurrently, the Ligue has been working to build itself a base within the working class. Its members have been involved in major strike battles, including the big auto strike in Renault and Peugeot plants last spring.

The Ligue has also been active in the struggle against the reactionary abortion law in France and has played a leading role in founding the Mouvement pour la Liberté de l'Avortement et de la Contraception (Movement for Freedom of Abortion and Contraception).

## Partisans of French-Style National Socialism

### The Ordre Nouveau Fascists

"For Alain Robert," *Le Monde* wrote in its June 13 issue, "the nationalist militants of Ordre Nouveau [New Order] represent this country's joie de vivre, for which it has singularly lost its taste."

The secretary of the fascist formation warned the convention of the group, held in the second week of June, against any temptation to become a "genteel organization." He said, according to *Le Monde*: "We are not ashamed of what we are and of what we think. We have no feeling of guilt. For us, being revolutionary is not a way of getting rid of your complexes."

In addressing the Ordre Nouveau convention, Robert was also speaking to a broad spectrum of invited guests, which, according to the June 12 *Le Monde*, went "from representatives of the MSI [Movimento Sociale Italiano—Italian Social Movement] of Almirante (whose emblem is virtually the same as that of the Front National [National Front, the rightist umbrella

In the legislative elections last spring, the Ligue and Lutte Ouvrière, another far-left group, agreed to support each other's candidates. Between them, the Ligue and LO ran 259 candidates and drew about 300,000 votes.

The Ligue has been especially active in the struggle against the fascist groups, Ordre Nouveau in the first place, and has frequently taken the lead in organizing united actions in defense of the far left and the mass movement.

"Since its creation," *Le Monde* wrote June 29, "the Ligue Communiste has little by little affirmed itself as the principal formation in the new revolutionary far left. While in 1969-1970 it had to compete with the Maoists of the former Gauche Prolétarienne [Proletarian Left], it has since come to rival the PSU [Parti Socialiste Unifié—United Socialist party], even winning over a certain number of leaders of the PSU." □

organization to which Ordre Nouveau belongs)) to the Greek colonels." The colonels, *Le Monde* noted, provided a certain republican cover!

"Formed in November 1969," the June 29 *Le Monde* wrote, commenting on the ban of the rightist organization, "Ordre Nouveau rapidly reassembled most of the cadres and activists of the far-right movement Occident [West], which was outlawed in the aftermath of the May 1968 events [in another display, presumably, of the government's "impartiality"]. But it also attracted a certain number of veteran activists coming notably from the OAS-Métro-Jeunes [the youth branch of the Organisation de l'Armée Secrète Métropolitaine—the Continental France Secret Army Organization, the section of the Algerian colonialist terrorist organization operating in France itself]."

Ordre Nouveau provided most of the activists of the Front National, a coalition of far-right groups headed by the former Poujadist deputy, Jean-

Marie Le Pen, which, the conservative daily *Le Figaro* noted in its June 29 issue, "could well serve as a substitute structure for the dispersed members of this far-right group." Despite certain generational problems among the various waves of rightists—the followers of Pétain, and the OAS, and finally tendencies of a more recent vintage looking for a new "grand plan"—the Front National represents a rather firm regroupment of the far right.

The Front National was quick to come to the defense of Ordre Nouveau after the organization was banned. In a statement published in the June 29 *Le Figaro*, it said: "Once again the government has struck indiscriminately at the forces of subversion and a national movement." It called on all "liberal and national movements to join in the protests against this violation of constitutional freedom."

Among the far-right organizations, *Le Figaro* pointed out, Ordre Nouveau fulfilled a specialized function and was distinguished by a corresponding panache.

"Partisans of French-style national socialism, raising the Celtic cross as their symbol, the activists of Ordre Nouveau modeled themselves on the Italian neofascist party, the MSI, and venerated the memory of the founder of Spanish fascism, José Antonio Primo de Rivera

"Organized in self-defense [sic] groups armed with clubs and iron bars, Ordre Nouveau specialized in fighting the far-left groups. Its headquarters on the Rue de Lombards was fortified like a pillbox."

In its recent congress, Order Nouveau projected a major campaign against "illegal" immigration, which it claimed "has reached such a level that it threatens in the near future to become an insoluble problem. This illegal, uncontrolled immigration threatens the underpinnings of our culture and our civilization and is slowly and irreversibly perverting our national heritage."

The June 21 meeting in the Mutualité, which touched off the incidents that led to the banning of Ordre Nouveau, was to kick off this campaign.

one of their vehicles and conduct a search of the Mutualité at around 10:00 a.m., without doing any damage whatsoever.

In 1971, you also protested against the fact that the police had been used, in conjunction with the helmeted Ordre Nouveau squads, to beat up isolated counterdemonstrators. This time, the fascists arrived as a group, with their materiel, under the protection of the police, and left again around midnight, again escorted by police, who accompanied them to their headquarters. There is much evidence to prove this. What is the meaning of this complicity?

The real collusion, if not deliberate collaboration, between the fascists and police officials was as cryingly obvious as in 1971, perhaps even worse. That is why we are astonished to see you take a different position.

So, why is it that this time you think it is only a matter of "*assuring freedom of expression*" and why do you so vigorously denounce "*provocateurs and professionals at demagoguery and unprovoked violence against officers who were only doing their duty within the framework of established institutions*"?

There are two possible explanations.

Either you really believe that it was a matter of defending freedom of expression and you share Prefect of Police Lenoir's view—that the [Ordre Nouveau] meeting should be considered simply an ideological one not likely to "disturb public order"; and this is false. It was a matter of an openly racist and anti-Semitic propaganda campaign. And in this sense it was intolerable and illegal even from the viewpoint of the bourgeois legality the police are supposed to defend. Only a few days ago, Ordre Nouveau militants from Nice waged such a campaign in Grasse. This helped to set off racist incidents that were conscious and deliberate and of a kind long without precedent, which almost ended with a lynching of some North African workers.

Or else, the position of the Fédération Autonome, of which you are secretary, was motivated by the fact that the damage done this time was more extensive than last time; casualties among the police were heavier than ever before. But you and your colleagues must ask yourselves about the attitude and the responsibility of

## Were Police Used in Provocative Way?

# Ligue Communiste Open Letter to Secretary of Autonomous Federation of Police Unions

[The following open letter was sent June 23 by the Political Bureau of the Ligue Communiste to Gerard Monatte, secretary of the Fédération Autonome des Syndicats de Police (Autonomous Federation of Police Unions).]

\* \* \*

Sir,

The press campaign unleashed by the regime after the June 21 demonstration calls for a response and an explanation on our part.

In particular it appears that everything is being done to weld the police together and line them up against demonstrators; with the aim, perhaps, of preparing the way for a vigorous repression against revolutionary militants and against the whole workers movement.

This is why we address you publicly.

After June 21, you strongly denounced the violence and the provocations of the demonstrators.

On this occasion, we would like to recall a precedent—that of the meeting held by Ordre Nouveau in the Palais des Sports on March 9, 1971, a meeting that also gave rise to some confrontations between counterdemonstrators and the police.

At that time, you protested the fact that the fascists had been knowingly allowed to arm themselves and to transform the Palais des Sports into an armed camp. This time, did the regime take account of this precedent? Not at all. All during the morning of June 21, the fascists were allowed to build up their arsenal at the Mutualité in complete calm. That is why we ourselves were obliged to intercept

the minister of the interior and the prefect of police themselves.

First of all, by their flagrant complicity with the fascists, they infuriated the counterdemonstrators. Then, on several occasions, isolated police cars or officers turned up in the midst of the contingents of the counterdemonstration, to the point that it is worth asking whether they were not being used cynically as bait, in the hope that serious incidents would occur. Thus, the two police first-aid cars that were attacked at the corner of the Jardin des Plantes and the Place de la Bastille were vigorously exploited by the sensationalist press. The driver of the first car, perhaps gripped by panic, drove directly into the crowd; one demonstrator was seriously wounded in the legs. At the Place de la Bastille, the car was stationed right in front of the contingents, but visible from far off; that is, it had time enough to leave. This car was attacked; the police inside were seriously burned; but as much eyewitness testimony can attest, it was the demonstrators' defense guard that came to the policemen's aid, even though one of them, who had panicked, had drawn his revolver.

It appears to us that police authorities deliberately exposed the police and exploited the resulting incidents to create a pogrom climate against revolutionists. At the very moment that the regime is using *Ordre Nouveau* against the revolutionary groups, using the yellow-union CFT [Confédération Française des Travailleurs—French Confederation of Workers] against strikers, it is also seeking to strengthen fascist tendencies among the police, as the recent police congress illustrates. It is not an accident that Marcellin's declaration at Vannes came exactly on June 21 itself.

Things must be made clear. We clashed with police who were physically protecting a fascist meeting. We are not among those who believe that the police force can be reformed; we believe the police to be a repressive instrument forged by the bourgeoisie for its own use. We therefore think that the police, by their very function, serve the employers against the workers, protect the fascists against revolutionists. But we do not hold all individual policemen responsible for



*Ordre Nouveau's* symbol as *Le Monde* sees it.

the role of the police. There are among them sons of workers, small peasants, and merchants, people who joined the police force not as a career, but because they were pressed by unemployment. Today the regime is capitaliz-

ing on their indignation in order better to prepare the police to intervene against the workers, as has already been done in Besançon and in Fos.

Finally, to sum up, we have two questions:

Do you consider it natural for you to be used to protect fascists and to intervene against strikers struggling to improve their wages and working conditions?

Do you not think that what really is responsible for bringing discredit on the police is the impunity that has to this day been enjoyed by those who disfigured Richard Deshayes or those (more and more numerous) who launch their tear-gas grenades into demonstrations, or those who brutalize or assassinate prisoners in the police stations (Mohammed Diab!), or those who under cover of their jobs serve as carriers or procurers in the drug traffic.

Our sincere greetings,  
Political Bureau of  
the Ligue Communiste

## 'When Fascism Raises Its Head...'

# Press Interview With Alain Krivine

[The following is a resumé of the statements made by Alain Krivine, general secretary of the Ligue Communiste (Communist League, French section of the Fourth International) at a press conference June 25 (before the banning of the Ligue) in the sacked offices of his organization. Although all the Paris papers were represented, only drastically abridged versions of Krivine's remarks were published. The police raid on the Ligue headquarters followed a demonstration June 21 against a rally held by the fascist organization *Ordre Nouveau* (New Order).]

\* \* \*

1. To begin with, let me make one thing clear: We are not for "urban guerrilla warfare" or rural guerrilla warfare, or anything of the sort. We do not think we can take power by hitting the police one by one with molotov cocktails. The revolution will

not be made by 3,000; 5,000; or 10,000; or even 100,000 demonstrators. We resort to violence on a minority basis when we are forced to and when it can be understood by the masses.

We are not putschists. Only mass action can put an end to the fascist gangs. Likewise, only the mass mobilization of the workers can successfully repel the attacks on strike pickets by the CRS [Compagnies Républicaines de Sécurité—Republican Security Companies, the special riot police], the SAC [Service d'Action Civique—Civic Action Service], the CDR [Comité de Défense de la République—Committees to Defend the Republic, Gaullist goon squads], and the CFT [Confédération Française des Travailleurs—French Confederation of Workers, an association of company unions that has become a professional strike-breaking outfit].

2. But you cannot avoid your responsibilities. As long as it is not too late, fascism can be crushed in the

egg. We are young but we have better memories than the older people. We do not want to see a recurrence of what happened a few decades ago. When fascism raises its head, there is always the same reaction:

"They are no threat, there will always be time to act, etc."

And then one fine day it is too late.

No freedom of speech for racists and anti-Semites! And since all the traditional workers and democratic organizations have failed to assume their responsibilities, the revolutionists have had to do it.

We carried out the June 21 action as a test, a warning to the nation. We have shown the way.

3. What happened was the fault of the government. It was the government that authorized and protected the Nazi rally. It deliberately stationed its police [between the demonstrators and the *Ordre Nouveau* (ON) meeting], making them at once targets and protectors of the Nazis.

