

Lift the Ban on French Trotskyists!



New Yorkers picketing French Consulate July 6 to protest Pompidou's outlawing of Ligue Communiste.

Special Feature

**An Interview With James P. Cannon
on the Radicalization Then and Now**

ERP, Split-Offs Take Stand on Government

The Argentine guerrilla organization Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo (ERP—Revolutionary Army of the People) has undergone two splits, according to a report in the July 1 issue of the Buenos Aires daily *La Opinión*. In addition to the pro-Peronist split-off that took the name August 22 ERP, *La Opinión* reported that "some time ago this Marxist-oriented guerrilla grouping suffered the loss of an ultraleftist grouping that called itself the ERP Fracción Roja [Red Faction ERP]."

While most observers agree that the majority of the ERP's forces remained with the central group, headed by Roberto Santucho, "it is thought possible that the August 22 is growing thanks to its ties to the Peronist ranks."

The three groups have all issued statements outlining their views on the Peronist regime. According to *La Opinión*, "a certain agreement can be seen between the positions of the main ERP and the Red Faction in that they reveal a firm position toward the national government. The tone of the latter is the most threatening ('one by one all the traitors will fall,' it says), and it also has a harsher analysis of the role that, in its view, the 'bourgeoisie' plays within the government."

The August 22 ERP, in an apparent criticism of the other two groups, has said that it "will struggle together with the people and not on the fringes for the revolution that will build a socialist society in a free country."

In a secret news conference June 27, Santucho issued what he called a "warning" to the government and not a "declaration of war." He predicted increasing repression: "While this government is arming the fascists to the teeth, it is preparing to attempt to disarm revolutionists," and "while it is embracing the counterrevolutionary military, it is preparing to join them in attacking the guerrilla movement and the people."

The ERP is thought to be anticipating a rapid erosion of support for the government. □

In This Issue

FEATURES	873	The Radicalization Then and Now—An Interview With James P. Cannon
ARGENTINA	850	ERP, Split-Offs Take Stand on Government
	857	Argentina Swept by Prison Rebellions
	866	Why Peron Returned
	867	Don't Forget the Trelew Massacre!
FRANCE	851	Broad Campaign Under Way to Defend French Trotskyists—by Jon Rothschild
	852	Belgian Far-Left Group Backs Ligue
	853	International Actions Support Ligue
	853	Appeal for Formation of Committee to Fight Ban on Ligue Communiste
	854	International Statements of Solidarity With Ligue Communiste
	854	Quebec Groups Demand Ban Be Lifted
	854	Protest at French Embassy in Vienna
	855	British Trotskyists Condemn Ban
	856	Canadian Trotskyists Protest Ban
	856	New Zealand Trotskyists Say Free Krivine
TURKEY	857	Defendants Charge Torture
U. S. A.	858	Nixon in Seclusion as Scandals Mount —by Allen Myers
	880	Feliciano Frame-Up Trial Set for September 4
INDOCHINA WAR	860	Sihanouk Stakes Out His "Independence"
	861	Ask Aid for Vietnamese Political Prisoners
CHILE	862	The Workers Against the Black Market —by Hugo Blanco
	863	Allende Names New, All-Civilian Cabinet —by David Thorstad
URUGUAY	864	Bordaberry Fails to Halt General Strike
FINLAND	868	Balance-Sheet of the Spring Strike Wave —by Pekka Haapakoski
GREAT BRITAIN	869	CP Seeks to Soften Grants Campaign
	872	Glasgow March Protests Cambodia Bombing
	870	Trotskyists Set National Conference
ITALY	871	Bangkok Students Make Regime Back Down
THAILAND	872	20,000 March Against NATO Meeting
DENMARK	864	Salvador Allende; 867, Juan Peron—by David
DRAWINGS	858	Richard Kleindienst; 858, John Mitchell; 860, Henry Kissinger; 871, Thanom Kittikachorn—by Copain

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

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.

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

COPY EDITOR: Lawrence Rand.

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

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.

ASSISTANT BUSINESS MANAGER: Steven Warshell.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Copyright © 1973 by Intercontinental Press.

Broad Campaign Under Way to Defend French Trotskyists

By Jon Rothschild

French Minister of the Interior Raymond Marcellin is angry at François Mitterrand and Georges Marchais, respectively heads of the Socialist and Communist parties. The July 3 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde* quoted Pompidou's chief cop as complaining about the support they had given the Ligue Communiste, French section of the Fourth International, which was dissolved by government decree June 28. (See *Intercontinental Press*, July 9, p. 819.)

Marcellin spoke after Mitterrand had turned the offices of his party over to Alain Krivine, general secretary of the ex-Ligue, so that Krivine could hold a press conference on June 29 despite the fact that there was a warrant out for his arrest. Mitterrand thus forestalled Krivine's arrest for several hours. So Marcellin was unhappy with Mitterrand, "who yesterday met with Mr. Krivine, in spite of what he had just done," and with Marchais, "who, not so long ago spoke of the ultraleftists and Marcellin in the same breath but who today is moaning because the Ligue Communiste has been dissolved."

From his government's point of view, Marcellin had good reason to complain. The support the ex-Ligue has gotten from the mass workers parties and organizations in France, including the SP, the CP, and the major trade-union federations, as well as from the far left and virtually every democratic and civil liberties group in the country, has already forced the regime partially to moderate its attack on the French Trotskyists. The fight against the ban on the Ligue has only just begun, but it has already reached mass proportions.

One of the central vehicles of this fight will be a national committee to oppose the ban. Its platform consists of three points: lift the decree dissolving the Ligue; drop all charges against leaders and members of the Ligue; immediate freedom for Alain Krivine and Pierre Rousset, the two ex-Ligue leaders who are now being

held in jail. (For the full text of the call for formation of the committee see page 853.)

The statement calling for the committee's formation appeared as a paid advertisement in the July 8-9 issue of *Le Monde*. It was signed by nearly

As We Went to Press...

JULY 10—We have just received word that Judge Alain Bernard has ruled favorably on a motion presented by Alain Krivine's lawyer, Yves Jouffa, and has ordered Krivine provisionally released from prison. The government, however, has twenty-four hours in which to appeal that decision and has announced that it will do so.

500 individuals, including prominent figures such as Simone de Beauvoir, Constantine Costa-Gavras, Régis Debray, Marguerite Duras, Michelle Ray, Jean Seberg, Simone Signoret, and leaders of a whole range of political and trade-union organizations, among them the Socialist party, the Confédération Française Démocratique du Travail (French Democratic Confederation of Labor, the country's second largest union federation), the Parti Socialiste Unifié (United Socialist party), the Alliance Marxiste Révolutionnaire (Revolutionary Marxist Alliance, the group headed by Michel Pablo), Lutte Ouvrière, Cause du Peuple, Mouvement pour la Libération des Femmes (Women's Liberation Movement), Jeunesse Socialiste (Socialist Youth), *Libération* (the daily newspaper founded by Jean-Paul Sartre), and the Syndicat National de l'Enseignement Secondaire (National Union of Secondary-School Teachers).

In addition to the statement calling for the formation of the committee, protest meetings and press conferences denouncing the ban and the imprison-

ment of Krivine and Rousset have been held in many French cities. The July 7 issue of the Paris daily *Combat* reported, for example, that in Lille a press conference was held featuring representatives of the CP, SP, CGT, CFDT, FEN (Fédération d'Enseignement Nationale — National Education Federation, the largest teachers union in France), and the Left Radical party. These organizations "vigorously denounced the arrest of the leaders of the Ligue and demanded that they be freed." They demanded the lifting of the ban on the Ligue, which they called a "grave new attack on democratic rights."

The July 5 issue of the Communist party daily *l'Humanité* reported that in Evreux a delegation composed of members of the CP, SP, PSU, CGT, CFDT, and FEN brought a statement to the police chief protesting the ban and the arrests.

The first mass meeting to be held against the ban took place in Paris on July 4. It was sponsored by more than twenty organizations, including the CP and the SP; it drew 15,000 participants. The meeting reflected both the broad support the Ligue has gotten and the ambivalent situation in which the CP leadership finds itself. While compelled to manifest its solidarity with the Ligue against the regime, the Stalinist leaders are bent on preventing the French Trotskyists from fully turning Pompidou's attack into an opportunity to take the offensive against the government. Specifically, this means preventing members of the ex-Ligue from speaking in their own name—which is just what was done at the July 4 meeting.

While nationally known leaders of the CP (like National Assembly member Jacques Duclos) took the floor at the meeting to denounce the ban on the Ligue, members of the editorial board of *Rouge*, formerly the Ligue's newspaper, were denied speaking rights. Throughout the speeches, there were chants from the audience of "La parole à la Ligue!" (Let the Ligue

speak!), but the organizers of the meeting refused to back down.

The day before the meeting, ten far-left organizations addressed an appeal to the meeting organizers saluting the meeting but urging that former members of the Ligue be allowed to speak. "You cannot defend a revolutionary organization and at the same time try to gag it," the statement said in part. "If this decision is in fact carried out, it can only give rise to vigorous condemnation on our part. Nevertheless, by our presence at the meeting we will reaffirm our desire to see the broadest possible response in defense of the right of free expression and organization for all."

The far-left groups all attended the meeting, and their supporters made sure that despite the disagreement on the question of the ex-Ligue's speaking rights, unity against the regime would be maintained. It was.

A similar meeting, one at which former Ligue members are scheduled to speak, has been called for July 11.

Opposition to the ban on the Ligue and the imprisonment of Krivine and Rousset is growing throughout Europe as well as in France itself. The July 6 *Le Monde* reported that 2,000 students in Frankfurt, West Germany, had attended a meeting to protest the ban. Speakers included Daniel Cohn-Bendit and Rudi Dutschke. The July 7 *Combat* reported that 5,000 students at West Berlin's Free University attended a protest meeting that was addressed by Cohn-Bendit.

In Great Britain, support for the Ligue has come from several members of Parliament and from the Communist party. The July 2 issue of *Morning Star*, the paper that reflects the views of the CP, reported that "Gordon McLennan, national organizer of the Communist Party of Great Britain, condemned the arrest of Mr. Krivine, and said that while he disagreed with the policy of the Ligue Communiste, the ban on it was undemocratic and authoritarian."

A special issue of *Red Weekly*, paper of the International Marxist Group, British section of the Fourth International, published an open letter to Pompidou urging him to "withdraw the ban imposed on the Communist League." It was signed by five members of Parliament, Phillip Whitehead, Eric Heffer, Norman Atkinson,

Michael Foot, and Frank Allaun.

In Belgium, the Ligue Révolutionnaire des Travailleurs (LRT—Revolutionary Workers League), Belgian section of the Fourth International, issued a statement calling on "all workers organizations, regardless of their political disagreements, to form a united front in defense of democratic rights. An attack against a part of the workers movement is an attack against the whole workers movement."

The LRT has initiated a petition campaign in support of the French Trotskyists. Initial signers of the petition, which demands the lifting of the ban, include several leaders of the Belgian Communist party.

One of the effects of the refusal to grant the ex-Ligue speaking rights at the meeting in Paris July 4 was that the extent of the government's ban was not tested in one important respect. It is still not known whether Pompidou will insist that the ban means that former members of the Ligue are to be denied the right to express their political views publicly.

But there have been two hopeful signs. On the weekend of July 7-8 opponents of the ban asserted their right to publicly sell copies of *Rouge*, "communist action newspaper," whose second issue since the banning of the Ligue came out dated July 4. On the night of July 7, *Rouge* sellers took to the streets throughout the Latin Quarter. On the morning of July 8 they sold *Rouge* at all the major mar-

ketplaces in Paris. Police made no attempt to interfere with the sales.

Further, police have not attempted to close down the building that houses the Société Internationale d'Éditions (International Publishers, directed by the Trotskyist leader Pierre Frank). The headquarters of the Ligue, which was sacked by a police "search" on June 22, was located in the same building. At first, it was not clear whether the government would insist that the publishing house be shut down.

Besides asserting their political rights, opponents of the ban on the Ligue are also moving on the legal front. Yves Jouffa, attorney for Alain Krivine, has filed a motion demanding Krivine's provisional release. Judge Alain Bernard is scheduled to rule on that motion by the evening of July 10. The July 6 *Le Monde* reported that Krivine had been interrogated by Bernard for seven hours on July 5. He is charged with violating the "antiwrecker law," a sweeping piece of witch-hunt legislation giving the government the right to imprison any leaders of any group that sponsors a demonstration at which violence takes place. If Krivine is not provisionally released, he may be held until October, when judges return from a vacation period. Pierre Rousset, who was arrested simply for being present in the Ligue's headquarters on June 22 during the police search, is being held indefinitely. □

Belgian Far-Left Group Backs Ligue

The Groupe Marxiste Internationaliste (GMI—International Marxist Group), a group mainly composed of former members of the Belgian LRT (Ligue Révolutionnaire des Travailleurs—Revolutionary Workers League, Belgian section of the Fourth International), issued a statement condemning the banning of the Ligue Communiste by the French government.

The statement said in part:

"It [the GMI] regards the simultaneous dissolution of the fascist organization *Ordre Nouveau* as a mere trick designed to give credence to the dissolution of the League.

"It recalls that the French government obligingly allowed the Nazis and racists of *Ordre Nouveau* complete

freedom to demonstrate at the Mutualité on June 21.

"It notes that the legislation adopted in 1936 allegedly against the combat groups of the extreme right is being enforced once again against the revolutionary movement.

"It expresses its solidarity with its French comrades and with the organizations that have just launched a campaign for immediate repeal of the decree banning the Ligue Communiste.

"The French Trotskyist movement was banned under the Nazi occupation, it was dissolved by de Gaulle in 1968, and now it has been dissolved again by Pompidou. It will surely emerge strengthened from this new test. □

International Actions Support Ligue



Part of the picket line at French consulate in New York July 6.

Saturday June 30 seventy members of the International Marxist Group (IMG), British section of the Fourth International, occupied the offices of the French State Tourist Board in Picadilly, London. Leaflets were distributed to customers and staff, explaining that the action was organized to protest the ban on the Ligue Communiste, French section of the Fourth International.

After two hours, the demonstrators linked up with another fifty IMG militants who had been picketing outside the office, and they marched down Picadilly, led by a banner calling for the immediate release of Alain Krivine and other imprisoned Ligue militants in France and demanding the unconditional lifting of the ban. Before the demonstrators dispersed, the IMG stated it intends to mount a solidarity campaign to defend the Ligue in the coming months.

A picket was mounted outside the French Embassy in London July 1, and a demonstration of individuals and groups in Britain opposing the ban was scheduled for July 7.

In Wellington, New Zealand, about twenty people picketed the French Embassy July 2 to protest the ban on the Ligue Communiste and the arrest of Alain Krivine. Holding banners with the slogan "Ban the bomb, not French socialists" (a reference to the French nuclear tests projected for later this summer), members of the Socialist Action League (the New Zealand Trotskyist organization) called for the immediate lifting of the ban.

In the United States, television coverage was given to demonstrations in

Boston (100 persons), Philadelphia (40), and Minneapolis (40), where several trade-union officials sponsored the demonstration. Actions also took place in Detroit (40), Chicago (90), Denver (30), Seattle (75), Los Angeles (65), and San Francisco (over 100). Demonstrations are planned for another six cities.

In New York City, nearly 200 persons picketed the French Consulate July 6. Groups attending included the Socialist Workers party, the Young Socialist Alliance, the Spartacist League, and Youth Against War and Fascism. Chants and picket signs demanded: Free Krivine and Rousset; Lift the ban on the Ligue Communiste; Pompidou's police protect fascists and anti-Semites. A statement of protest was delivered to the Consulate. □

Appeal for Formation of Committee to Fight Ban on Ligue Communiste

[The following is the text of an appeal issued by a number of French political, artistic, scientific, and cultural personalities for the formation of a National Committee Against the Dissolution of the Ligue Communiste. The text was published in the July 3-9 issue of the far-left weekly *Lutte Ouvrière*. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

By jointly dissolving *Ordre Nouveau* and the Ligue Communiste, by thus putting them both on the same level, the government would like to make it look as though it is responding to the desires of a large part of public opinion.

It intends to bring political militants, leaders of the Ligue Communiste, before the State Security Court for violation of the "antiwrecker law" and for "attempted murder."

We believe that it is our duty to denounce this operation. If the government had really wanted to strike at *Ordre Nouveau*, a racist and neo-Nazi organization, it would have been enough to apply the July 1972 law that forbids racist activities and inciting racial hatred. Far from doing this, the government is invoking and utilizing the 1936 law only in order

to set up a scandalous amalgam aimed at outlawing an opposition organization because of its latest political campaigns.

And the height of hypocrisy: the decree dissolving the Ligue Communiste refrains—and for good reason—from mentioning the purpose of the June 21 counterdemonstration, which was to prevent *Ordre Nouveau* from holding in the middle of Paris a meeting aimed at arousing hatred and contempt against the foreign workers and at developing a racist campaign whose possibilities are shown by the events in Grasse.

We are not fooled. The dissolution of the Ligue Communiste represents a dangerous turn and is a provocation against public opinion.

We demand:

● Lift the decree dissolving the Ligue Communiste!

● Drop all charges against leaders or militants of the Ligue Communiste and against all militants who have been harassed since June 21!

● Immediate freedom for all political prisoners, especially Alain Krivine and Pierre Rousset!

We call for the formation of a national committee on the basis of this appeal in order to wage a struggle to defeat the repression. □

International Statements of Solidarity With Ligue Communiste

Revolutionary groups around the world have protested Pompidou's ban on the Ligue Communiste and demanded that Alain Krivine and Pierre

Rousset be freed and that all charges against them be dropped. The following are the texts of the statements we have so far received.

Groupe Marxiste Révolutionnaire come together on this occasion to denounce the ban decreed against the Ligue Communiste. All advocates of democratic rights in France are invited to a protest picket that will be held in front of the French consulate, Place Bonaventure, at 5:30 p.m. Friday, June 29; this will be the first step in a broad campaign for the lifting of the ban on the Ligue Communiste and for the defense of democratic rights in France. In order to prevent the governments of other countries from following the example of the French government, it is necessary to make the defense of the Ligue Communiste's right to exist an exemplary one. □

Quebec Groups Demand Ban Be Lifted

[The following statement was released June 29 by the Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière (Socialist Workers League, part of the League for Socialist Action/Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière, Canadian section of the Fourth International), the Ligue des Jeunes Socialistes (Young Socialists League), and the Groupe Marxiste Révolutionnaire (Revolutionary Marxist Group). All these organizations are based in Québec.]

* * *

Yesterday the French Council of Ministers proclaimed the dissolution of the Ligue Communiste (French section of the Fourth International). This organization had become widely known during the 1969 presidential elections, when it ran Alain Krivine and received a quarter of a million votes. The pretext of this banning was the Ligue Communiste's opposition to the holding on June 21 by the fascist group Ordre Nouveau of a racist meeting against immigrant workers.

The suppression of the Ligue's democratic right to organize caps a period of strikes and high-school and university mobilizations that followed the legislative elections. At the same time, the French press has been full of spectacular revelations about the use of wiretapping by the French police. As we see, Choquette is not the only one to use these little gadgets to suppress socialist and opposition ideas. Law 51, which has recently rounded out the arsenal of the police in Québec, also has its equivalent in the copious arbitrary searches carried out in Pompidou's country. Different countries, but the same customs.