[Interior Minister] Marcellin's statements in Vannes before the rally revealed the trap he wanted to lay, with the police as bait. All the press has highlighted the complicity of the police with the ON monitors both before and after the rally.

4. ON is a little Nazi grouplet, but it is drawing strength from the development of fascist tendencies, among other places in the state apparatus and the police. Capital has both its legal armed gangs (the police and the army) and its illegal ones (which it turns to when the former are not enough). The SAC, CDR, CFT, and ON have the job of attacking and weakening the workers and revolutionary organizations.

In the face of armed attacks, there is no effective "democratic" answer; you have to organize for self-defense, even if you can't win without the participation of the mobilized masses.

5. Racist and anti-Semitic campaigns are developing on a large scale and in a hysterical atmosphere. One example is Grasse, where there was a full-fledged pogrom against the immigrant workers.

There is the example of Nice, where the ON wanted to prevent any expansion of the revolutionary groups.

In the suburbs of Paris, Arab cafes have been attacked in recent days. Communist party headquarters have been attacked. Anti-Semitic articles

have appeared in *Minute* or other far-right publications such as *Ordre Nouveau*. All this demands a firm response today.

6. The struggle must be broadened. We are not carrying on a private feud with ON, neither in Marseilles nor in St. Etienne. We have set an example.

It is the duty of the workers organizations to continue the counter-attack by organizing united action on a nonexclusionist basis of all antifas-



ALAIN KRIVINE: Arrested under "anti-wrecker law."

cists. To this end, we make a solemn appeal to all the worker and democratic organizations.

7. Finally, we direct ourselves to Gérard Monatte, the leader of the police union. The responsibility of the government in the June 21 events must be clearly brought out. As for the policemen injured in the police medical cars (in the Place de la Bastille and the Boulevard de l'Hôpital), the picture in *Libération* showing our comrades going to the aid of the policeman and the injured person disproves the claim in *France Soir* that they were in a sadistic fury.

8. As regards the sacking of our headquarters, four questions:

● Who made the decision for this operation? Why was the sentence in one edition of *Le Monde* that said that the local police authorities knew nothing about the search dropped in in the following edition? Who, what leaders, what section of the police occupied the headquarters of the *Ligue Communiste*?

● Was there a warrant? No. Did they do it on the principle of "hot pursuit"? Yes. But why, then, was the search carried out six and a half hours after the end of all the demonstrations? After so long a time you cannot claim the right of "hot pursuit."

● The search was carried out without any witnesses. Pierre Rousset asked to be present during the search. By way of an answer, they locked him in the guard room and took away his trousers.

● Is taking hostages part of the law? Twenty-five comrades were arrested and fourteen charged just because they were in the headquarters. But the person legally responsible for the headquarters and the *Société Internationale des Editions* [International Publishers], Pierre Frank, was the only one who could be served with a summons in connection with the search. At no time did the cops take any legal step.

But they broke everything and even trampled on the books. It was like something out of "Fahrenheit 451" [a film that describes a police state where all books are burned].

9. And what about the weapons? It is not our policy to stock them. The idea of guerrilla warfare today is absurd. But there was a reason—a simple one. These weapons were brought to us ten days ago by an unknown person. Provocation or irresponsibility? The persons who took these weapons were afraid they might fall victim to provocation if they tried to get rid of them immediately. They could have been seized at the door of the headquarters. They decided to wait to remove them.

It was irresponsible that this was never done. But the two rifles (one dating back to the first world war!) were not hidden. Far from it; they were in an accessible wall cupboard. We treated this problem as a minor one.

At some time or another all organizations (the SP, the CP, or us) are confronted with such situations. Virtually no one on the Political Bureau knew anything about it. The first to be surprised must have been Pierre Rousset.

We call for an arms expert to examine these weapons (the rifles may not even work or the grenade that was brought in with them, about which we know nothing).

As for molotov cocktails, it is true the we had a few. They were to defend the headquarters, which was attacked only a month ago by *Ordre Nouveau* with molotov cocktails. The rest of the defensive material was nothing but water bottles and steel bars. Every organization has this sort of thing around its headquarters.

10. Pierre Rousset has not participated in any demonstration (not even in selling *Rouge*, which can also get you arrested) since he got his eight-month suspended sentence. This is why he stayed at the headquarters that evening. His arrest looks like taking a hostage. We demand his immediate

release. We will wage a major campaign to win it.

The twenty comrades arrested by the police and the fourteen detained have been the object of numerous racist, anti-Semitic, and fascist insults from the police.

We are beginning a big campaign for pledges to pay for the damage to our headquarters and to continue the antifascist campaign.

We appeal to the working press to help counteract the campaign against the *Ligue Communiste* and the *Union des Antifascistes* [Antifascist Union] in the papers and on radio and television. □

## Socialist Workers Party Statement

### Solidarity With the *Ligue Communiste*!

[The following statement was issued by the Political Bureau of the Socialist Workers party in New York July 1.]

\* \* \*

On June 28 the Council of Ministers acceded to the demand of Minister of the Interior Raymond Marcellin to outlaw the *Ligue Communiste*, French section of the Fourth International.

This blow against the French Trotskyists is a blow against the entire left in France, including the trade unions. By beginning with what appears to him to be an isolated sector, de Gaulle's heir, President Pompidou, hopes to dampen the growing militancy of the entire workers and students movement. If he can get away with it in the case of the *Ligue Communiste*, he will proceed with similar moves against other sectors.

To make it appear that the *Ligue Communiste* was not being singled out, the council also ordered dissolution of the fascist organization *Ordre Nouveau*. This has not fooled anyone. The *Ordre Nouveau* has enjoyed special relations with Marcellin's police and will continue to be shielded and protected as a fascist reserve.

Thus the most diverse organizations and personalities—including the Communist and Socialist parties—have issued declarations denouncing the ban-

ning of the *Ligue Communiste* despite deep political differences, in some instances, with the French Trotskyists.

Outside of France, expressions of opposition to the banning of the *Ligue Communiste* and of solidarity in the defense of its democratic rights have already begun to mount. Particularly in Western Europe, even demonstrations have already been organized by the far left with sympathetic support from a broad spectrum of political tendencies.

Already sufficient evidence has come to light to inspire demands that the role of the police in connection with the provocative racist meeting staged by the *Ordre Nouveau* June 21 be investigated. One of the questions being asked is why the Pompidou government decided to grant permission to the fascists to hold such a meeting.

In Paris, with its bitter memories of the Nazis and of a previous generation of French fascists, the inflammatory slogans suggesting racist violence that were used to publicize the meeting inevitably caused a big reaction.

At the meeting itself, members of the *Ordre Nouveau* arrived armed with such "persuaders" as molotov cocktails, iron bars, chains, and similar weapons, which they have used in setting upon members of the labor movement in the streets in the recent period. They were protected by a large

mobilization of police, who made no effort whatsoever to disarm or to arrest fascists illegally armed in this fashion.

The *Ligue Communiste* called for a counterdemonstration in the area of the meeting. The call was well received. Crowds many times the size of the assemblage of fascists arrived.

They did not hesitate to show what they thought of this brazen attempt to give momentum to a new fascist movement in France. Scuffling broke out in various places, being conducted in many instances outside the control of the *Ligue Communiste*. Here and there members of the police force, caught between the two sides, were badly injured.

In a broader context, the outlawing of the *Ligue Communiste* is another ominous step in an international campaign waged against the Fourth International by the most reactionary forces, particularly the political police, in various countries. Among previous moves it is sufficient to recall the bans issued by the French, the U.S., the Swiss, the Australian, and the West German governments against Ernest Mandel entering those countries to lecture on economics.

The Socialist Workers party appeals for international solidarity with the *Ligue Communiste* of France.

It asks that protests against the outlawing of the *Ligue Communiste* be lodged on as wide a scale as possible with diplomatic representatives of the French government in other countries.

Let the Pompidou regime know that the arbitrary actions of its political police do not escape notice internationally.

Rescind the ban on the *Ligue Communiste*!

Let's act on the slogan of the international working class: An Injury to One Is an Injury to All!

#### Taiwanese Extradited to U. S.

Cheng Tzu-tsai, the Taiwanese architect accused of participating in an unsuccessful attempt on the life of Chiang Kai-shek's son in New York in April 1970, has been returned to the United States after a long battle to avoid extradition from Britain. He jumped bail two years ago while awaiting sentencing in the assassination attempt.

Demonstrators from World United Formosans for Independence in New York said they fear he will be returned to Taiwan and executed. □

## The Elections in Northern Ireland

By Gerry Foley

"The results of the election for a new Northern Ireland Assembly provide modest hopes for moving the bitterly divided province toward workable government and peace," the *New York Times* wrote in a July 2 editorial on the elections for the new local assembly in Northern Ireland. What inspired these "modest hopes" on the part of this organ of American imperialism was the relative success of the "moderate" bourgeois parties in the June 28 vote in the British imperialist enclave of Northern Ireland. "Altogether, the political forces willing to bury old differences and share power on a proportional basis across sectarian lines will control more than two-thirds of the seats in the 78-member Assembly."

The official Unionists, the section of the traditional proimperialist party that continues to operate more or less within the mainstream of British Tory politics, won 25 seats.

The alliance of demagogic reactionaries led by the Belfast government's former minister of the interior William Craig and the Bible-pounding preacher Ian Paisley won 18 seats. Both reactionary leaders favor more desperate and risky means of preserving the Protestant proimperialist ascendancy than the official party, but at present they advance different tactics. Craig threatens the British government with a Rhodesian-type declaration of independence if it continues to make concessions to the Catholics at the expense of the Protestant ascendancy. Paisley on the other hand sees the best way of maintaining the Protestant caste as total integration into Britain.

In addition to the official Unionists and the extremist bloc, seven independent Unionists were elected.

The Social Democratic and Labour party, an amalgamation of the old antipartitionist parties, including some modern Catholic bourgeois figures who won their reputations in the civil-rights movement, swept the nationalist vote, winning 19 seats. The North-

ern Ireland Labour party won one seat. The liberal Unionists of the Alliance party won eight.

The SDLP's share of the popular vote was 23% as against a total of 62% for all the right-wing Unionists. The Catholic, or nationalist, community represents somewhat more than a third of the Northern Irish population but has a higher percentage of youth under voting age.

Nonetheless, the vote totals indicate that the Alliance party, which was created as an instrument for reconciling the Catholic and Protestant bourgeoisie within the framework of "modern Unionism," won the majority of its votes from Catholics.

Public opinion polls over the last few years have indicated that a section of the Catholic population was looking toward a solution to communal strife within the framework of



WILLIAM CRAIG

union with Britain. This is the inevitable result of the pressure of imperialism and the powerful Protestant community on the nationalist minor-

ity and its weak, capitulationist bourgeoisie. Pressures for "reconciliation" are weaker in the dominant community.

The fact that the overwhelming majority of the Catholic community voted for the SDLP, which although a bourgeois party is identified with rejection of the partition, indicates that the nationalist-minded people are not ready to surrender to Unionism. The main prospects for leading the nationalist community into a reconciliation with British rule thus lie in a slow, careful sellout by the SDLP. The *New York Times* editorial put it in these terms:

"Everything now depends on the ability of the official Unionists and the S. D. L. P. to surmount traditional suspicions and collaborate on the 12-member Executive Council that will be organized from the Assembly to govern the province under British supervision. Though it won only eight seats, the interdenominational Alliance party will make its own positive contribution to the coalition as well as help to build bridges between the two large sectarian forces."

However, if the election results did not show that the nationalist community is quite ready for "peace at any price," they did indicate that the militant anti-imperialists have become isolated from the large majority of the oppressed population.

"What the election demonstrates above all is the overwhelming desire of a vast majority in Northern Ireland for an end to violence," the *New York Times* editorial said. "The turnout was an impressive 72 per cent. The drive of the militant I. R. A. Provisionals to get Catholics to spoil their ballots failed spectacularly. The Official I. R. A. entered 10 candidates and failed to elect a single one of them."

A large poll was favored by the new proportional representation system that encouraged Catholics to vote in Protestant areas where heretofore, being in such a small minority, they would not have bothered. However, the vote does indicate that the struggle in the North is in a defensive phase and that the overwhelming majority of the oppressed population are looking, at least for the moment, toward parliamentary solutions.

For example, the bourgeois political leadership of the nationalist community, which had been severely shak-



en by the rise of the civil-rights movement and had come within inches of being irreparably thrown off balance by the crisis that flared in the summer of 1971 and reached its culmination in January-February 1972, has re-consolidated itself in a renovated Catholic communalist party.

In this context, the Officials' decision to run candidates seems to have been proved correct. Running revolutionary candidates in bourgeois elections offers the opportunity to educate and consolidate a body of activists and train them in the methods of reaching out to entire communities. In particular, their participating in the Northern Ireland elections will make repression of the Officials more difficult for the regime, which needs in this stage to hold out the prospect of greater political democracy to the oppressed community.

The 2 percent of the popular vote reportedly won by the Official candidates reflects the fact that the "Marxist IRA" does not as yet have a mass political following among any major section of the Irish population. The strong presence of the Officials in a few scattered neighborhoods, as well as the historic reputation of the IRA, has tended to obscure this reality.

The Official republican movement is essentially a small, left, propaganda party. The extent that it will be able to consolidate gains from its electoral campaigns depends on its assessing its real position very clearly. In the first place, if the Official activists think that their organization can immediately become a major factor in parliamentary politics, they are bound to become demoralized.

By their nature, bourgeois elections lag far behind the real relationship of forces in the community. The weight of the older, more conservative layers of the population is exaggerated. Voting tends to follow ingrained traditional patterns. The mass of voters not involved in direct campaigns against at least one aspect or another of bourgeois society are in essence politically passive and subject to manipulation by the capitalist media and political machines. Furthermore, consciousness tends to lag behind action. Remaining essentially under the influence of bourgeois political concepts, many persons willing to follow the leadership of the republicans in direct action will still not consider them a

"serious alternative" in the parliamentary field.

Secondly, a misunderstanding of the real tasks of a propaganda party would lead the Official republicans into throwing away opportunities for politically educating their ranks and for getting out key political ideas to a widening circle of the population in return for really quite insignificant vote gains.

The essential purpose of a revolutionary party participating in capitalist elections is to put a revolutionary program before the masses of the people. This program must be related to the immediate concerns of the peo-



IAN PAISLEY

ple and seem as reasonable as possible; otherwise, it is easy for the capitalist politicians to dismiss the revolutionists' campaign as "unserious" and deny them legal rights and facilities. But they have to offer a clear, fundamental alternative to the system.

In Ireland in particular, there is little perspective for gradually building up a strong "left" party on the basis of piecemeal practical demands a little more radical than the most generous of the bourgeois or reformist parties. The political situation in a chronically unstable country like Ireland tends to shift rapidly from explosive to conservative; the mood of the masses swings from wild hopes

to profound demoralization and back again.

The main purpose of revolutionary election campaigns, particularly in periods of temporary ebb or retreat in the mass struggle, is to prepare the way politically for explosive crises of the system that will enable revolutionists to mobilize and lead the masses. In their campaign in the Southern general elections at the end of February, the Official republicans failed to follow this principle. While it may have gained them a few more votes than a clearly revolutionary campaign would have won (but not enough to mean very much), the centrist campaign that they ran did little to consolidate a revolutionary party or project a clear revolutionary alternative.

The results of the Northern campaign are not yet clear. But it seems likely that a centrist approach could be especially damaging to the Officials in this area. It would not appeal to the most alienated section of the oppressed community, particularly the youth too young to vote, who will be in the center of future revolutionary battles. At the same time, disappointment at a small vote would send all those who still think in the fundamentally opportunistic terms inculcated by bourgeois society, both ultraleftists and reformists, in search of new gimmicks for quick success that could be particularly disorienting and dangerous in the difficult context of the North.

In any case, the three electoral campaigns run by the Officials in this spring and early summer represent an important attempt by an experienced cadre of revolutionary-minded activists to build an effective political leadership for the anti-imperialist struggle in Ireland. □

#### **Tripped on Their Own Rhetoric**

The Australian followers of the Socialist Labour League, the sectarian British group led by Gerry Healy, have produced what is undoubtedly the most original analysis yet of the Watergate scandal. The May 4 issue of their paper carried the following information:

"But whether Nixon holds on to the reins of power or not, both the Democrats and the Republicans will be vying with each other to provide the new legislation necessary for stepped up trade war and mounting attacks on the American ruling class."

## The Struggle in Chile Revives

By Hugo Blanco

Santiago

JUNE 22—With the paradoxical strike by the copper miners of El Teniente serving as the starting point, the past week has seen an increasing unfolding of mobilizations by the left and the right.

The paradox of the Teniente strike lies in the fact that although it is a strike in which the workers are struggling for demands that defend their standard of living in the face of the runaway inflation that is plaguing Chile, from an early stage it was branded a "fascist approach" by practically the entire left (mainly the Unidad Popular [Popular Unity], and to a lesser extent the MIR [Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria—Movement of the Revolutionary Left]). This was a godsend for the right, which in October had already experienced how dangerous it was to confront the working class as a whole, but which now has an opportunity to divide the workers by supporting this and other conflicts condemned by the UP. There is no doubt that this right-wing maneuver is facilitated by the lack of sufficient political clarity among certain sectors of the working class, such as the miners, who, by not vigorously exposing the rightist ploy, are isolating themselves from their class brothers.

Within this confused context stands out the clear position of the Partido Socialista Revolucionario (PSR—Revolutionary Socialist Party), Chilean section of the Fourth International, which is denouncing the ploy of the right and showing how reformism is aiding the right by qualifying the struggles of the workers for their demands as "fascist." Unfortunately, the smallness of the PSR's forces makes it impossible for it to bring its position to large sectors of the working class.

It was in this atmosphere of confusion that the march of the striking miners to Santiago last week took place. This was used as a pretext for the right, including fascist bands, to mobilize, claiming that they were

taking to the streets "in support of the miners." The UP played into their hands by attempting to halt the advance of the miners and by calling on the people to prevent these workers from "taking over the government house." Fortunately, there were few clashes between workers because the miners acted only in a defensive fashion. Those who were really very active were the fascist bands.

Confrontations occurred throughout the entire downtown area of Santiago, where tear gas hung in the air. In one of these confrontations, Nilton da Silva, a Brazilian revolutionist, was murdered. Da Silva had been forced to leave his own country by the monstrous repression with which the military dictatorship defends its existence. Nilton da Silva was a member of the MIR in Chile, and fell as a new Che Guevara, a symbol of proletarian internationalism.

His death stirred the masses of the left with indignation, and his funeral was a vigorous demonstration of a determination to struggle. The right called attention to the fact that he was a foreigner as proof that "there are foreign agitators." The UP tried to obscure this fact. The MIR, fortunately did single it out, mainly through one of its speakers, who spoke "in the name of the foreign members of the MIR."

Street incidents continued in Santiago and other cities during the following days, one of their prominent features being attacks by fascist groups, which assaulted the headquarters of left-wing political groups and carried out other armed attacks.

The show of strength by the right reached its high point with a demonstration "in support of the miners" that attracted around 80,000 persons.

Along with this, in the parliament the right moved to censure three ministers, and the National party declared in the pages of *El Mercurio* [a major right-wing daily] that "in the light of justice and morality, no one is obliged to respect or obey a government that

has ceased to be legitimate." Its next move was to call on Congress to "consider the illegitimacy of the activity" of the government.

In response to this rightist escalation, the CUT (Central Unica de Trabajadores—Workers Central Union) found itself forced to call a strike and a demonstration for June 21.

Anticipating that the mobilization would be a success, the right had the foolishness to call for a "strike of Chile" against the government for the same day, urging people "not to leave their houses," and "to present the picture of a lifeless city."

There was unquestionably nothing lifeless about Santiago yesterday, with hundreds of thousands of demonstrators winding through its streets. Huge columns from the Vicuña Mackena Cordón and other sectors gathered in the hotbed of reaction—Providencia. One could not tell whether the rattling of windows was the result of the deafening voices of the demonstrators or the trembling of the terrorized parasites inside their homes.

Thus the working class defended its gains, among which it included the government that it had put into office.

Together with unenthusiastic chants like "No to civil war," and "I stand in line but, no matter what, I am sticking with the UP," could be heard other, more vigorous chants, like "If the parasites want war, that's what they'll get," "How do you prevent or win a civil war? By struggling and creating people's power," and "Create, create a popular militia."

About one million persons gathered in Constitution Square and the adjacent streets in the biggest demonstration in recent years. In spite of the transport strike, there were many people who came from outlying suburban shantytowns. Unlike earlier demonstrations, this time workers came with their work vehicles—tractors, trucks, garbage trucks, etc.

Large crowds also took to the streets in other cities.

Allende and Godoy, president of the CUT, spoke in a much less lukewarm tone than at the May Day demonstration. Among other things, Allende had to pick up on the chants for "creating people's power," but he did so by explaining that this should not be done in contradiction to the government. He threatened to ban Patria

y Libertad (Fatherland and Freedom) and to bring to trial the leaders of the National party because of their seditious manifesto.

Godoy spoke of the need to centralize the distribution and supply of food.

The UP press is reprinting Godoy's speech, but not Allende's. It could be that he said something that was not in the script in response to the gigantic chorus with which the entire crowd greeted his speech. "Firm Hand! Firm Hand!" they roared. The criticism appeared to strike home, because he began by stating that he had never used a gentle hand, and later on he said that his was not a reformist government; yet he mixed this up with charges that the right had "branded [!] his government as Marxist without respect to the military ministers."

Repeated appeals for people to re-

main calm did not stop the masses from stoning the headquarters of Patria y Libertad and the Catholic University.

A large number of the demonstrators carried clubs or "spears" without attempting to conceal them.

The reviving of the masses of the left can also be seen in the occupation of various ranches by peasants in Maipú, near the Cerrillos Cordón; the take-overs were supported by the workers in the zone.

It is also worth noting that the Vicuña Mackena Cordón is becoming more active.

In addition, *El Mercurio* was suspended from publishing for six days. [An appeals court invalidated the closure, enabling the newspaper to resume publication on June 23, after not coming out for one day.] □

Bulnes Square, while shooting continued for more than an hour after the action began."

The government said that twenty-two persons were killed, most of them civilians, and at least thirty-two wounded. The civilian victims appear to have been caught in cross-fire. UPI described the scene inside the presidential palace in a dispatch published in the July 1 issue of the New York Spanish-language daily *El Diario-La Prensa*: "Bullets bounced off the marble walls. Various persons who were in the vestibule were hit by these bullets. One man, wounded in the neck, cried: 'My god! My god!'"

"Two or three dozen persons were seen wounded, for the most part, it appears, by gunfire."

Not everyone left the zone. "Thousands of curious persons congregated in the side streets, catching glimpses of the fighting from the intersections, retreating and falling to the ground when the fighting heated up, but returning when attacking forces . . . let up."

At 10:00 a. m., Allende went on radio to appeal for people to remain calm and stay out of the area. He called on the workers to take control of their factories and to await further instructions. "People must remain calm," he said, "for I have complete confidence that loyal forces will normalize the situation."

Left-wing broadcasts urged workers at communications centers and hospitals to keep the buildings under their control.

*New York Times* correspondent Jonathan Kandell reported from Santiago June 29 that spokesmen for the main opposition party, the Christian Democrats, called for support of the government and constitutional order. "We Christian Democrats have a long tradition of fighting for democracy," said Claudio Huepe, a Christian Democratic member of the Chamber of Deputies, in a broadcast during the revolt. He called for support to "the constitutional government" and urged his party's followers, "Stay in your houses."

Shortly after noon, Allende arrived at the presidential palace. By 1:00 p. m., he was able to announce that the revolt had been put down. The government, he said, would use "all means to reach the real culprits and as always they will try to disguise their responsibility."

## Allende Declares State of Emergency

# Attempted Coup in Chile Foiled

By David Thorstad

As office workers in the downtown section of Santiago were heading for work on the morning of June 29, they got caught in traffic jams created by the heavy fighting going on around the presidential palace. Rebel troops from the Second Armored Regiment stationed on the outskirts of Santiago had chosen that morning to attempt a coup against the Popular Unity government of President Salvador Allende.