The banning reveals the French government's desire to repress the so-

cialist organizations selectively by isolating them from public opinion. By first attacking the leftist groups, it is preparing the way for an attack against the French trade-union movement, especially against the use of strike pickets during workers strikes.

The Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière, the Ligue des Jeunes Socialistes, and the

Protest at French Embassy in Vienna

[The following documents are a press release and a protest statement issued in Vienna June 29. Signers of both documents were the Austrian Trotskyist organization Gruppe Revolutionäre Marxisten (Revolutionary Marxist Group), the Kommunistischer Bund (Communist League) of Vienna, Marxistisch-Leninistische Studentenorganisation (Marxist-Leninist Student Organization), Freie Oesterreichische Jugend (Free Austrian Youth), Verband Sozialistischer Mittelschüler (Socialist High-School Students League), Verband Marxistischer Studenten (Marxist Student League), and the Verband Marxistischer Arbeiterjugend (League of Marxist Working Youth). The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

On Thursday, June 28, the Ligue Communiste, French section of the Fourth International, which received more than 300,000 votes in the last elections, was banned by the government. The pretext was the organizing of an antifascist demonstration.

Today, June 29, representatives of various progressive and communist groups protested against this measure

at the French embassy in Vienna. While demonstrators outside the embassy addressed themselves to passers-by with placards and leaflets, a delegation attempted to deliver a protest resolution to the embassy.

The embassy personnel were so discomfited by this international solidarity against the repression of the Ligue Communiste that they refused to receive the delegation and instead drove it from the building with physical violence. Members of the delegation had their clothes torn in the process and received minor injuries from the embassy thugs.

It is obvious that such tactics cannot stop international solidarity against the repression of progressive organizations. The protest action in Vienna is only one of many in the important capitals of Europe.

* * *

Solidarity With the Ligue Communiste, French Section of the Fourth International

After the police attacks against striking workers in Besançon and other cities, the Gaullist regime has taken

Intercontinental Press

a new repressive step of unheard-of extent: On Thursday, June 28, 1973, the Ligue Communiste, French section of the Fourth International, was banned, and arrest orders were issued against members of its Political Bureau.

These measures represent a serious attack on the political rights of the progressive and communist movement and deserve the sharpest condemnation. The pretext used by the powers that be to justify their action is worse than rotten: The organizers of a racist witch-hunt and those who protest against it cannot be placed on the same level.

The fascists had sufficient time for the "free expression of opinion" from 1933 to 1945. Police protection for a gathering of Ordre Nouveau was a monstrous provocation against all antifascist forces. With astonishment one learns that the heirs of the Nazis are under the protection of the police and the military in a country that had one of the strongest resistance movements in Europe.

The measures against the Ligue Communiste are part of an unexamined escalation of repression against democrats, leftists, and communists in Europe. The dissolving of the General Union of Palestinian Students and

the General Union of Palestinian Workers and the outlawing of the KPD [Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands — Communist party of Germany] in West Germany, countless fascist provocations in Italy, and the intensified state terror against all the progressive forces in Spain are only the most prominent examples of a long chain of repressive measures against revolutionists and the workers movement as a whole and against all progressive forces.

From the beginning, the French government has been deeply involved in this chain. Its complicity with the Franco dictatorship's steps against the ETA (the Basque liberation movement) is well known. Once again it has been shown that repression against foreigners is only a prelude to repression at home.

All the progressive forces will stand firmly and decisively against the repression in Europe!

We solidarize with the Ligue Communiste!

We demand:

Immediate revocation of the ban on the Ligue Communiste!

Immediate release of all members of the Ligue Communiste!

Immediate revocation of the arrest warrants! □

in hounding and planning attacks on immigrant workers, but also in serving as strikebreakers for the French bosses by openly attacking picket lines.

The International Marxist Group, the British section of the Fourth International, salutes the militants of the dissolved Communist League and congratulates them for their initiatives against the fascists. The rise of a new extreme-right is not simply a French phenomenon. It is a process which is taking place in a number of countries in capitalist Europe and is a result of the growing instability of the capitalist system on both an economic and political level. As such it has to be seen in the light of the increasing repression and attacks on democratic rights which the bourgeois governments themselves are launching throughout Europe. The banning of a Maoist group in Brandt's Germany, the new laws against immigrants in social-democratic Sweden, the legal harassment of strikers in Britain together with the role of the army in Northern Ireland, the rise of the MSI [Movimento Sociale Italiano — Italian Social Movement] in Italy, repression in Switzerland, are all pointers to the growth of the strong state in a period of capitalist decay.

In this situation the attack of the French government on the Communist League does not come as a surprise. For the last two years the growth of the Communist League as the largest and most powerful organisation of the revolutionary left in Western Europe has been worrying the French bourgeoisie. The role of the Communist League, earlier this spring, in the massive mobilisations of school students against the army, and its actions in defending these mobilisations against the fascists, are public knowledge. It was only a matter of time before the Gaullist regime intervened. The fact that they have acted against the French section of the Fourth International because of the latter's initiatives against a fascist organisation is an indication whose importance will not be lost on the working-class movement in France. Already protests are pouring in from many quarters.

The action cannot be allowed to go unchallenged. The IMG appeals to all working class organisations (including the Labour and Communist

British Trotskyists Condemn Ban

[The following statement was issued June 29 by the International Marxist Group (IMG), British Section of the Fourth International.]

* * *

On June 28th, 1973, the French government, after a special cabinet meeting, announced the dissolution of the Communist League, the French section of the Fourth International, and prepared to prosecute its leaders in a "special Court for State Security". This is one of the few instances since June 1968 that a revolutionary organisation has been declared illegal. As such it constitutes the opening of a new attack on the revolutionary movement as a whole and reflects the gravity of the social and political crisis which is confronting the French ruling class.

The attack on the Communist League comes on the heels of the latter's combative opposition to the French fascist organisation Ordre Nouveau (New Order). This organisation attempted to hold a mass meeting in the centre of Paris to mobilise support for an openly racist campaign directed against immigrant workers. The Communist League was vital in ensuring a vigorous counter-demonstration in the course of which the police openly appeared as the defenders of the Ordre Nouveau. At the end of the day nearly seven hundred fascists, dressed in black uniforms and black helmets, were escorted by armed policemen in *their* black uniforms and riot shields to a place of safety. This is the first time since 1934 that the French police has come to the aid of the fascists in such a blatant way. Ordre Nouveau has, over the last year, been particularly active not only

Parties) to support a campaign in this country to get the ban on the Communist League lifted. We call, in particular, on all socialist and revolutionary organisations to join in

our actions on this question, which include a picket of the French Embassy this weekend, a public meeting in the following week and a demonstration on Saturday 7th July. □

the democratic rights not only of revolutionary socialists, but also of all workers organizations.

The LSA/LSO appeals to all organizations and individuals in Canada with an interest in defending the democratic rights of the workers organizations—the New Democratic Party, the trade unions, the other left organizations such as the Communist Party, civil liberties organizations, women's liberation organizations — to protest the totalitarian decree of the French government.

DROP THE BAN ON THE COMMUNIST LEAGUE! For the right of all political tendencies to organize for their views.

We call for a united protest picket line at the Consulate of France, 185 Bay Street, Friday, June 29 at 7 p.m. All groups and individuals who wish to join this protest and to make statements of their views are so invited.

The protest is initiated by the LSA/LSO as the sister organization in Canada to the Communist League of France. □

Canadian Trotskyists Protest Ban

[The following press release was issued June 28 by the League for Socialist Action/Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière (LSA/LSO), Canadian section of the Fourth International.]

* * *

"The French government's ban on the Communist League is a blow against the entire left and workers movement," John Riddell, executive secretary of the League for Socialist Action/Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière, stated today.

The LSA/LSO is the Canadian section of the Fourth International, the world party of socialist revolution, founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938. The Communist League is the French section of the Fourth International.

The move by the Pompidou government to dissolve the Communist League is a qualitative new stage in the increasing campaign of repression against the Trotskyist movement by the French government, Riddell stated.

This is not the first time that the French Trotskyists have been outlawed by the state in recent years, Riddell noted. In 1968 its predecessors, the Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire (JCR) and the Parti Communiste Internationaliste (PCI) were banned by de Gaulle along with several other left-wing organizations, following the massive May strike and upsurge by millions of workers and students, in which the JCR and the PCI played a leading role. That ban was never lifted.

In 1969, the French Trotskyists were the only far-left organization to contest the presidential election against Pompidou. Alain Krivine was the Communist League's standard-bearer, winning the support of a quarter-million French worker and student voters.

Speaking today on French radio, Krivine declared that the Communist League would not accept the government's order to dissolve.

An Associated Press dispatch from Paris today inferred the real motivations behind Pompidou's attack on the

Communist League. "The Ligue Communiste . . . was regarded as a much more important target of the government because its Trotskyist stance has become increasingly popular among French political youth. The League was a key force behind widespread student demonstrations this spring and provided much of the leadership, including Michel Field, a spokesman for the demonstrators."

The banning of the Ordre Nouveau (New Order) is only a pretext to get at the Communist League. By banning both a neo-fascist organization and a revolutionary socialist organization in the same decree, the regime hopes to play on the understandable hatred of the French masses towards fascism in order to undermine

New Zealand Trotskyists Say Free Krivine

[The following statement, in the form of an open letter addressed to the French ambassador to New Zealand, was issued July 2 by the Socialist Action League, the New Zealand Trotskyist organization.]

* * *

On June 29 it was reported that Mr. Pompidou's government has banned the Communist League—the largest organisation of the radical left in France—and arrested its leader, Alain Krivine.

The Communist League has been at the head of the massive protests against militarism which have taken place throughout France this year. Several hundred thousand high-school students, university students and apprentices demonstrated in March and April against new laws which sought to step up the conscription of young people.

Alain Krivine and other League leaders were prominent participants in the giant student-worker protests in May-June 1968. Krivine was the League's candidate in the 1969 presidential elections, polling one quarter

of a million votes.

There can be no doubt that the ban on the League is aimed at intimidating the organised high-school and university student movement. The pretext for the ban was that the League defended itself against a combined attack by police and the fascist "New Order" group. This was only the latest in a series of violent attacks which have taken place against student and left-wing demonstrations this year, with the fascists and police working together to bludgeon the protesters, several of whom have been hospitalised.

Yet when the left defends itself against such attacks, the French government responds by banning the victims! The government's simultaneous banning of the "New Order" mob is only a cover for this attack against the French left. The League has been demanding for some time that the government take action against the fascists' street violence.

We demand the immediate lifting of the French government's ban against the Communist League, and the release of Alain Krivine. □

Argentina Swept by Prison Rebellions

Since President Héctor Cámpora took office May 25, Argentina has been swept by at least eleven prison riots. The rebellions, by common prisoners, have raised a number of demands, among them the removal of officials, commutation of sentences, release from prison, improvements in prison food, relaxation of discipline inside the prisons.

The government decided in mid-June to commute the sentences of common prisoners in an effort to quell the rebellions. (See *Intercontinental Press*, June 25, p. 754.) As a result, some 800 prisoners have reportedly been freed. The prison rebellions, however, have not subsided.

United Press International reported, in a dispatch published in the July 5 issue of the New York Spanish-language daily *El Dairio-La Prensa*, that the fourth new rebellion within twenty-four hours had broken out.

The rebellions have affected prisons not only in the capital, but in other cities as well, among them Rosario, Santa Rosa, and Salta. "The demands of the prisoners throughout the entire country," reported UPI, "include measures that will tend to alleviate their situation, mainly as regards trial procedures and various improvements in prison conditions." The prisoners are also demanding that the commutation of sentences be implemented.

On June 29, prisoners in Villa Devoto Prison in Buenos Aires went on a hunger strike, demanding ratification of a special law releasing prisoners. Some threatened to set fire to themselves if their demand was not met.

"The atmosphere of tension grew sharper last night," reported the July 4 issue of the Buenos Aires daily *La Opinión*, "especially among the groups of relatives that have taken to standing around in the vicinity of the Villa Devoto Prison."

A number of prisoners had to be hospitalized as a result of the hunger strike.

In Santa Rosa, in La Pampa Province, where prisoners are demanding the immediate removal of prison of-

ficials, six guards were taken hostage. "The conflict was going peacefully as this edition went to press," *La Opinión* said. "The governor of La Pampa, Aquiles Regazzoli, ordered the release of eighteen prisoners whose terms of confinement allowed them to leave the

Prisoners Begin Passive Resistance Campaign

Turkish Defendants Charge Torture

Torture is once again a major issue in Turkey. According to the June 19 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde*, one of the fifty-seven accused in the so-called "bombs" trial, Numan Esin, declared before the judges of the Istanbul military tribunal that he had been tortured by the police.

Two ex-officers implicated in the same trial, Talat Turhan and Hasan Yalcinkaya, also stated that they had been tortured during questioning. At the tribunal's request, martial-law authorities in Istanbul sent the three to the military hospital at Haydarpasa, where the doctors reported no trace of maltreatment. This led Esin to challenge the competence of these doctors, "bound by their military obligations." Another defendant, Atamer Erol, presented the judges one of his teeth, broken during his interrogation by the police departments.

The military judges, while taking note of the allegations of torture, expressed the opinion that these allegations were in fact a defense method aimed at influencing public opinion. On the other hand, two former officers of the May 1960 junta, Kamil Karavelioglu and Suphi Karaman, reacted sharply. In a telegram addressed to the Istanbul military commander, General Faik Turun, Karavelioglu expressed his indignation at the practice of torture, which, he said, is aimed at finding "false culprits" while those genuinely responsible remain at lib-

prison. The prisoners, for their part, sent the authorities a list of other inmates whom they wanted to see freed."

By July 5, Argentine authorities had decided to crack down. According to a UPI report in the July 6 *El Diario*, "two prisoners died and dozens of others were wounded and injured" during the repression. Officials said that the two dead men were inmates in a neuropsychiatric hospital who drank ethyl alcohol they had obtained during the riot there. □

erty. Karaman took the floor at a stormy session of the Senate to demand an official inquiry into the torture allegations and to call for penalties, if necessary, against the torturers.

In Ankara, *Le Monde* reported, several university students known for their progressive ideas were arrested recently. Some of them are still being held, while others have been jailed, accused of belonging to a clandestine organization.

On June 20, more than a thousand prisoners in an Ankara jail began a campaign of passive resistance in protest against the National Assembly's decision to strike off its agenda a draft bill for a general amnesty. Implementation of the amnesty was projected for the October festivities planned to mark the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the republic. The June 22 issue of *Le Monde* reported that the prisoners are refusing meals, and that those who are presently on trial are boycotting the tribunal.

The amnesty bill was submitted to the National Assembly by the Republican People's party, the major opposition grouping. The sharp controversy over the bill has been stimulated by the presence in the prisons of nearly 400 leftists, arrested under the state of emergency. The (majority) Justice party would prefer that no decision be taken on this matter before the general elections scheduled for October 14, suggests *Le Monde*. □

Nixon in Seclusion As Scandals Mount

By Allen Myers

"President Nixon," John Herbers wrote from San Clemente in a dispatch to the July 3 *New York Times*, "has been here since June 22 and has not left the Presidential compound except to see off the Soviet leader, Leonid I. Brezhnev, at El Toro Marine Air Station on June 24. He has worked in seclusion except for brief ceremonial occasions."

Nixon's seclusion at San Clemente was symbolic of his political isolation in the days following John Dean's devastating testimony before the Senate Watergate committee. Even members of his own party are anxious to disassociate themselves from the gangster in the White House.

"One senior Republican congressman," *Newsweek* reported in its July 9 issue, ". . . was asked how many of his colleagues now believe Mr. Nixon to have been involved in the cover-up. 'Everyone,' he said tartly, 'except Gerry Ford and Les Arends'—the Minority Leader and the Republican whip."

A "moderate" Republican senator told the magazine: "The President is no longer relevant. It's every man for himself now."

Even conservative reporter Stewart Alsop, a long-time Nixon supporter, called on Nixon to resign. In his *Newsweek* column, Alsop suggested that Nixon was reduced to using his office mainly to stay out of jail:

"If President Nixon were to cease to be President, he would become plain Citizen Nixon, theoretically as liable to a summons or a subpoena or even indictment for felony as any Citizen Smith. As the testimony has made obvious, Mr. Nixon sees himself as a man surrounded by enemies, and he may also see the White House as a necessary fortress to protect him from those enemies."

Public belief in Nixon's guilt is approaching unanimity. A Gallup poll taken June 22-25—before Dean's appearance on nationwide television—found that 71 percent believed that Nixon planned, had prior knowledge of, and/or helped cover up the Water-

gate burglary. Only 17 percent thought him totally innocent.

"Middle America," whose support Nixon has always claimed, shares this view of his involvement. In the July 5 *Washington Post*, Leroy F. Aarons described the mood of disenchantment in several small towns in the mid-western state of Kansas.

"We do not know what's going on in our government any more," one



KLEINDIENST: Nixon gangster aids Mafia gangster.

typical resident told Aarons. "All we know is we've had a lot of crookedness, and that's what it is, just plain crookedness."

"The increasing skepticism in conservative Kansas," Aarons wrote, "one of the most solid Nixon states in the last election, is reflected in the press as well. Today's Hutchinson, Kan., News editorial quoted Thomas Jefferson's list of grievances against King George III in the Declaration of Independence—'He has obstructed the administration of justice. . . . He has made judges dependent upon his will.

. . . He is transporting large armies of mercenaries to complete the works of death, destruction and tyranny.

. . .
"Then, the newspaper pointedly adds: 'These grievances were filed against King George III. We mention that just in case you got confused about the monarch at whom the Declaration was aimed.'"

Nixon's credibility is not increased by his inability to answer the charges that have been raised. On July 2, two days after Dean finished his testimony, White House press secretary Ronald Ziegler announced that Nixon would make no public statement until after the Senate committee finishes the present phase of its hearings, which are scheduled to run into September.

"Mr. Ziegler," Herbers reported in the *New York Times*, "emphasized that the President would have nothing to say publicly on the matter before then, that he will not appear before the committee or the investigating grand jury to answer the charges, that he will not submit a statement to the committee nor answer in writing or any other way questions put to him by the committee."

Ziegler said that Nixon would not even hold a press conference until the current phase of the hearings is over. His last news conference was on March 15.

On July 7, Nixon himself sent a letter to Sam Ervin, the committee chairman, confirming his determination not to testify. Nixon also retracted an earlier promise to give the committee access to White House papers bearing on the investigation.

The reason for this refusal to cooperate with the committee is obvious. If it were simply a matter of discrediting Dean's charges, Nixon could probably invent a defense that, if not entirely plausible, would at least undermine the widespread conviction of his personal role in the scandal.

But Nixon has already been forced by events to retract, one after another, his previous denials and explanations. He simply cannot afford the risk of having still another defense contradicted by the witnesses who have not yet testified.

The Ervin committee plans to hear from about twenty more persons during the current phase of the investigation. And with perhaps a few exceptions, Nixon cannot be certain that

any of them would not give the lie to whatever defense he might offer now.

The witnesses still to be heard include H. R. Haldeman and John Ehrlichman, formerly Nixon's two top aides, and former White House special counsel Charles Colson. All three have indicated publicly that they remain loyal to Nixon and will deny Dean's accusations, but it remains to be seen whether their stories will hold up under cross-examination.

There are other witnesses of whom Nixon can be even less sure. These include Egil Krogh, who organized the burglary of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist's office and who, according to Dean, said that Nixon ordered him to do so. Frederick LaRue, a former

ey to the Watergate burglars and thus confirm an important part of Dean's testimony.