Fewer than 150 of the 900 troops in the regiment took part in the coup, which was headed by Colonel Roberto Souper. There was no sign of support from either the navy, the air force, or the rest of the army. It was all over three hours after it began.

The Buenos Aires daily *La Razón* carried the following early report from United Press International in its June 29 edition:

"An intense shoot-out began when the armored cars and the soldiers reached the Moneda presidential palace, and the cracking of gunfire could be heard throughout the entire center of town, while the civilian population fled the area.

"The armored cars and tanks reached Bulnes Square, in front of the Moneda Palace, just after 9:00 a. m. and immediately began their martial activity. Buses and other means of collective transportation quickly got out of the area of fighting, as did the civilians who were in the vicinity. Other armored cars were posted at the Ministry of Defense, located on the other side of La Alameda, which runs in front of the presidential palace; one of the tanks was placed in the door of the ministry itself, thereby blocking the entrance.

"The carabineer corps of police guarding the presidential palace responded to the shooting as the armored cars circled the building. Various projectiles hit the residences that face onto Bulnes Square; one of these contains the offices of United Press.

"Some radio stations reported that they had seen some passers by fall wounded in the streets, while ambulance sirens added a note of distress in the middle of all the confusion. The office workers who managed to evacuate the area left the sector around

"Shortly after the revolt had been quelled," reported Kandell, "pro-Government supporters marched through the streets on the periphery of a heavy cordon of loyal troops surrounding the Presidential palace.

"A united left will never be defeated," the demonstrators chanted. "Allende, Allende, the people are defending you."

Later that evening, Allende spoke to thousands of cheering supporters. He accused members of the fascistlike group *Patria y Libertad* (Fatherland and Freedom) of having participated in the revolt. Some of them, he said, had taken refuge in foreign embassies when it failed.

Reuters reported July 1 that five members of the organization had sought political asylum in the Ecuadorian embassy.

According to a report in the June 29 *La Razón*, Communist Senator Luis Valente Rossi charged that there had been an "invasion of mercenary troops" in the northern part of the country and that *Patria y Libertad* had helped to organize it. "The legislator claimed that it was an attempt to create border problems and that persons from *Patria y Libertad* were traveling by plane to the northern zone and preparing an option for an incursion of troops through this sector; they were said to be doing this with Arturo Marshall, former Chilean army major who headed various subversive movements and who is living in voluntary exile in Bolivia. Orders for his arrest are out for having violated the law on state internal security."

Following the attempted coup, a state of emergency, already in effect in O'Higgins and Santiago provinces, was extended to the rest of the country's twenty-five provinces.

The revolt came some twenty-four hours after General Mario Sepúlveda, commander of the emergency zone in the Santiago region, announced that a "barracks revolt" had been crushed in the egg. The aim of the thwarted revolt, he said, had been to "break the institutional processes" of the military. Arrests of its leaders, he said, "have totally aborted this barracks uprising."

On June 28, Minister of Defense José Tohá told the parliament that nine officers, among them seven sergeants, had been arrested for taking part in a plot to overthrow the government.

Government spokesmen provided few details of the thwarted conspiracy, not



SALVADOR ALLENDE

even revealing the regiment involved. According to a report by Kandell in the July 1 *New York Times*, however, it was the same regiment that attempted the coup the following day. Indeed, he reported, Colonel Souper "was about to be arrested as the head of a barracks plot uncovered by army officials earlier in the week" when he went ahead and led the abortive coup attempt.

The announcement that the "barracks revolt" had been crushed followed what the government described as an attempted assassination June 27 of the army commander in chief, General Carlos Prats González. "Government dailies," reported the Buenos Aires daily *Clarín* June 29, "label the incident a plot to kidnap or—according to some—to assassinate the former minister of the interior. The opposition press says that it was a simple incident between a woman and General Prats."

Kandell gave the following account of the incident in the June 28 *New York Times*: "The General, Carlos Prats González, was riding in his chauffeur-driven Ford when a middle-aged woman in a small red Renault passed his vehicle on a main avenue. Recognizing General Prats—who has been increasingly accused by conservatives as a supporter of the Marxist Government—the woman stuck out her tongue.

"During a brief chase, General Prats allegedly fired twice—once into the air and once at the vehicle—before the woman stopped her car.

"According to witnesses living in houses overlooking the scene of the incident, General Prats descended from his car and approached the woman, brandishing a pistol and demanding that she apologize."

A near riot ensued, during which the tires on Prats's car were deflated.

The woman, Alejandrina Cox Palma de Valdivieso, when asked why she stuck her tongue out at the general replied that she did it "because I enjoyed doing so."

The government took a dimmer view of the incident; it declared a state of emergency throughout the capital region. It said that the housewife's car had hemmed in the general's, leading him to think that he was about to become the victim of a terrorist attack. The general secretary of the government, Anibal Palma, called it "a strange siege" and said it "bore all the characteristics of an ambush."

In the wake of the attempted coup, Allende's position appears to have been strengthened. So does the likelihood that he will again try to name military officers to posts in his government.

Allende out singled General Prats as the man most responsible for putting down the army revolt. Prats personally supervised the military operations around the presidential palace. Photographs of him carrying a machine gun and leading loyal troops will no doubt help refurbish his image, tarnished somewhat by the Cox incident.

Allende himself, who had been warning for weeks of "fascist plots" against his government, will use the abortive coup to strengthen his image as an upholder of the bourgeois constitution and to cast his bourgeois opponents as the "subversives." "Even some of the more moderate members of the Opposition today compared the effects of the revolt to the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba [in] 1961, which followed repeated warnings by Fidel Castro that his Government was being threatened and which strengthened his popular support," observed Kandell in a June 30 dispatch from Santiago. "In a congratulatory message to Dr. Allende last night, the Cuban Premier was quick to liken the episodes." □

### Nixon, Sihanouk Move Toward Agreement

"If they [the Congress] knuckle under now," Congressman Wayne Hays told reporters June 27, "I'll offer an end-the-war amendment to everything that comes along. I think we ought to accept the challenge. If the president wants to shut down the government, shut it down."

"He might find it dangerous. People might find they can get along without it—especially the White House."

The alleged fighting mood of Hays and other members of Congress lasted for almost two days, at which point they gave in and voted Nixon funds to continue the bombing of Cambodia for another six weeks.

The June 29 measure, politely described as a "compromise," came after Nixon had vetoed a measure that would have ended funds for the bombing immediately. As a concession to wounded Congressional feelings, Nixon promised that he would initiate no military actions in Indochina after August 15 without asking the approval of Congress.

Nixon had already indicated that this would be all the time he would need to work out a deal acceptable to U.S. imperialism with Norodom Sihanouk. In a closed-door meeting with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee June 28, Secretary of State William Rogers specified August 15 as the date by which Nixon expected U.S. forces to be "disengaged" from Cambodia.

The brief intransigence of Congress was easily overcome by the accumulating evidence that Washington's détente with Peking and Moscow will make it possible for Nixon to achieve the kind of Cambodian settlement he seeks. The *Washington Post* pointed out the realities of the situation in a June 29 editorial. Ostensibly a criticism of Nixon's veto of the immediate bombing cutoff, the editorial actually provided the rationale for giving Nixon an additional six weeks to work out a deal:

". . . it is indisputable that, no matter what government sits in Phnom Penh, Hanoi will be able to keep using Cambodia for purposes of supply and sanctuary in South Vietnam. Mr.

Nixon and everybody else knew this perfectly well in January. He signed the cease-fire agreement anyway—for the good reason that he counted on



SIHANOUK: Acceptable to Nixon

South Vietnam's coping for itself despite the problem of the Cambodian flank. . . .

"As for Mr. Nixon's contention that a bombing halt would deal 'a serious blow to America's international credibility,' it is nonsense—a relic of a way of thinking about international affairs which has been rendered obsolete by, among other things, Mr. Nixon's own considerable achievement in improving relations with Russia and China."

The Saigon puppets would in reality have a great deal of trouble "coping" with a *revolutionary* government in Pnompenh, but it would seem that the U.S. imperialists have concluded that there is no longer a serious threat of such a government.

The key to the situation is Sihanouk, who has convinced Washington that he is able to control the insurgent forces.

". . . the Administration," *New York*

*Times* correspondent Bernard Gwertzman wrote in a June 30 dispatch from Washington, "reportedly informed Peking, Hanoi and Moscow that it had made a policy decision to accept . . . Sihanouk . . . as a participant in any future negotiations that include the Government of Lon Nol in Phnom Penh."

After a briefing by administration officials, Senate Democratic party leader Mike Mansfield predicted that when Sihanouk returns to Peking from his tour of Africa and East Europe, "the tempo for possible negotiations will be stepped up, and I believe that in this respect, the People's Republic of China and our government are in close contact."

Nixon has spent the last few months performing plastic surgery on Lon Nol's "government" in order to make it possible for Sihanouk to negotiate a deal without losing face. The cosmetic measures have included the de facto exile of Lon Nol's brother and the creation of a four-man council as the first step in easing Lon Nol out of the picture. In a dispatch from Paris to the June 25 *Far Eastern Economic Review*, Edith Lenart described some further moves in prospect:

"Having persuaded Lon Nol to share his power, the Americans are now preparing to ship the President to the US (ostensibly for medical treatment), putting Sirik Matak in the top seat. Should Sirik Matak prove unacceptable in talks with the other side, Washington, it seems, is prepared to scuttle him, too. In that event, the next man in line is Son Sann, who has already been involved in unofficial negotiations with Sihanoukist exiles here."

Lenart also reported that at the time of Kissinger's visit to China in February, a member of his party met with Sihanouk.

Sihanouk himself was heard from on June 30, when he granted an interview to Henry Kamm of the *New York Times*. The interview took place in Rumania, where Sihanouk is on a "nonofficial" visit.

Sihanouk confirmed that a deal was being prepared, although he denied that he was participating:

"The only contacts there are between the Americans, China, Hanoi, Moscow and Paris. We are not involved. It is a tragicomic farce."

The situation is more tragic than comic. Sihanouk indicated that Peking

and Hanoi are no longer providing needed ammunition to the Cambodian fighters. Kamm wrote:

"Prince Sihanouk contended that since the signing of the Paris agreement, North Vietnam had scrupulously obeyed the accord as far as Cambodia was concerned and China had respected her obligation as a participant in the conference that followed the cease-fire. 'Arms and ammunition deliveries have been finished since January, 1973,' he asserted.

"Prince Sihanouk said that, acting on an urgent request from Mr. Khieu Samphan [the deputy premier of Sihanouk's government], he had called in the Chinese and North Vietnamese ambassadors to Rumania to ask them for a resumption of ammunition deliveries. He said he expected to receive an answer on his return to Peking next week."

After staking out his claim to speak for the resistance movement, Sihanouk spelled out his willingness to be reconciled with U. S. imperialism. Rather than condemning the congressional acquiescence in the continued bombing, he promised cooperation with those imperialists for whom the "doves" speak:

"We ask Congress please to continue the fight. If Congress can help us have peace in obliging Mr. Nixon to disengage, it is possible, it is even probable, that the Cambodia of tomorrow can be reconciled with the United States of America. If the Congress and we can become friends because Congress has fought for us, we shall take this into account and the Congress and we could work together to bind the wound."

The successful conclusion of the deal now being worked out cannot be regarded as a foregone conclusion, however. There are several factors that could still abort the planned offspring of Nixon's détente with the Stalinists.

One of these is the Cambodian liberation fighters themselves. Despite Sihanouk's assertions, it still remains to be seen whether they will follow orders to turn off the struggle at the appropriate diplomatic moment. Even as the latest maneuvers were leaking into the press, the liberation forces were reported to have launched a new offensive all around Pnompenh.

A second unknown is the Pnompenh "government," which by all accounts makes Chiang Kai-shek's regime in

1949 look like a model of popularity and stability. The prospect of an approaching end to U.S. air support and the knowledge that Washington is willing to allow the return of Sihanouk might be enough to cause the collapse of the whole show be-

fore Nixon has concluded the deal. In that case, even with the most "honorable" of intentions, Sihanouk and the Stalinists would find it difficult to contain the upsurge of the Cambodian masses within the framework of a capitalist state. □

## Senators Charge U.S. Embassy Involvement

## Bordaberry Dissolves Congress, CNT

By David Thorstad

After months of mounting hostility between the Uruguayan military and Congress, President Juan Maria Bordaberry gave in to intense pressures from the military and abolished the Congress June 27.

The showdown had been building up since last February, when the armed forces threatened a coup d'etat if Bordaberry did not grant them participation in the government. Since then the military has moved to take over key positions, starting with the ministry of the interior.

A focal point of the struggle between the military and the Congress has been the military's demand that Congress lift the immunity of Senator Enrique Erro, whom it accused of subversion and alleged links to the Tupamaros. The decree dissolving the Congress gave as a reason the Senate's refusal to lift Erro's immunity. The House had voted against impeachment proceedings.

The decree asserted that there was a "grave deterioration" of constitutional rule and blamed the situation on "the criminal actions of the conspiracy against the country, aligned with the complacency of political groups without national spirit."

"Uruguayans, who had learned the news of the dissolving of parliament Wednesday morning [June 27]," wrote Philippe Labreveux in the June 29 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde*, "had to wait until late into the night before knowing for sure the full implications of the coup d'etat carried out by Mr. Bordaberry with the agreement of the armed forces. Radio and television stations broadcast only military marches and folk songs, interspersed with official communiqués. Around 11:00 p. m. resounded the first

few bars of the 'Hymn to Joy'—a worn record that has seen a lot of use recently—announcing the start of the presidential speech."

In the speech, Labreveux reported, Bordaberry "underlined the 'essential' role of private activity in the economy. In addition, he stated that foreign investments 'were welcome,' and for every program he invoked the need to 'modernize' the administration and enterprises of the state in order to make them more efficient. The president of the republic also used the harshest words to condemn Marxism, a manifestation of the 'sedition' that is corrupting the country's institutions and that, according to him, justifies the 'exceptional measures' taken Wednesday morning."

All the country's schools were shut down until July 20. Censorship, imposed last year, was strengthened; news media were prohibited from making any report that "directly or indirectly attributes dictatorial goals to the executive power." On June 30, censorship was extended to international news agencies operating in Uruguay.

The day after he abolished Congress, Bordaberry moved to consolidate his control by dissolving the country's nineteen municipal councils. In their place will be a "Council of State," appointed by the government and the military-dominated National Security Council that was established following last February's semicoup.

Reaction to the decree abolishing constitutional government was swift. Two cabinet members resigned in protest. The powerful Convención Nacional de Trabajadores (CNT—National Workers Congress) called a

general strike for the following day and ordered the occupation of factories.

The strike, according to a Reuters dispatch from Montevideo June 28, "paralyzed the nation's major industries, such as the tire and textile factories that provide Uruguay's main industrial exports. Several factories were taken over by strikers, and students at Montevideo University boycotted classes.

"The streets of the capital were almost deserted, with only a few buses and taxis ignoring the strike. Most white-collar workers remained at home.

"No newspapers were published today in another protest against the President's action. The formerly pro-Bordaberry evening newspaper *Acción* was ordered to halt publication for three days because of an editorial yesterday describing the dissolution of Parliament as a 'historic error.'"

Participation of telephone workers virtually isolated the country from the outside world.

A United Press dispatch, published in the June 29 issue of the Buenos Aires daily *La Razón*, described the scene at the occupied university: "Huge banners, such as 'People: Fight the dictatorship,' 'Respond with popular resistance,' 'Struggle and confront the gorilla coup,' and 'Destroy the military dictatorship,' appeared, covering the entire facade of the classroom building, while the police and the army maintained a discreet but sharp lookout nearby."

On June 30, the government ordered the army and the police to break the general strike by force, and it announced that it was disbanding the CNT and arresting its leaders.

"Police, marine and army units cleared factories, banks, public offices and refineries of workers who had defied a deadline of this morning to stop the strike and leave buildings they had occupied," reported UPI June 30.

The government also called for the confiscation of all property belonging to the CNT. "Soldiers raided the labor coalition headquarters soon after the decree was announced, confiscating records and arresting union men. A coalition source said, however, that the organization had emergency plans for such a situation and that its leader-

ship would continue to function underground."

Erro and another leftist senator, Zelmario Michelini, were in Buenos Aires when the Congress was dissolved. They asked for political asylum in Argentina and immediately called a news conference to accuse the United States Embassy in Montevideo of having a hand in the coup. They warned that "the government has, by decree, created tens of thousands of potential Tupamaros, who will rise up in arms to defend their country."

Erro added that "I personally accuse the commander in chief of the Uruguayan army, General Chiappe Posse, of being a drug smuggler and of having acted as an accomplice in the murder of an aeronautics instructor who, a few months ago, indicated that he was prepared to denounce his illegal activities."

The two former legislators said that, in their view, the "military coup is not of a Peruvian type, but one that follows the Brazilian pattern. It has the firm support of the United States,

through its embassy in Montevideo, and of a CIA agent by the name of Siracusa, infamous for his activities in Bolivia." Ernest Siracusa was recently named U.S. ambassador; he was formerly the imperialist ambassador to the gorilla regime in Bolivia.

Bordaberry's decision to abolish the Congress was welcomed in Brazil by the vice-chairman of the ruling party, the Aliança Renovadora Nacional (ARENA—Alliance for National Renewal), Cantidio Sampaio. "Little by little," he said, according to a report in the June 29 issue of the Buenos Aires daily *Clarín*, "Uruguay is moving into the Brazilian schema." In a speech to parliament, he added that "as long as the army did not go out into the streets to fight terrorism, as long as certain liberties upon which the 'Tupamaros' thrived were not suppressed, and as long as the Uruguayan press itself was not restricted by the government and 'habeas corpus' remained untouchable, subversion dominated the country." □

## London Blacks Protest Police Assault

London

More than 250 persons, mainly from the local Black community and from socialist groups, demonstrated in Brixton, South London, June 23. They protested the continuing harassment of Black youth, in particular the arrests a fortnight previously of three young Blacks after a street fight in which 200 youths battled the police.

The main slogans of the demonstration were: "Free, free, the Brockwell three," "What do we want—Justice; What do we get—Brixton," and "Hands off Black people."

The street battle was the culmination of a long period of harassment of the Black community in Brixton—referred to as the Harlem of London. The premises of local Black organisations, shops, and restaurants have been firebombed. Black youths have been subject to intimidation and arbitrary arrest; each week around 100 Black youths appear before the local courts on charges such as "loitering" and "suspicious behaviour."

The arrests followed an assault by 100 police armed with truncheons and iron bars on Black and white youths

attending a local fair. One of those arrested was a 14-year-old schoolboy who was held ten hours in police cells, during which time his parents were denied access to him. He was later charged with causing bodily harm to three policemen!

The local teachers union protested the action of the police and urged its members to attend the demonstration. They also are projecting a local conference on racism and education in response to these recent events.

The march ended in an open-air rally chaired by Sister Beverley of the Black Workers Movement. Spokespersons for the International Marxist Group [British section of the Fourth International], Communist party, and other left groups outlined the growth of repression and stressed the need for the Black community to take their campaign into the Labour movement. The Black Unity and Freedom party and the Black Workers Movement detailed the brutalisation of their community by the police and called for the exclusion of the police Special Patrol Group from the Black community. □

# Nixon Under Pressure to Testify on Watergate

By Allen Myers

"The net sum of your testimony," Senator Howard Baker told John Dean on the afternoon of June 28, "is fairly mind-boggling."

A few hours later, another Republican member of the Senate Watergate committee, Lowell Weicker of Connecticut, told the hearing and the television audience:

"... I would like to go ahead and repeat now as to exactly what acts have been testified to, have actually been proven or admitted in the illegal area, acts committed by various members of the executive branch of government: conspiracy to obstruct justice, conspiracy to intercept wire or oral communications, subornation of perjury, conspiracy to obstruct a criminal investigation, conspiracy to destroy evidence, conspiracy to file false sworn statements, conspiracy to commit breaking and entering, conspiracy to commit burglary, misprision of a felony, filing of false sworn statements, perjury, breaking and entering, burglary, interception of wire and oral communications, obstruction of criminal investigation, attempted interference with administration of the internal revenue laws, and attempted unauthorized use of internal revenue information."

Clearly, it was not a good week for the Nixon gang. John Dean's testimony, which lasted from June 25 through 29, provided a wealth of detail linking Nixon himself to many of the crimes listed by Weicker. And while this testimony may have boggled Baker's mind, for millions watching the hearings on television, it must have confirmed what was already a widespread suspicion—that Richard Nixon is a crook.

## 'A Prima Facie Case'

In a June 28 editorial, the *Wall Street Journal* observed that Dean's accusations against Nixon have "an internal plausibility. . . . By and large, the mass of detail and the lack of obvious inconsistencies weave Mr.

Dean's story into a believable whole.

"The only way to believe the President was not involved in the cover-up is to believe that Mr. Dean has contrived or maliciously distorted the parts of his testimony dealing with Mr. Nixon. . . . it is difficult to believe that a contrivance could be skillful enough to produce the story Mr. Dean tells. People lie, but they do not ordinarily lie so well."

The influential bourgeois daily added that "Dean's account is quite enough for a prima facie case, to create the presumption of presidential involvement, to shift the burden of proof to the White House."

Dean's testimony provided an impressive list of charges for Nixon to attempt to refute. He consumed the entire first day of his appearance by reading a 245-page statement containing detail after detail on the crimes of Nixon and other members of the gang.

Dean's was the first sworn testimony that Nixon himself knew of and approved the attempted cover-up of the

Watergate scandal and other crimes. Dean charged that:

- Nixon personally ordered the burglary of the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist. He was told this, Dean said, by Egil Krogh, the White House aide who organized the break-in.

- On September 15, 1972, Nixon congratulated Dean for his apparently successful efforts to protect the higher-ups involved in Watergate.

- Nixon knew of and approved illegal contacts between the Committee to Re-elect the President (CREEP) officials and the judge hearing the Democratic party's lawsuit against CREEP.

- Nixon ordered successful efforts to prevent an investigation of Watergate by the House Banking and Currency Committee.

- Nixon twice acknowledged having promised executive clemency for Watergate conspirator E. Howard Hunt in order to keep him from implicating higher-ups.

- Nixon approved the payment of hush money to the convicted burglars, at one point saying there would be "no problem" in paying as much as \$1 million.

- Nixon directed an effort to frustrate the Senate investigation, making contact with the vice-chairman, Senator Howard Baker, in the hope of securing his cooperation.\*

The press and the senators tended to focus most of their attention on Dean's description of Nixon's role in the Watergate cover-up. But equally damning was Dean's testimony about other illegal and shady activities that are normal practice for the Nixon gang.

"We Are Poor Little Lambs  
Who Have Lost Our Way.  
Blah — Blah — Blah —"



\*The effort to interfere with the committee is still going on. Weicker charged on June 28 that the White House was attempting to pressure him and that former Nixon aide Charles Colson had attempted to plant with the press false charges that Weicker had accepted illegal campaign contributions.



Dean provided documentary evidence, for example, that White House aides kept an extensive "enemies list" of individuals and groups who had aroused Nixon's wrath and were to be subjected to tax audits and other forms of harassment. As Dean put it in a 1971 memo to top Nixon advisers H. R. Haldeman and John Ehrlichman, the question was, "How we can use the available federal machinery to screw our political enemies."

Other memos that Dean submitted to the committee described a "Special Service Group" in the Internal Revenue Service that was assigned to "monitor" leftist organizations. A September 1970 memorandum from White House aide Tom Charles Huston to Haldeman observed:

"Nearly 18 months ago, the President indicated a desire for IRS to move against leftist organizations taking advantage of tax shelters. . . .

"What we cannot do in a courtroom via criminal prosecutions to curtail the activities of some of these groups, IRS could do by administrative action. Moreover, valuable intelligence-type information could be turned up by IRS as a result of their field audits."