The first witness scheduled when the hearings resume July 10 is John Mitchell, former attorney general and CREEP director. Mitchell has already been indicted for obstruction of justice and perjury in connection with an illegal campaign contribution. Perjury would seem to come easy to Mitchell: His lawyer has already announced that Mitchell's testimony to the Ervin committee will not implicate Nixon in any way.

On more than one occasion, Martha Mitchell, the wife of the former attorney general, has declared that he is covering up for Nixon. In a June 22 telephone call to a reporter, for example, she declared that Mitchell would "go to jail for Richard Nixon." If Mitchell sticks to his past statements on Watergate, the prediction is very likely to come true—a fact that will cause Nixon some nervousness until Mitchell has completed his testimony.

Nixon's difficulties, moreover, are not confined to the Ervin committee hearings. New scandals crop up almost daily, covering the spectrum from illegal campaign contributions to deals with organized crime to Nixon lining his own pockets at public expense:

- On July 6, George A. Spater, the chairman of American Airlines, admitted that the corporation had made an illegal donation of \$55,000 to CREEP in early 1972. The contribution, he said, was solicited by Kalmbach at a time when the corporation had a request before the government for approval of a proposed merger with another airline.

Spater's confession was motivated by the knowledge that documentary evidence of the contribution was already in the hands of special prosecutor Archibald Cox. The evidence reportedly consists of a secret list of campaign contributors that was obtained under subpoena from Rose Mary Woods, Nixon's personal secretary. It has not been publicly released, but is said to contain records of more than \$19 million in donations to CREEP. The existence of the list is expected to produce more corporate confessions.

- Senator Henry Jackson of Washington announced July 5 that the Senate Permanent Investigations Subcommittee, which he heads, would look

into a pardon that Nixon granted a Mafia figure in December 1970. Angelo DeCarlo was pardoned after serving only nineteen months of a twelve-year sentence. Jackson charged that John Dean and Richard Kleindienst, then assistant attorney general, had "bypassed normal procedures and safeguards" in handling DeCarlo's petition for pardon.

- Documents turned over to the Ervin committee by Dean prove that White House officials sought a parole for an imprisoned Teamsters Union official after Florida Senator George Smathers and Bebe Rebozo, a long-time friend of Nixon, suggested that this would help Nixon's reelection campaign.

- Nixon's expenditure of nearly \$2 million in public funds to improve his properties in Florida and California was described in the July 2 issue of *Intercontinental Press*. Infor-



MITCHELL: Ready to "go to jail for Richard Nixon"?

high official of the Committee to Reelect the President (CREEP), has been allowed to plead guilty to one count of conspiracy to obstruct justice in exchange for telling what he knows; if he holds to this promise, it could be very embarrassing for Nixon. Similarly, Nixon's former personal attorney, Herbert Kalmbach, is reported to be cooperating with the federal prosecutors in the hope that he will not be indicted; even if his testimony does not touch Nixon himself, it is likely to link Ehrlichman and Haldeman directly to the payment of hush mon-

An Answer to His Prayers?

Among the documents turned over to the Senate Watergate committee by John Dean was a memorandum indicating that White House officials intervened to stop tax audits on two of Nixon's personal friends: actor John Wayne and evangelist Billy Graham.

The magazine *Christianity Today* reports that Graham claims to be "completely mystified" by the memo. "I have never asked for any intervention and I have not been aware of any intervention," Graham said, presumably referring only to human agencies.

mation has now been uncovered by the press indicating that Nixon saved himself at least \$200,000 in taxes by donating personal papers to the National Archives. Nixon appears to have falsified the date of the gift in order to evade a law that removed tax deductions for such donations.

- A former presidential staff assistant has said that Haldeman and his assistant Larry Higby attempted to get blackmail-type information on Ervin and Lowell Weicker, another member of the Senate Watergate committee. Nixon's staunchest defender on the committee, Senator Edward Gurney, admitted July 2 that on May 23 Rebozo and Murray Chotiner, another long-time Nixon friend and political

adviser, gave him \$20,800 as a "contribution" to his 1974 reelection campaign.

● Randolph W. Thrower, the former commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, has stated that he resisted "strong pressure" from the White House in 1970 to hire John Caulfield or Gordon Liddy to head a crack-down on radicals. Liddy is one of the convicted Watergate conspirators and Caulfield has admitted carrying promises of executive clemency to the Watergate burglars. The *Washington Post* reported that the pressure on Thrower came from Ehrlichman, who was then Nixon's top domestic adviser.

● The *Wall Street Journal* reported July 6 that lawyers defending CREEP in a civil suit had turned over to the judge a sealed file marked "Jones-Luxembourg." It is thought that the file contains information on another "laundering" operation similar to the one in which \$100,000 eventually paid to the Watergate burglars was sent through a Mexican bank in order to conceal its origin.

● Nationally syndicated columnist Jack Anderson reported July 2 that a subsidiary of the International Telephone and Telegraph corporation had installed a golf course—free of charge—on Nixon's San Clemente estate. This gift was made at about the same time that ITT promised a \$400,000 contribution to Nixon's campaign in exchange for a favorable settlement of an antitrust case.

● William J. Casey, the former head of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), told the House Commerce Subcommittee on Investigations that Ehrlichman pressured him last year not to seek ITT documents related to the \$400,000 contribution and the antitrust suit.

There is scarcely a single individual in the Nixon administration who remains untouched by one or another scandal. The U.S. people are being treated to an unprecedented look at the real workings of the world's most powerful capitalist government.

The unfolding scandals have developed a momentum of their own that no one has yet been able to bring under control. While the talk of impeachment or of Nixon's resignation is still only talk, the U.S. ruling class may yet find itself forced to consider these alternatives seriously as the only way to conceal the truth. □

Secret Talks Pick Up Speed

Sihanouk Stakes Out His 'Independence'

"I proposed to Kissinger that he should see us," Norodom Sihanouk told reporters in Peking July 5. "I made the proposal two or three times. Now it's too late."

In the midst of the current flurry of diplomatic activity, Sihanouk's statement aroused considerable skepticism from most observers, as Murrey Marder reported in the July 6 *Washington Post*:

"To many diplomats Sihanouk, in an exultant mood, was staking out, unsurprisingly, a tough bargaining

he will be able to meet with Sihanouk.

With the Chinese bureaucrats having evidently decided to force the Cambodian rebels into a cease-fire agreement, Sihanouk may bluster about "fighting on," but he shows no inclination or ability to oppose the plans of his hosts.

The Chinese role was underscored by meetings July 6 between Huang Chen, the Chinese government's representative in the United States, and Kissinger and Nixon. Huang was flown to San Clemente, California, where Nixon was hiding out from the Watergate scandal, in the presidential jetliner, a mark of courtesy that White House press secretary Ronald Ziegler pointedly called to the attention of reporters. Huang met with Kissinger for several hours and then with Nixon for about forty minutes.

Kissinger later told reporters that one of the subjects they discussed was Cambodia.

"The ambassador and I," Kissinger added, giving Huang a title higher than his official one, "reviewed the international situation in a friendly and constructive manner."

Kissinger did not discuss details of his talks with Huang, but he offered the observation that the "public expressions of the Chinese leaders have been in the direction of peace throughout Indochina."

In a July 6 report on the secret moves toward a Cambodian agreement, Bernard Gwertzman of the *New York Times* indicated—no doubt on the basis of deliberate "leaks"—that Nixon has enlisted the aid of other governments as well:

"Washington has . . . asked all governments with contacts in Peking to join in efforts to persuade Prince Sihanouk to seek a political settlement guaranteeing him some power, and not to trust to a military victory in which he might find himself the puppet of a militant Communist regime.

"The Chinese, French, Rumanian and Yugoslav Governments, among others, are believed to have spoken to him."



KISSINGER: Anxious to meet with Sihanouk in Peking.

stand, rather than literally rejecting all negotiations."

Several days earlier, in an interview with the *New York Times*, Sihanouk had acknowledged that discussions on a Cambodian cease-fire were already under way between the U.S., French, Soviet, Chinese, and North Vietnamese governments. Washington has been careful to leak the information that Sihanouk's return to Pnompenh could be part of an acceptable settlement, and that Henry Kissinger hopes that when he visits Peking in late July or early August,

Sihanouk has used an interview with the *New York Times* to signal Nixon as to his independence of any "militant Communist regime." The prince was interviewed in Rumania June 29 and 30 by Henry Kamm. A portion of his remarks was published July 1, and represented a rather open gesture of willingness to be reconciled with the wing of U.S. imperialism represented by congressional "doves." (See *Intercontinental Press*, July 9, p. 837.) The rest of the interview, which was not published until July 4, appealed even more openly to imperialism and even hinted broadly that Sihanouk was shopping for U.S. "aid." His 1963 decision to end U.S. "aid," Sihanouk said, was made "under the pressure of leftists."

"I assure you," he told Kamm, "that there would have been no coup d'état if I had not rejected American aid. My great mistake was 1963, when I rejected American aid." Kamm continued:

"He added quickly that it was a mistake that he would make again if he were to start over tomorrow because he considered the way in which the United States gives its military and economic assistance a humiliation.

"But, the Prince suggested, a small, underdeveloped country in a region in turmoil could not afford such an assertion of national independence with impunity.

"Either I accepted all the compromises with American materialism or I agreed to help the Vietcong," he said, using the word 'Vietcong'—disliked by the Vietnamese Communists—as a synonym for the North Vietnamese and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam."

Sihanouk went on to explain that he allowed arms to be transported across Cambodia to the Vietnamese liberation fighters not out of any feelings of solidarity, but because he was able to impose a levy of one-third on such equipment:

"There was two-thirds for the Vietcong and one-third for my army. That way I didn't have to provide in my budget for military equipment, arms and ammunition."

Nixon's legal commitment to end the bombing of Cambodia by August 15 obviously gives Sihanouk a little extra advantage in the secret deal be-

ing worked out—although not as great an advantage as that provided by the successes of the liberation fighters, who control 85 to 90 percent of the country. Should Sihanouk attempt to overplay his hand, Nixon has several cards in reserve, including the use of the Saigon puppet forces and an appeal to Congress to permit continued bombing. This latter possibility was mentioned by James Schlesinger, Nixon's new secretary of

defense, in a July 6 press conference. John W. Finney reported in the *New York Times*:

"Asked what action might be taken if by Aug. 15 no cease-fire was reached and military conditions had so deteriorated that Phnom Penh was in danger of falling, Dr. Schlesinger said that President Nixon might ask Congress for authority to continue the bombing. It was apparent that he regarded this as unlikely." □

More Than 100,000 Still in Thieu's Jails

Ask Aid for Vietnamese Political Prisoners

Amnesty International called July 1 for a concerted international campaign to free more than 100,000 political prisoners being held by the Thieu regime. The appeal was issued in conjunction with a forty-page report entitled *Political Prisoners in South Vietnam*.

While the January 27 cease-fire agreement called for the release of all prisoners, the provision has been deliberately ignored by the Saigon puppet regime. The Amnesty report notes that political prisoners have been reclassified as criminals in order to evade the agreement: ". . . since late in 1972 the GRVN [Government of the Republic of Vietnam—the Thieu gang] has been systematically reclassifying large sections of the prison population, so that prisoners once detained under various 'political offender' classifications now appear to be held under ordinary criminal charges."

Many prisoners have never been tried, even though those trials that are held are mere formalities, most of them lasting less than five minutes.

"It is also very common," the report says, "for prisoners to be held on in prison for years after they have served out their sentences, on the grounds that they are 'obstinate', refuse to salute the GRVN flag and so on. Amnesty has on record the cases of prisoners held for five years and more in this way."

Torture is still a standard practice of Thieu's police, the report adds:

"There can be no doubt that torture is now also widely used in areas controlled by the GRVN not only as

an instrument of intimidation but as an end in itself. Torture has become a standard part of the interrogation not only of NLF suspects, but also a wide range of non-Communist political dissidents."

The "cease-fire" has not brought an end to the notorious Operation Phoenix, the CIA-organized campaign of assassination against suspected NLF cadres. The report quotes official U.S. estimates that 20,000 persons have been killed by this operation and adds:

"Another branch of the National Police is now in charge of the Phoenix Program, which together with the 'F6 plan' put into action in 1972, has been responsible for the arrests and executions of tens of thousands of 'suspects' . . .

"Since the January Ceasefire the Phoenix Program has continued in operation while being adjusted to the political needs of the post-ceasefire period."

The report quotes a Saigon Ministry of the Interior telegram that explains that in reports on assassinations "the expression 'charged with being a communist or an agent for the communists' should not be used and instead 'disturbing the public order' should be substituted." □

Permanent Job Opening

Richard Nixon on July 2 accepted "with the deepest regret" the resignation of Robert Anderson, the U.S. representative in the Panama Canal treaty negotiations. Anderson had held the job for nine years.

The Workers Against the Black Market

By Hugo Blanco

Santiago

JUNE 14—One of the products in shortest supply in Chile at the moment is toothpaste. It is almost impossible to find it except on the black market. One of the recent labor conflicts in Santiago was caused by the struggle of the workers against this state of affairs.

"GEKA Laboratories" is the company that makes the most popular toothpaste in Chile. The bosses of this company had distinguished themselves by repeatedly failing to live up to contract agreements. Among other things, they did not provide the agreed-upon uniforms. As for wage raises, they violated agreements and in a discriminatory fashion raised only those of their informers and stooges.

But the bosses of this company were not satisfied with exploiting their own workers. They attempted to suck blood from the people as a whole. They urged their workers to stage a public demonstration in the streets clamoring for *an increase in the price of toothpaste!* This was not a utopian hope on their part, for bosses in various countries have succeeded in getting their workers to take such action in connection with offers of wage increases. This time, however, the GEKA bosses were mistaken. They found themselves up against the highly developed class consciousness of the workers, who told them that to do such a thing would be as crazy as to take to the streets shouting "We want an increase in the price of bread and milk!"

But this was not all the workers did in defense of the interests of the consumer. The workers who made the truck deliveries of toothpaste to the pharmacies agreed to inform the neighbors in the vicinity of each pharmacy of the deliveries.

The boss had had the labels removed from the boxes so the public would not be able to identify the toothpaste. The workers resorted to many different ploys to frustrate the boss's

efforts to keep it a secret. They would enter a pharmacy full of customers with the boxes open so people could see what they contained. When they were not allowed to do this, they would "stumble" so that the tubes of toothpaste would be out in the open for everyone to see. On other occasions, they would ask the pharmacist in a loud voice what product was being delivered. Lastly, they would tell the neighbors directly about the arrival of the toothpaste.

Everyone knows that the reason the pharmacists and the bosses were angry about all this is their efforts to send all of the product onto the black market.

The laboratory owners began a campaign against the delivery men. They took them off their jobs and sent them to carry out very boring tasks, generally isolated from the rest of the workers and under the close watch of a supervisor who took it upon himself to make life miserable for them. This kind of repression was first applied to one worker, Roberto Pizarro, and then extended to others. Finally, a supervisor attacked the worker Orlando Ramirez, and when Ramirez complained, he was fired.

This was the last straw for the GEKA workers (most of whom are women), who had already been hit with the imprisonment of two of their compañeras, slandered as having stolen two (!) tubes of toothpaste.

The workers, and some of the white-collar employees, went on strike. They asked that contracts be observed, that those who had been fired be rehired, and that the all-powerful supervisors be punished. But the demand that stood out most was the following: "We demand an investigation into where our products are sent and the way in which the taxes are paid. . . . We demand the immediate formation of bodies that allow the participation of the workers in the distribution of our products and in the acquisition of raw materials."

The complaints of the GEKA work-

ers against government officials should be pointed out. The work inspector Emilio Loyola called María Eugenia Fariás, the president of the union, "crazy" for consistently defending the rights of her compañeros. The strike manifesto stated: "Our concern as workers has always been to keep a lookout for and to expose the whole gamut of irregularities that have existed, and that exist, in regard to the distribution of our products; we have demonstrated this concern in repeated reports to DIRINCO [Dirección de Industria y Comercio—Industry and Trade Office] and the Oficina de Delitos Tributarios [Office of Tax Violations] without yet seeing any solution to the problem of the undersupply of Odontine paste."

From the very first day of the strike, the GEKA workers received support from the Vicuña Mackena Industrial Cordón. Despite the cordón's organizational weaknesses, it was able to see to it that there were always compañeros from other factories on the scene in the tents set up by the GEKA union in the entrance to the laboratory. This, and the public demonstration carried out by the cordón, served to counteract the provocations of the right and pro-boss elements—stooges who first took over the factory to prevent the workers from occupying it, and who then, after leaving through the windows because of the lack of water, settled down on the facing sidewalk and engaged in provocations against the workers. One night, cars belonging to Patria y Libertad [Fatherland and Freedom, a far-right group] drove past throughout the whole night in an effort to intimidate the workers.

Nevertheless, neither the provocations, nor the maneuvers of the pro-boss judges, nor the attitude of the CUT [Central Unica de Trabajadores—Workers Central Union] and the Popular Unity government leadership of putting a brake on struggles, nor the hunger and cold endured by the workers in the flimsy and simple tents were enough to force the workers, the GEKA production workers, and the few white-collar workers who joined them, to give up.

Although at first the workers demanded only the points already mentioned, when they saw the hostile attitude of the bosses and the results

of a deal that was agreed to by the workers in the Vitorino shoe factory, they decided to demand that the plant be transferred to the Social Sector of the economy, that is, to state ownership. At Vitorino, the bosses had just agreed to provide a heaven on earth for the workers so that work could be resumed; yet they ended up firing all but seven of their workers. The GEKA workers saw through the sweet promises finally made by their bosses, and rejected them.

Finally, through DIRINCO the government found itself obliged to requisition the laboratories and name an interventor. The Communist party and its economics minister, Orlando Millas, opposed this "take-over" (which was in reality only a blocking of the gates); yet they were forced to give in by the pressure of the working class and the GEKA workers. In an irony of the class struggle, the workers were led by a rank-and-file CP activist, a courageous twenty-eight-year-old woman who placed the interests of her class above the interests of her party.

The final resolution adopted by the general assembly of the GEKA workers union was:

"1. Bring into operation as soon as possible all bodies of workers participation—an administrative committee, a coordinating committee, production committees, and committees for defense and protection.

"2. Change administrative structures: strict control over planning and distribution; a large percentage of the goods produced must go directly to the people, for the present via the Monserrat Store (a people's store planned by the Vicuña Mackena Cordón). In the future, all of the goods that are produced must go directly to the people via people's stores.

"3. End wage and salary discrimination.

"4. Open all the books.

"5. A common dining hall. At present there are four—one each for office workers, professional workers, production workers, and bosses. . . ."

It is clear that the struggle has not ended, not even on the level of this particular factory. A new stage is beginning, one of struggle against the state bureaucracy, of struggle for workers management. In order to wage this struggle, the workers will have to recognize the fraudulent nature of so-called participation. □

gency into a state of siege. Such a measure would have set aside many constitutional guarantees for a period of ninety days and given the president the power to order house arrests and search and seizure without warrants.

On July 2, the Chamber of Deputies rejected the petition by a vote of 81 to 52. In response, Allende issued a statement in which he warned that "every citizen should be aware that the nation is on the border of a new civil war, which the Government is pledged to avoid."