The Special Service Group, according to a 1970 IRS report, had collected information on 1,025 organizations and 4,300 individuals.

Other documents from Dean's files proved that Nixon was lying when he claimed to have "rescinded" his original approval of an illegal spying and sabotage plan developed in 1970. In his May 22 statement on Watergate, Nixon said that he vetoed the plan on July 28, 1970. But documents that Dean turned over to the committee show that in September 1970, high White House officials were discussing details of implementation of the plan. Carl Bernstein and Bob Woodward reported in the June 25 *Washington Post* that "the staff of Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox is investigating the possibility that as many as 25 burglaries were carried out under White House auspices."

### 'Concern Over Political Impact of Demonstrators'

Dean's description of life in the White House indicated the extent of indecision and concern aroused in the U. S. ruling class by the growth of the radicalization, particularly by the mass

antiwar demonstrations. Dean called the Watergate scandal "an inevitable outgrowth of a climate of excessive concern over the political impact of demonstrators, excessive concern over leaks, an insatiable appetite for political intelligence."

Nixon's hatred of antiwar demonstrators was particularly intense, Dean said. "The White House was continually seeking intelligence information about demonstration leaders and their supporters that would either discredit them personally or indicate that the demonstration was in fact sponsored by some foreign enemy." The inability



Dean: "Any means—legal or illegal—were authorized."

of the FBI to produce evidence of such foreign sponsorship was taken by Nixon as proof that "intelligence" operations were inadequate.

Dean provided a number of examples of Nixon's fear of the antiwar movement. During a demonstration by Vietnam Veterans Against the War in May 1971, Dean was assigned to give Nixon hourly reports on what the protesters were doing.

" . . . a major part of any Presidential trip advance operation," Dean's statement said, "was insuring that demonstrators were unseen and unheard by the President.

" . . . I learned that any means—legal or illegal—were authorized by Mr. Haldeman to deal with demonstrators when the President was traveling or appearing some place."

In one instance in the winter of 1971, Dean said, Nixon ordered an aide to get some "thugs" to remove a lone demonstrator who appeared with a banner across the street from the White House.

### A Mysterious Memo

At the beginning of the week, Nixon's press secretary, Ronald Ziegler, announced that Nixon would not comment on Dean's testimony. The boss, it appears, wants to hear what all the members of the gang have to say before he publicly announces his defense. But Dean's evidence was so devastating that Nixon was forced to try to discredit it immediately.

On June 27, J. Fred Buzhardt—Dean's replacement in the White House—submitted to the Ervin committee a lengthy memorandum purporting to demonstrate that the whole Watergate scandal was the fault of Dean and former Attorney General and CREEP director John Mitchell, while Haldeman, Ehrlichman, and Nixon were innocent victims of Dean's conspiracy.

The quality of this document is indicated by the fact that it mentions Dean's Justice Department experience "of working on problems of demonstrations and intelligence" as though this were a recently discovered secret rather than Dean's chief recommendation for his White House job. Dean had little trouble replying to most of the memo's contentions, some of which—such as the statement that Dean was "the principal author of the political and constitutional crisis that Watergate now epitomizes"—evoked laughter from the audience.

But the most peculiar aspect of the Buzhardt memo was the immediate attempt of the Nixon gang to disown it. On June 28, Gerald Warren, Nixon's deputy press secretary, told reporters that the memo "is not the president's position, it is not the White House position." Ziegler, however, admitted that Nixon had been "briefed" on the memo's contents.

Buzhardt himself issued a statement saying that the memo was "an hypothesis prepared as a basis for cross-examination." What it obviously added up to was an attempt by Nixon to try out a defense without being required to stick to it if it fell flat.

The graceless effort represented by the Buzhardt memo only added force

to the growing sentiment that Nixon should answer Dean's charges under oath before the Ervin committee.

Ervin, Baker, and Weicker all delivered some broad hints on this subject to the television audience. On the last day of Dean's testimony, all three cited precedents in which presidents had appeared before congressional committees. The day before, Ervin appeared to rule out accepting a written statement from Nixon, asking rhetorically, "Is there any way whatsoever to test the credibility of anybody when the credibility has to be judged merely upon the basis of a written statement?"

Nixon immediately had his deputy press secretary say that he would not appear before the committee voluntarily and that a subpoena would be "constitutionally inappropriate." The remark prompted the *New York Times* to observe in a July 1 editorial:

"Mr. Nixon's record as President shows distressing readiness to stretch the Constitution to meet his own purpose. . . . Why this sudden devotion to the most rigid interpretation of constitutional strictures?"

The question must be presumed to be rhetorical. Nixon has not dared for months even to face a press conference. For him to submit to cross-examination, no matter how gentle, before the television cameras would be politically suicidal. The task of defending Nixon is to be left to other members of the gang, particularly Haldeman and Ehrlichman.

### The Witnesses to Come

One of the reasons the Buzhardt memo was so quickly disavowed—aside from the absurdity of the document itself—was probably because it accused John Mitchell of part of the responsibility for Watergate.

Nixon has already demonstrated that he has no compunction about making Mitchell—or anyone else—a scapegoat if it will protect him. In fact, Dean testified that one of the cover-up strategies developed in March of this year was to persuade Mitchell to take the entire blame for the scandal.

But Mitchell has not yet testified before the Senate committee, and it was an obvious blunder to accuse him while he still has the opportunity to strike back.



LARUE: Threat to Nixon?

The committee is in recess as of June 30. The former CREEP director is scheduled to be the first witness when hearings resume July 10. His lawyer has said that Mitchell "has no information implicating the president in the Watergate bugging or the cover-up."

Haldeman and Ehrlichman have also indicated their intention to deny Dean's charges against Nixon and against themselves. Whether their

stories will convince anyone in the face of the evidence that has accumulated is another matter.

There is a strong likelihood that other members of the Nixon gang besides Dean will contradict many, if not all, of their claims of innocence.

It has been reported that Herbert Kalmbach, Nixon's personal attorney, is planning to break ranks and tell what he knows. Another unknown for Nixon and his cohorts as they plan their strategy is Frederick LaRue, who has made a deal with the Watergate special prosecutor.

LaRue was a deputy to Mitchell at CREEP and one of the directors of Nixon's "Southern strategy." On June 27, he was allowed to plead guilty to one count of conspiracy to obstruct justice in exchange for his promise to tell what he knows about higher-ups. In addition to implicating Mitchell, LaRue should be able to tell much about Haldeman's and Ehrlichman's knowledge of the payoffs to the Watergate burglars, since he was involved in the transfers of funds.

If witnesses like LaRue testify that Mitchell, Haldeman, and Ehrlichman are lying when they protest their own innocence, their denials of Nixon's guilt are not likely to carry much weight. Nixon may yet find that he has to tell his lies for himself. □

## FBI Helped Organize Terrorist Group

The FBI and an undercover employee of Nixon's campaign organization have been linked to a right-wing paramilitary organization in California. At least one FBI agent participated in shootings, fire-bombings, and burglaries carried out by the terrorist group.

The organization, known as the Secret Army Organization, was founded in 1971. Steven V. Roberts reported in the June 24 *New York Times* that an FBI informer, Howard Godfrey, "was one of the six founding members and contributed the money used to print the group's recruiting literature."

Godfrey has admitted in court that he was with SAO terrorists in January 1972 when they fired into a house occupied by young persons planning

demonstrations at the Republican convention. A woman was wounded in the attack. Godfrey turned the gun that was used over to his FBI contact, who hid it for six months, until after the attacker was arrested by the police.

Godfrey has also admitted supplying explosives for an SAO bomb attack on a theater.

Roberts reported that two members of the SAO had identified a photograph of Donald Segretti as one of two men who attended a discussion on "protecting" the Republican convention. Segretti was an undercover agent hired by the Committee to Re-elect the President to disrupt Democratic party campaigns. He has been indicted in Florida for violation of election laws. □

# Signs of Detente Between Mao and Marcos

Manila

In February 1972, just prior to Nixon's China trip, President Marcos dispatched his brother-in-law, Kokoy Romualdez, to Peking. The emissary met privately with Chou En-lai and returned to the Philippines in a shroud of silence that was assumed to have meant a rebuff by Peking.

Marcos, who has since installed himself as dictator, has now given the first public account of the Romualdez mission, including the report that "Peking admitted that certain 'Lin Piao elements' were training cadre for Philippine rebel movements." But Marcos added he was "satisfied with Prime Minister Chou En-lai's assurances that this would not continue." (*Philippines Sunday Express*, May 27, 1973.)

If Marcos is telling the truth, the implications are plain. If Chou was willing to repudiate the token training of a few Filipino radicals even before the Nixon visit, how far will the Chinese bureaucrats be willing to go now that the Nixon-Mao detente has been sealed and now that there are prospects of new trade deals with the U.S.'s far eastern banana republic?

Will the Philippine New People's Army (NPA), which in early 1971 named its guerrilla training site after Lin Piao, be dismissed as ultraleft and adventurist? Will pressure be applied to the NPA not to embarrass the bureaucrats in their accommodation with Marcos? After Peking's betrayal of the Vietnamese in the face of Nixon's murderous onslaught, the Philippine struggle must seem small potatoes.

Three points indicate that Marcos is not distorting Chou's words.

First, refusal to support revolutionary struggles in Ceylon, Bangladesh, etc., has been a conspicuous part of Chinese foreign policy since the beginning of 1971.

Second, the announcement by Marcos of Chou's "assurances" coincides with the approval of two large export sales to China: over 9 million pesos worth of coconut oil and 14 million pesos worth of buri fiber, the

latter being the largest single transaction ever recorded in that commodity.

Third, the announcement represents a retreat for Marcos from his previous verbal intransigence toward Peking. It amounts to a reversal of previous hostile statements indicating China as the source of foreign support for Philippine radicals.

In the text of his martial-law proc-

## Plan Fight Against Racism

# African Liberation Day in Britain

London

Some 250 Blacks packed Brixton Town Hall here on Africa Liberation Day, May 25, for a rally called by the Africa Liberation Committee in solidarity with the liberation struggles of the peoples of southern Africa. Speaking to the rally were representatives of the African National Congress (ANC) of South Africa, the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) and the Communist party of the Sudan.

Zola Zembe of the ANC urged Black people in Britain to get interested in the struggles of Black people in Africa. "It's about time," he said, "that Black people all over the world knew they came from Africa." Zembe stressed that the people of South Africa were not fighting simply for their own interests but for the liberation of Black people everywhere. Zembe drew attention to the wave of strikes sweeping through South Africa to protest the starvation-level wages received by African workers in South Africa. These struggles, along with those of the students and the inhabitants of the rural bantustans, are increasingly threatening the racist white regime.

Ignatius Chigwendere of ZANU described the long struggle of the Zimbabwean people for independence—from the wars of the 1890s against the colonial invasions to the present struggle against the Smith regime.

lamation on September 21, 1972, Marcos gave primary emphasis to "elements . . . enjoying the active moral and material support of a foreign power . . . and whose . . . precepts are based on the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist teachings and beliefs" as the reason he was taking over as dictator.

Now, Marcos concedes that seven months previously he was already "satisfied" with Chou's "assurances" that such support had been discontinued. The willingness to abandon the main propaganda justification for martial law indicates that Marcos expects a ripening friendship with the Chinese leaders. □

Chigwendere reported that rural guerrilla resistance to the Smith regime is now so widespread that the regime is attempting to forcefully move thousands of Africans to government-guarded villages.

The size and enthusiasm of the rally reflect the deepening interest in Africa and identification with its struggle for freedom by the Black community in Britain. The Africa Liberation Committee is planning to expand its work. In particular, there is growing opposition to the British government's plans to celebrate the 600th anniversary of the alliance between Britain and Portugal and the proposed visit to Britain by Portuguese Prime Minister Marcello Caetano in July.

The Africa Liberation Committee, along with many other organizations, has joined the End the Alliance Campaign, which is demanding that the British government end its collaboration with Portugal's colonial wars, and is planning a massive national demonstration in London on July 15, the day before the scheduled start of Caetano's visit. □

## Automated Security

A security guard in Indira Gandhi's home accidentally touched the trigger of his automatic rifle and fired off nine shots before he could stop. Gandhi was not home at the time.