On July 1, a government offer was accepted by striking workers at Chile's giant Teniente copper mine, bringing to an end their two-and-a-half-month strike. "The strikers last night agreed to return to their jobs tomorrow after accepting a Government offer of a bonus payment of \$225 and a wage increase of \$15 a month," reported Reuters July 2. "But they are demanding that sanctions against 60 miners dismissed for occupying a radio station in Rancagua, near the mine 50 miles south of Santiago, be called off.

"The Government has insisted that a commission be set up to try the 60."

The strike cost Chile an estimated \$70 million to \$100 million in lost production.

By July 5, five days after the attempted coup, Allende felt that the situation had stabilized to the point that he could call off the state of emergency imposed throughout the entire country, as well as the 11:00 p.m. to 6:30 a.m. curfew in the capital. Almost 2,000 people had been arrested in Santiago for curfew violations, but most were released after spending one night in jail.

During the state of emergency, police powers were turned over to the military. The military also had authority to censor newspaper stories. Associated Press reported July 2 that "Santiago newspapers appeared on newsstands today with numerous blank spaces caused by military censorship. Both pro-Government and opposition newspapers were affected."

The government called off the emergency decrees, according to Interior Under Secretary Daniel Vergara, "because the causes that forced imposition of the measures have disappeared."

The growing prominence of the military in the increasingly tense situation in Chile had led to mounting specula-

Initiates Plan Requiring 'Great Sacrifice and Effort'

Allende Names New, All-Civilian Cabinet

By David Thorstad

"What we fear most is that some right-wing group will go off half-cocked against Allende. That would be just what he wants. He could put on emergency powers, suspend the constitution and rule by decree. We'd be finished as an opposition."

These fears, expressed in June by a member of Chile's opposition Christian Democratic party, have proved to be a bit exaggerated. While an abortive, right-wing coup was attempted June 29 by some 100 or so soldiers from the Second Army Regiment (see *Intercontinental Press*, July 9, p. 835), and while President Salvador Allende has emerged strengthened from the crisis, such extreme measures were not used.

Following the failure of the coup,

five top leaders of the fascistlike group Patria y Libertad (Fatherland and Freedom) sought asylum in the Ecuadorian Embassy in Santiago. They were Pablo Rodríguez Grez, John Schaffer, Benjamín Matte, Manuel Fuentes, and Juan Hurtado Larrain. Rodríguez Grez is president of the organization, and Matte was, until recently, head of the National Agricultural Association. He resigned when it was discovered that he belonged to Patria y Libertad.

With the crushing of the revolt, Allende moved to consolidate the position of his Popular Unity government.

On June 30, amid booing from the opposition, his government requested Congress to extend the state of emer-

tion that some military officers would be named to the cabinet. General Carlos Prats González, commander in chief of the armed forces, was frequently mentioned as a likely candidate. His prominent role in personally leading the crushing of the June 29 coup attempt seemed to make his appointment all the more likely. It was known, according to an AP report

stated the document, according to a report in the July 4 issue of the Buenos Aires daily *La Opinión*.

"As we have already said, their role is to be a part of, and to press forward, an irreversible historical process for all Chileans, which is not the personal possession of select groups of politicians."

Nevertheless, when the fifteen-member cabinet resigned July 3 in order to give Allende a free hand in choosing new ministers, the president announced that he had decided not to appoint any military figures to the body. Two days later, the new cabinet was named. While it represents one of the most extensive cabinet reshuffles since Allende took office in 1970 (seven new ministers), the new cabinet retains the political balance of the preceding one. Four portfolios went to Socialists, four to Radicals, three to Communists, and the rest to independents or members of smaller parties.

The first task of the new cabinet, Allende announced July 6, will be to implement, within a month, a new "emergency plan" that "will require great sacrifice and effort, which we all have an obligation to make."

According to a United Press International dispatch published in the July

8 issue of the New York Spanish-language daily *El Diario-La Prensa*, the new plan will include, among other things, the following measures:

"Strengthening of the authority of the executive branch in economic, political, and administrative matters.

"Economic austerity in order to confront the inflationary spiral, which reached 163 percent last year.

"Better distribution of consumer items, with state control over the market for essential goods."

Allende added that "in this difficult time, it is urgent that those who do not wish to understand should realize that the destiny of our country obliges us to act generously."

The same day that he made his appeal for "generosity," the leftist Frente de Trabajadores Revolucionarios (FTR — Revolutionary Workers Front), which has ties to the Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria (MIR — Movement of the Revolutionary Left), issued a call for a nationwide strike. The FTR statement noted that "the only way that we workers can hold back the offensive that is aiming at a coup or capitulation is by taking a big step forward. . . ." This step, it said, would be "a big, national work stoppage." The response to the FTR appeal is not yet known. □



ALLENDE: Moves to consolidate UP position after attempted coup.

July 3, that the military "had repeatedly demanded not only wider participation in the Cabinet, but jobs as ministry under secretaries and provincial governors as well."

In addition, not long before the coup attempt, Allende's own Socialist party, the major group in the Popular Unity coalition, issued an unusual statement praising the military and urging it to collaborate with the government. "We have never conceived of the armed forces as henchmen for oligarchic interests and foreign monopolies, nor as being subject to the game of petty partisan interests,"

Uruguay

Bordaberry Fails to Halt General Strike

The focus of opposition to the military-run regime of Juan María Bordaberry has become the general strike called by the country's major trade-union federation, the Communist-led Convención Nacional de Trabajadores (CNT — National Workers Congress). Nearly two weeks after it began, the strike continued effective, although a few industries had resumed partial functioning.

The strike was called by the 400,000-member CNT to protest Bordaberry's decision June 27, under intense pressure from the military, to abolish Congress (see *Intercontinental Press*, July 9, p. 838). On June 30, Bordaberry dissolved the CNT and ordered the army and the police to try

to break the strike by force.

Hundreds of unionists were arrested, and strikers were forcibly dislodged from the factories and buildings that they had occupied. "Troops had cleared out most strikers by last night," reported Reuters from Montevideo July 2, "but this morning offices, shops and factories remained idle as workers continued a campaign of 'passive resistance.'"

"The Government has managed to get public transport working again in the capital, but only with a skeleton service, and has averted a fuel crisis by sending troops into the country's only oil refinery."

Bordaberry's strong-arm approach did not work, however. The workers

stayed out. So on July 3, the Labor Ministry tried another tack and announced salary increases: 31.45 percent for the private sector and 25 percent for civil servants. Simultaneously, however, major price rises were announced in basic items, such as bread, meat, fuel, and transportation.

The next day it was officially decreed that civil servants who took part in the strike would be fired, and that strikers in private industry could also be dismissed without compensation.

The wage raises fell far short of the 83 percent that the CNT had been asking for in an effort to offset inflation. In a dispatch from Montevideo July 4, *New York Times* correspondent Marvine Howe said the striking workers she spoke to "expressed disdain" for the wage hike.

A woman textile worker said, "It's a big sacrifice, but we're for the strike because we don't want a military government."

Another striker, a metalworker, said: "If Bordaberry thinks he's going to win us over with peanuts, he's mistaken. The cost of living has already gone up 35 per cent this year, and so what good will the new raise do?"

This prognosis appeared to be accurate, according to a report by United Press International published in the July 6 issue of the *New York Spanish-language daily El Diario-La Prensa*:

"The big factories, many of which had been empty and were then again occupied by the workers, were practically paralyzed, while the banking system remained virtually inactive for the eighth consecutive day.

"Construction workers continued the strike, and as a result all related industries were in a state of paralysis.

"Transport was close to sixty percent normal, but vehicles are taken off the street at night owing to the fact that various attacks have occurred against buses, and it is feared that these might increase."

In spite of the continuing shutdowns, Minister of the Interior Néstor Bolentini told journalists July 3 that the situation in the country was "tending to return to normal." He said that the government was ready to talk with "genuine representatives of the workers," but not with leaders of the CNT.

Although many union leaders were said to have been arrested, the gov-



Avanzada Socialista

BORDABERRY: Strong-arm approach not working.

ernment announced July 5 that the army and the police were looking for fifty-two more who are operating underground. Among them are the president of the CNT, José D'Ella, and Vladimir Turiansky, former deputy of the Frente Amplio (Broad Front).

An undetermined number of political leaders have fled to Argentina. Although meetings have been prohibited, and it is thought possible that opposition parties may be banned, various opposition political forces have joined ranks against Bordaberry, calling for his resignation and an immediate restoration of constitutional freedoms.

"One of the most important consequences of the latest coup was the agreement reached this week between two of the country's leading political groups, which until now were bitter enemies — the conservative National party and the Broad Front, which in-

cludes Socialists, Communists and Christian Democrats," reported Marvine Howe in the July 5 *New York Times*. The two parties have been joined by an "important group of dissidents" from Bordaberry's own Colorado party.

The combined opposition issued a statement expressing solidarity and support for the struggle of the workers "for public liberties and their specific claims."

According to a Reuters report July 2, a spokesman for the opposition called for a provisional government that would include members of the armed forces, all political parties, and workers representatives.

"The opposition bloc announced yesterday it was planning to take the President before the Supreme Court for violating the Constitution," Reuters added.

A few days after the dissolving of Congress, the Broad Front issued an appeal to "all activists, all national and democratic organizations, and to all the people" to struggle against the regime. "The aims of this struggle," it said, "are the restoration of the dissolved parliament, the removal of the dictator, through effective and sustained popular action, and the call for new elections in the near future." □

Amin's Get-Well Message

President Idi Amin of Uganda sent President Nixon a Fourth of July message in which he wished Nixon a "speedy recovery from the Watergate affair." The United States government has chosen not to interpret this as a well-intentioned expression of sympathy for Nixon's plight; it has decided against sending a new ambassador to Uganda.

In many ways, Amin's message seems reasonable, if understated. He warns that "American military and economic might in the world now has not only enabled her to reach the moon with ease but has made her prone to interfering in the internal affairs of other countries in the world. We in Uganda hope that the great United States of America does not continue to use its enormous resources, especially the military might, to destroy human life on earth, particularly in the developing world."