## Petition for Jailed Ukrainian Dissidents

[The following petition is being circulated by the Committee to Defend Ivan Dzyuba and Vyacheslav Chornovil. The committee's address is P. O. Box 187, Station "E," Toronto, Ontario, Canada.]

\* \* \*

The recent emergence of articulate socialist oppositionists within the Soviet Union has brought into question the economic, social and cultural policies of the Soviet government. Thoroughly familiar with Leninist theory and practice, the present oppositionists call for the restoration of Marxist-Leninist norms and socialist legality in all areas of Soviet society. This call for democratic socialism has gained support among the workers, students, and intellectuals. The Soviet government has reacted to this by wilfully distorting and forcefully suppressing any manifestation of oppositional activity and thought.

Issue number 26 of the *Chronicle of Current Events* reported that there were massive arrests of oppositionists in the Soviet Union, and especially in the Ukrainian S.S.R. during the early part of 1972 in an attempt by the K.G.B. [political police] to crush the samizdat, samvydav literature. Among those arrested were two Ukrainian socialists, Ivan Dzyuba and Vyacheslav Chornovil.

Ivan Dzyuba, former editor of the State Publishing House of Ukraine, was arrested in September 1965, for allegedly sending the diary of the deceased poet Vasyl Symonenko to the West. He was released because he was suffering from acute tuberculosis. He is the author of the book *Internationalism or Russification?*, a Leninist critique of the present nationalities policy of the Soviet Union. Despite the fact that he is suffering from acute tuberculosis, he was sentenced in March 1973 to five years imprisonment.

Vyacheslav Chornovil, former member of the editorial board of the Komсомol newspaper *Moloda Gvardia*,

was arrested in July 1966 for refusing to testify at a closed trial. He was sentenced to three months imprisonment. Arrested again in August, 1967, he was sentenced to three years imprisonment in November 1967. The sentence was later reduced to eighteen months. He is most noted for the *Chornovil Papers*, a collection of documents

## Four Bolivian Exile Groups Issue Call for Struggle Against 'Fascist' Regime

[The following "Call to the Bolivian People" was issued in June by the leaders of four Bolivian parties in exile in Santiago, Chile. The four were: Juan Lechín Oquendo of the PRIN (Partido Revolucionario de la Izquierda Nacionalista—Revolutionary party of the Nationalist Left), Hernán Siles Zuazo of the MNRI (Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario de Izquierda—Left Revolutionary Nationalist Movement), Simón Reyes Ribera of the pro-Moscow PCB (Partido Comunista Boliviano—Bolivian Communist party), and Oscar Zamora Medinacelli of the pro-Peking PCB M-L (Partido Comunista de Bolivia Marxista-Leninista—Communist party of Bolivia Marxist-Leninist).

[The parties call for a struggle to overthrow the military dictatorship of the Frente Popular Nacionalista (FPN—Nationalist Popular Front), a coalition of the Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario (MNR—Revolutionary Nationalist Movement) of Víctor Paz Estenssoro and the Falange Socialista Boliviana (FSB—Bolivian Socialist Falange), headed by Mario Gutiérrez. The parties incorrectly characterize the FPN government of Hugo Banzer Suárez as "fascist," despite the fact that it has neither attained the stability of a fascist regime nor crushed and eliminated the organizations of the working class. Their call to arms is a typically class-collaborationist scheme, urging that the present regime be replaced by a bourgeois government;

which exposes the secret trials of 1965-66. Chornovil was sentenced to seven years imprisonment and five years exile in February 1973.

Recognizing that Vyacheslav Chornovil and Ivan Dzyuba are only two of those oppositionists recently arrested and tried for their socialist convictions, we the undersigned:

1. Condemn the arrests and sentences of Vyacheslav Chornovil and Ivan Dzyuba;
2. Demand their immediate release; and
3. Call for the implementation of democratic rights and civil liberties in the Soviet Union. □

it has the cooperation of both the pro-Peking and pro-Moscow Stalinist parties.

[Tensions within the ruling coalition have reached new levels in the wake of the assassination of Colonel Andrés Selich, who led an abortive coup against Banzer in May (see *Intercontinental Press*, June 4, p. 665). Selich had close connections with the extreme right wing of the rightist FSB.

[On June 20, Carlos Valverde Barbery, a leader of the FSB far right, former minister of public health, and leader of a movement in opposition to Gutiérrez within the FSB, was expelled from the organization. He was also said to have been a collaborator of Selich. The expulsion appears to have been aimed both at consolidating the position of Gutiérrez as head of the FSB and at preserving the shaky ruling coalition. According to the June 22 issue of the Buenos Aires daily *La Opinión*, the expulsion reflected a "desperate desire" on the part of Banzer to keep the coalition together. The move was described as a measure demanded by Paz Estenssoro in order to "attempt to situate the government in the center, bringing about a tactical separation from the far right."

[The expulsion of Valverde is also being interpreted as possibly a step toward endowment of the shaky and increasingly eroded Banzer regime with a constitutional basis. Another indication of mounting criticism of the regime was a statement by the Catholic church June 19 condemning repres-

sion and calling for amnesty for political prisoners, reported *La Opinión*.]

\* \* \*

The present government of Bolivia has entered into a period of final decomposition, despite the economic injections and support it is receiving from imperialism and despite its desperate efforts to hide its insoluble contradictions. It flails about between the terror, corruption, and poverty it bred. Banzer is increasingly being questioned by the armed forces; this is shown by the successive military plots, including the recent, unclear military crisis reflected in the resignation of General Zenteno Anaya. And, most important, Banzer, Gutiérrez, and Paz Estenssoro have been repudiated by the workers, peasants, middle class, and the people as a whole. This is a government that the Bolivian nation rejects.

Through a bloody coup that arose out of a plot hatched abroad, with the support of North American imperialism and the direct interference of Brazilian militarism, a fascist government was installed August 21, 1971, that interrupted a process of mass upsurge. Its main aim is to preserve the regime of antinational exploitation by subjecting the Bolivian people to a repressive barbarism without precedent in our history. This government got its start with massacres of students, workers, and peasants, as happened in the universities of Santa Cruz and La Paz.

The methods of governing that characterize the dictatorship are the disregarding of the Central Obrera Boliviana [Bolivian Workers Central Union] and the union confederations and federations; armed assault on the universities and the suppression of university autonomy; destruction of the people's political, social, and human rights; imprisonment of thousands of men and women, who are subjected to torture and deprived of any chance to defend themselves; censorship of the means of communication and infringements on correspondence; raids on private homes; and persecution of the Catholic and Protestant churches—in short, political crime.

The brutal methods of fascism have been exposed by the official recognition of the torture and assassination that Banzer, Gutiérrez, and Paz Estenssoro make use of to instill terror and to impose a policy dictated by

imperialism. The death of Colonel Selich, resulting from the internal struggle between the civilian and military groups that support them, has served to lay this bare.

The countless political crimes perpetrated against militants of the Bolivian left and union leaders go unpunished, while in the case of Selich, the deed is publicly recognized because he was a military man, and offers are even made to investigate it and punish the authors. Hours earlier, the death of two political pris-



PAZ ESTENSSORO

oners, Mónica Herlt and Osvaldo Ucazqui, had become known—a dual crime cynically covered over with the usual excuse that they were allegedly surprised while involved in guerrilla activity. There has been no intention of shedding light on these crimes. Nor was there in the case of Dr. Felix Sandoval Morón—notwithstanding the naming of a commission to investigate his torture and execution, under similar circumstances, in a Santa Cruz police cell one year after the murder of his brother Alcides, a transport workers leader. This proves that for the dictatorship, the value of human life varies depending on the social origins and political position of the victims.

Hundreds of homes are demanding a clarification of the above-mentioned crimes and others, like that of Mrs.

Cecilia Avila de Paz, teachers leader Oscar Paz Ortiz, university professor Roberto Alvarado Daza, the architect Lisimaco Gutiérrez, the university student Roberto Sanchez, the journalist Claudio Marañón, and many more whose names are not included for lack of space but are engraved in the people's memory.

The press, which has been silenced, terrorized, or compromised, and the news agencies controlled by the monopolies, hush up or systematically distort the facts. Yet today no one can claim ignorance of the tragic situation the Bolivian people are going through. The government can no longer deceive national and international public opinion with stories about alleged escape attempts, confrontations, or "accidents" on the part of political prisoners.

In twenty-one months of relentless repression, the dictatorship created for itself contradictions rooted in arbitrariness in order to impose its authoritarianism. Harsh conditions like these place limitations upon, but do not prevent, activity by democratic, progressive, and revolutionary forces, which have lost courageous leaders who have been murdered in prison or who have "disappeared."

In the economic field, the government is carrying out a policy of serving international finance capital and a small group of industrialists and businessmen linked to it. It is in this capacity that it has decreed arbitrary measures improperly called the Law on Investments, the Hydrocarbon Law, the Stabilization and Development Plan, and has increased the state mineral reserves.

Devaluation is the measure complementary to the political and economic conditions required by the investors, since their main aim is to lower the cost of labor power to 66 percent of its value, thereby allowing them to reap superprofits, and to continue the policy of denationalizing mining, oil production, and the removal of other natural resources.

The international monopolies and their subsidiaries like monetary devaluation because it reduces their costs through purchase of more Bolivian pesos with fewer dollars. At the same time, it makes it possible for them to purchase more dollars from the Central Bank than they turn over to the state; this increases the gap produced

by the flight of capital.

What is even more serious is the fact that this measure strikes mainly against the meager income of the workers in the mines, the cities, and countryside, since it lowers real wages, drastically reduces their purchasing power, and results in an uncontrolled rise in the cost of living. It also affects many children of artisans and the small manufacturing industry, who find it impossible to compete with foreign industry because of the increase in the costs of their imports. At the same time it hurts national industries that reinvest their profits, since now more than ever they find themselves forced into a position of dependence upon finance capital; turned into a mere extension of it, they lose their national character.

As long as the people continue to be excluded from power, any government will maintain the present conditions that are hurting the country.

An effort is made to persuade people that the devaluation was necessary. This is inaccurate. In reality, in addition to the already mentioned credits and aid, the government counted on a tin price that would be more than double that of previous years, an increase in both the value and the amount of exports of nontraditional goods begun some time ago, and an increased collection of taxes. However, the government squandered these earnings by driving up inflation through loans on the national treasury, credits to the private sector, and maintenance of a top-heavy and voracious bureaucracy, an alleged "civilian base" indebted to the budget, and repressive bands dependent upon fiscal plunder and contraband.

In order that the dictatorship might be able to carry out such a task, it has been given the political and military backing of imperialism. It has, in fact, received the greatest and most expensive assistance and war materiel in order to repress the people.

By pushing the economic consequences of dismal dictatorial rule to an extreme, such a policy provokes the popular masses to increasing resistance and causes the unions of the workers, peasants, and working people of the middle class, which have not been forced to knuckle under, to assume a courageous stance of repudiating the dictatorship. This is reflected in things like the October strike and

the May Day march, in the permanent raising of economic and political demands, and in the miners union elections—facts that testify to the absolute helplessness of the parties of the Frente Popular Nacionalista, the parasitic beneficiaries of a deteriorated national economy.

Faced with this situation, which reflects general discontent, the fascist government has reinstated the State Security Law and is continuing to disregard the union charter, after having militarily occupied La Paz's factory zone, placing the armed forces once again in a position of violently repressing the workers in a new proletarian bloodbath and obliging the soldiers to fire on their own brothers. The results of the October strike and the May Day workers demonstration were persecution, jailing, torture, and exiling of left-wing politicians, rank-and-file workers, and union leaders like Felix Valencia and Gonzalo Condiri.

The antinational government has not only seriously affected the economy of the state and the people, who bear the weight of an ever growing foreign debt, and irresponsibly mortgaged the country's future; it has also compromised territorial integrity and has created antagonistic regional factors. It has projected the image of a raw-material producing country where corruption and political crime are rife. It has reached the point that outside of Bolivia our natural resources—the iron of Mutún, for example—are at the mercy of foreign interests and the expansionist designs of Brazilian militarism.

In view of this danger, the undersigned parties solemnly state that they will defend Bolivian sovereignty over its natural resources and the security and integrity of the national territory, and that they will do so with everything within their means and without regard to the sacrifices involved.

All the above shows that it is not possible to rule without the active and direct participation of the people in political decision-making and that the road to winning Bolivia back will begin with the establishment of a democratic and national government that will fully apply the freedoms and rights that are today in bondage. This difficult period, in which the people are banished and in shackles, shows the need to search for unity as the means

for achieving national liberation.

Our organizations are aware that the task of uniting the Bolivian people requires an effort of great courage. We are aware of the differences that exist and of the different levels of approaching national reality. We recognize our methodological differences, including the contrasts of outlook. Nevertheless, above and beyond these differences arises our desire to bring down the dictatorship and install a democratic and national government. To this end, we reaffirm our intention to continue a dialogue among our organizations and to broaden it to include others and all Bolivians who agree on this struggle against the dictatorship. Let us encourage the hope that our efforts will bring about a great national agreement between democratic, popular, and revolutionary forces to come together around realistic and precise objectives in order to form the political instrument that our people need for their liberation.

Nourished by our own historic experience, we have an obligation to overcome the errors of the past by securing the unity that will make it possible for the people to fully exercise their rights, to establish a genuine popular sovereignty, and to promote social progress and independent economic development.

While confirming their ideological, political, and organizational independence, the parties that are signing this call are making clear that this does not affect bilateral or multilateral agreements, such as the FRA [Frente Revolucionario Antimperialista—Anti-imperialist Revolutionary Front], or other types of contacts suitable to the nature of political relations. (The MNRI was not consulted with regard to, and is not a part of, the FRA.)

The undersigned parties call on patriotic, democratic, progressive, and revolutionary forces to struggle against the fascist dictatorship until it is brought down, and to struggle for a democratic, popular, and revolutionary government that will carry out the following immediate tasks:

1. Genuine application of democratic freedoms and constitutional rights.
2. Abolition of the death penalty imposed by the dictatorship, of the State Security Law, and of all decrees that violate human rights.
3. Immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners held for politi-

cal and union activity.

4. Elimination of all repressive bodies, concentration camps, barracks prisons, "security houses" or torture chambers, and of the armed fascist bands protected by the government, such as the "death squad," the "white shirts," and the "black shirts." Expulsion of foreign police advisers.

5. Freedom of activity for the Central Obrera Boliviana, the Confederación Universitaria Boliviana [Bolivian University Students Confederation], and of all trade-union, professional, and religious groups. Restore jobs to all citizens who have been arbitrarily fired.

6. Freedom of operation for political parties and revolutionary organizations, guaranteeing them the dissemination of their programs and principles on the broadest scale.

7. Full university autonomy and abolition of all regulations imposed by fascism with regard to the university and Bolivian education.

8. Fair wage and salary compensation for devaluation and the rise in the cost of living. Measures to compensate for the damages suffered by members of cooperatives and those with small savings.

9. Intransigent defense of the natural resources and territorial sovereignty that have been affected by the sellout policy of the Banzer-Gutiérrez-Paz Estenssoro government.

10. Restoration to the peasants of land usurped by the dictatorship and the big landholders. Genuine and effective elimination of the big rural estates.

11. Cancellation of agreements and contracts entered into by the dictatorship that are causing the removal of natural resources and that compromise the country's sovereignty.

12. Independent foreign policy, with diplomatic and trade relations with all countries of the world on a basis of equality and mutual benefit.

13. Investigation, trial, and punishment of the authors of political and economic crimes committed by the fascist dictatorship.

This historic task cannot be accomplished by any single party or by a passing agreement of one or more political groupings. Unity among all patriotic Bolivians is necessary. Defense of the Bolivian nation is the task of the workers in the mines, cities, and countryside, those in cooperatives,

artisans, university students, teachers, professionals, and intellectuals; it is the task of the Catholic and Protestant churches, of small businessmen, of democratic currents in the armed forces and in the National Corps of Carabineers; in short, it is the task of the Bolivian people as a whole. □

## Withdrawal from Ireland Campaign

[With the Provisional republicans hard pressed by massive British military repression in Northern Ireland, selective repression in the Dublin-ruled area, and growing harassment of their supporters in Britain and the United States, the Provisional organ *An Phoblacht* responded enthusiastically in its June 22 issue to the signs of a bring-the-troops-home movement beginning in Britain.

[In particular, the Provisional weekly cited the statement of the "British Withdrawal from Ireland Campaign," which was published in the June 8 issue of the pacifist weekly *Peace News*, as well as the British liberal magazine *The New Statesman*.

[Although this new group, like the various sectarian groups that have tried to build a movement in support of the Irish struggle, seemed to feel compelled to include a rather lengthy and involved analysis of Irish history and politics in its statement of purpose, the declaration was fairly clearly focused on building effective support in Britain for the Irish people's right of self-determination.

[Pacifist personalities were prominent among the list of signers of the statement, and the *An Phoblacht* article indicates that some pacifists involved want to apply the concept of individual moral witness to the propaganda directed at British soldiers. This is the meaning of the call to British soldiers to desert, which will obviously be heeded only by a tiny minority and runs directly counter to the needs of building a mass movement in the army that will oppose the directives of London and demand withdrawal.

[While the moralistic traditions of republicanism interlock in some respects with the moralism of the radical pacifists, as *An Phoblacht* indicates, the Provisionals have a com-

elling interest in the material success of a campaign to reach the troops. The article also indicates that they would give enthusiastic support to activities that could win mass support in the army and provide the basis for effectively organizing soldiers against the repressive role of the army. The following is the full text of *An Phoblacht's* comment on the development of a bring-the-troops-home campaign in Britain.]

\* \* \*

A tremendous victory for the Republican Movement has been achieved in the battle for the truth: the clamour for the removal of British troops from Ireland now is being heard over the length and breadth of Britain and is being echoed all over western Europe and America.

As soon as the intellectuals got together, nationally and internationally, to demand the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam, the war had been won by the Vietnamese: it was only a question of time and heart-breaking negotiation before they were pulled out.

That time has arrived in Ireland now with the full page advertisement in the "New Statesman" demanding the withdrawal of British soldiers from Ireland and signed by 123 intellectuals—poets, dramatists, novelists, actors, political activists, pacifists, including the playwright John Arden, the "Guardian" journalist Richard Scott, the comedian Spike Milligan, the poet Adrian Mitchel and the former chairman of the British Young Liberals, Louis Eakes.

The so-called "Peace Women" and similar groups, including clergy of all denominations, should be urged to demonstrate their sincerity by backing the British "withdraw the troops" movement.

Whenever it is feasible, British troops in the North—and in Germany or wherever else they are stationed—should be leafleted, faced with posters telling of the growing demand at home to have them withdrawn, and urging them to add their own voices to the voice of reason. Write posters such as this: "Why should YOU be asked to die for Ireland? Your people want you home". Such a campaign can strike a telling blow at the war-lords of the British military establish-

ment and of their Tory and Unionist masters.

Full use, on the widest scale possible, must be made of the important Republican victory in the battle for truth. The friend of imperialism will be silence, failure to exploit the situation, laziness. What the British would like would be a complete damper on publicity or a low-powered campaign which would fizzle out during the summer months.

The campaign, to succeed, needs to be intensified throughout the summer and continued at full blast into the winter with a peak aimed at during the Christmas-New Year period. With luck, the first signs of withdrawal might be seen in the spring.

The "withdrawal" campaign can be used to drown British propaganda in favour of the Belfast assembly election, to strengthen the people's will to resist and their determination to abstain from fruitless, window-dressing politics. The dupes of British imperialism, masquerading as peace-lovers, can be shown up for what they are.

The "New Statesman" advertisement makes it clear that the group sponsoring the campaign in Britain will seek to dissuade soldiers from serving in Ireland. It is understood that its wording was much stronger when the advertisement was submitted originally to the "New Statesman" management. It was emasculated, somewhat, for legal reasons. Thus the plea to soldiers to desert was toned down.

According to Mr. Howard Clark, one of the organisers of the advertisers and a member of the editorial board of "Peace News", a pacifist publication, the "New Statesman" cut out the sentence "Soldiers will be asked to consider refusing postings to Northern Ireland, staging sit-downs and demonstrations in barracks and in the final resort, deserting". Another reference to dissuading young people from joining the British Army, was also deleted from the advertisement, Mr. Clark said.

After setting out the groups historical view of the present conflict, the advertisement points out that while Catholics and Protestants are in sharp conflict, at grass roots level, both communities make similar demands.

"Not only does the use of troops keep them apart physically, but the presence of the British Army invites

each to seek the intervention of an outside force to overrule the other".

Later, the advertisement states that a forced reunification against the wishes of Protestants would be neither just nor viable and it goes on to say: "But a continuation of the political union with Britain is, we suggest, also neither desirable nor practicable.

"It can be argued that this would be depriving the Protestant community of its rights, but these rights are not absolute, nor are there ever an unlimited number of choices". The British people also have the possibility of saying they did not wish the political union with Northern Ireland.

The advertisement continues: "The withdrawal of Britain would open the way for the rights and aspirations of the Protestant community to be judged on their own merits in Ireland".

"No doubt there are those in Britain who would prefer to see Northern Ireland politically autonomous but economically tied to Britain as the Irish Republic now is, and who hope that the entry of Britain and the Irish Republic into the E. E. C. will prepare the way for this. We oppose this kind of 'solution' because it would confirm Ireland's status as a client state of British capitalism".

Concluding, the signatories assert: "In the Irish rebellion of 1798, the United Irishmen had the support of English radical groups who denounced the repression of Irish people and urged English soldiers to refuse to take part in it". Something like this was needed in Britain today, the advertisement said.

"We, the undersigned, now demand in relation to Northern Ireland: (A) that the British government name a definite date for the complete withdrawal of British troops in the immediate future; (B) that the union between Britain and Northern Ireland be ended.

"In furthering these aims, we, the undersigned, intend to campaign among British civilians and soldiers; our friends in Germany and elsewhere will be encouraged to leaflet British soldiers stationed there.

"Leafleting and demonstrations will also be organised at recruiting centres. The campaign among civilians will aim to provide information and gain support for the policy of British withdrawal from Northern Ireland".

Adding weight to the protest move-

ment, Mr. Richard Crossman the Labour ex-Minister, said in a radio interview that Britain's only way out of an increasingly hopeless situation would be to set a "time limit" for the withdrawal of the British army—anything from a year to 18 months.

Mr. Crossman's drastic "solution" is now regarded much more seriously than when he first uncovered it in the columns of the "New Statesman" which he formerly edited. His proposal coincides with the growing feeling on all sides at Westminster that if the constitutional proposals including a power-sharing Assembly and a Council of Ireland are rejected by a substantial majority at the North's election, Britain may be forced into a complete and drastic overhaul of its existing policies in Ireland.

Mr. Crossman believes that if Britain's present constitutional proposals are rejected at the election, "colonial type" direct rule by Britain in Northern Ireland could not go on. The alternative, he says, is to fix a time limit for withdrawal.

"Extremely generous terms" could be offered to both parts of Ireland, he suggests, as Britain would not be concerned about saving money in its withdrawal from Ireland.

The chorus is taken up by the Defence Correspondent of "The Times", London, a bastion of Toryism. The correspondent, Mr. Henry Stanhope, in a B. B. C. radio broadcast, said it was believed by British soldiers in the North that it was time the people in the North co-operated by doing something to help themselves.

The inference was that the soldiers were fed up. They were complaining, according to Mr. Stanhope, of the lack of appreciation of their services to the people of Ireland (over the centuries, an ungrateful lot), of, in fact, some hostility.

This, the British public was told discreetly, has led to an increasing number of soldiers seeking to end their engagements by buying themselves out of the Crown forces.

British army authorities told Mr. Stanhope that they were not worried at present about the state of the morale of the troops but that it would have to be watched carefully. This shows that, in fact, they are very worried, indeed. The graph, showing a steady decline in recruiting, tells its own tale to all but the most obtuse. □