Amin concluded: "While wishing you a speedy recovery from the Watergate affair, may I, Excellency, assure you of my highest regard and esteem." □

Why Peron Returned to Argentina

[The following article was published in the June 20-27 issue of *Avanzada Socialista*, the weekly newspaper of the Argentine Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores (PST—Socialist Workers party). The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

After eighteen years in exile, General Perón is returning to the country. His return is cause for rejoicing for the majority of the Argentine people, who remember the great gains made during his governments—the standard of living, the formation of massive unions that gave strength to the workers movement, and the nationalization of imperialist companies. Perón's return is one more in a line of victories won by the working class during the course of the struggles that have been dealing blows to the regime of the bosses since May 29, 1969, the date of the Cordobazo.

But General Perón is not coming back in order to head up these struggles all the way until the oligarchy and imperialism are expelled from the country. He is coming to attempt to salvage the bourgeois regime, which is flailing about in one of the most acute crises of its history.

His return is just one more step in his efforts to unite all sectors of the Argentine bosses and oligarchy in a common front. This is demonstrated in his approach of bringing the other big bourgeois party in our country, the Unión Cívica Radical [UCR—Radical Civic Union], into the government with full honors.

General Perón is also returning in order to try to move forward the country's economy, which continues to drag along in the state of chronic crisis it has been in since 1930. But he is not attempting to do this by turning to the workers movement and placing the mainsprings of production and distribution under its control. On the contrary, he intends to carry out "National Reconstruction" without in any fundamental sense laying a hand on private ownership of

the means of production and exchange—industry, land, trade. Thus he brought about the "Social Pact" [an agreement between the bosses and the labor bureaucrats on social peace and a truce on social struggles], which, once again, lays the consequences of the economic crisis upon the shoulders of the workers; it does this with the consent of all the country's exploiters, who came together in what the oligarchic daily *La Nación* termed "the most complete and representative business gathering held in more than a quarter century."

This attempt at National Reconstruction, which General Perón has just strengthened with his presence, has as one of its bases respect for the fundamental interests of imperialism and its monopolies, which, set up on our soil, are sucking out the wealth of the country. This is shown first of all by the nearly total absence of measures leading to the expulsion of these monopolies, and second, by the warmly approving commentaries on the government of President Cámpora by the big bourgeoisie's press in the United States.

Finally, Perón is returning in order to personally put a brake on all struggles of the workers movement that might constitute a danger for the bosses' government of Dr. Cámpora. In order to do this, he will use all the prestige he still has with the working class to try to convince it to passively agree to the role of silent partner to the Great Bosses Agreement put together around this government. The plea by Abal Medina on behalf of the Movimiento Nacional Peronista [National Peronist Movement], during which he called for an end to the occupations just a few days before Perón's arrival, is only a foretaste of this policy of holding back workers struggles. This is a policy that General Perón has applied in every instance in which mass mobilizations threatened the stability of the bosses' regime; the highest expression of this was his refusal to call on the working class to arm itself and struggle when

his own personal fate was at stake in 1955.

These plans of Perón—for unity among the exploiters, good relations with imperialism, rebuilding the country on the basis of the exploitation of the workers movement, and defense of the bourgeois regime—are destined to fail, first of all because the working class will continue to press forward with its struggles in the face of the inability of the system to solve its problems and those of the country; and second, because the economic crisis and imperialist exploitation will become increasingly sharp and will undermine the foundations of the bosses' agreement. Temporary improvements in the economic situation and partial retreats in mobilizations could postpone this inevitable process for a time. During this respite the Peronist movement could retain its unity, and General Perón could maintain and even increase his prestige and influence among the workers. But once this process speeds up and erupts, the crisis of Peronism will be full-blown and total, and Perón himself, forced to choose sides in the clash between workers and capitalists, will cease to be the great legend he now is for the Argentine workers movement. Perón's return, then, represents the last card played by the Peronist movement and the first step toward its complete and final crisis. It is also the final card of the bosses' regime, for with the disappearance of Peronist influence in the mass movement, the doors will remain open to the taking of power by the workers.

Perón is returning at a time when, unlike the situation during his previous governments, the capitalist system is in a wretched state of affairs and lacks any medium- or long-range solutions. He is coming back to a workers movement that has gone through four years of big mobilizations that have left it with rich experiences and a new determination to continue the struggle. He is returning to defend a weak government, badly situated in the quagmire of this situation, that has seen itself forced to grant democratic freedoms on a scale never before known. The workers will make use of and defend these democratic freedoms, conscious of the fact that they are the fruit of their own struggle, not of any brilliant stra-



PERON

tegic maneuvering on the part of General Perón.

During his government, Perón had sharp frictions with imperialism. These frictions could again occur, and if there is no letup in the pace of workers struggles, they could lead to the taking of positive measures that, although partial, would recover for the country some sector of our economy presently dominated by the monopolies. The workers movement must support this type of measures and struggle to make them more and more deepgoing, without having any faith in either the government or Perón to carry them to their logical conclusion.

Every extension of democratic freedoms and every anti-imperialist measure will provoke a reaction from imperialism and the oligarchy. The workers must defend the government from any attack by the forces of re-

action; in doing so they can count on the total support of our party, the Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores.

But defending the government in the face of reaction, and supporting the positive measures that it might take, must not mean either compromise or the slightest political support on the part of the working class for the government and Perón, since they are the present representatives of the permanent and historic enemies of the workers movement. With regard to the return of Perón, the great architect of this government, socialists call

on the workers to continue to struggle against these enemies—the bosses, the oligarchy, and imperialism—and against those who are serving to synthesize their interests: the government and General Perón. We call on the working class to mobilize to kick the bureaucracy out of the unions and the CGT [Confederación General del Trabajo—General Confederation of Labor] in order to replace it with a new, class-struggle leadership and build an independent workers party that can organize the struggles and lead them to their final goal: a workers and popular government that can begin the construction of socialism. □

PST Demands Investigation, Punishment of Guilty

Don't Forget the Trelew Massacre!

[The following article was published in the June 20-27 issue of *Avanzada Socialista*, the weekly organ of the Argentine Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores (PST—Socialist Workers party). The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

The Trelew massacre is one of the biggest crimes committed by the regime against expressions of workers and popular struggles. These struggles opened the way for the restoration of many democratic freedoms, among which the main one has been the freeing of the political prisoners. Nevertheless, the regime is now arming itself as if to prevent any investigation or punishment of those responsible for that massacre.

The demand for clarification on this bloodbath is today being raised only by sectors of the left and by minority groupings in the Peronist movement. But beginning with our seemingly weak forces, we must create a massive movement.

It is the obligation of General Perón to publicly support this demand. Among those who died were young persons who gave their lives for Perón. The compañeros who are members of the organizations to which these young people belonged have no excuse for abandoning the relentless

task of bringing about clarity and public placing of responsibility for the massacre. Nor does the ERP [Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo—Revolutionary Army of the People], the organization that was hardest hit by the massacre.

No political party can call for silence on this matter. Whoever makes liberal use of the word "democracy"—and all the politicians are doing so—has an obligation to support the investigation.

Our party proposes that a commission be organized made up of representatives of the workers movement and the CGT [Confederación General del Trabajo—General Confederation of Labor], legislators, the political parties, and the organizations that themselves directly suffered from the massacre, and that this commission initiate the investigation and bring about a definitive clarification. □

Correction

In the article on repression in Northern Ireland entitled "Fresh Attempts to Intimidate Prisoners," which appeared in our June 11 issue, p. 709, the address of the Officials Support Organisation for Prisoners in Ireland was given incorrectly. The proper address is: Saoirse, 30 Gardiner Place, Dublin 1, Ireland.

Balance Sheet of the Spring Strike Wave

By Pekka Haapakoski

Helsinki

Spring 1973 turned out not to be the beginning of the new golden era expected by the Finnish bourgeoisie. Although the international economic upswing began to be felt in Finland, the real stability that capital wants and needs was perhaps further away than at any time since the crisis that immediately followed World War II.

On the political level, the governmental coalition suffers increasing strains, and economic measures such as the free-trade agreement with the Common Market remain unconcluded. Moreover, the beginning of the upturn gave the workers a new willingness to fight to regain what they had lost during the lean years. Thus the bourgeoisie had reason to raise a hue and cry about "the crazy spring" and to oil its machinery of repression.

Quantitatively the spring strike wave was an extremely massive movement that touched nearly every layer of the working class. Qualitatively it varied according to the strategies of the unions and employers, and was influenced by spontaneous rebellions of the workers and the new combativeness of certain "semiproletarian" layers.

So-called wildcat strikes were prominent. Groups participating in them ranged from oil workers, television technicians, and printers to travel-agency and airport officials. Issues varied from the firing of individual workers to wages and work conditions. These strikes generally produced better results than during the preceding two years, despite the greater opposition from employers and the union bureaucracies.

Many "new" working-class groups started to use the strike weapon through their unions. Thus 20,000 bank officials and several thousand technicians were on strike for several weeks. The strike of bank employees was primarily a wage struggle, while the technicians fought for the right of collective bargaining. Both were proof of the rising trade-union consciousness of white-collar workers, even though the technicians' strike had certain elitist traits.

The biggest struggles in the blue-collar sector were the strike of 100,000 building workers, which lasted about a month, and the longshoremen's strike. In most industries short "warning strikes" were launched before the agreements.

Now that the spring wave is over, it is possible to draw a balance sheet of the employers' and of the union bureaucrats' strategies, and of the negative and positive experiences of the workers.

In contrast with recent years, the employers attempted a strategy of divide and rule rather than seek a total agreement with the union bureaucracy as a whole. They also used harsher tactics against the most stubborn sectors of the working class.

The divide-and-rule strategy took the form of concluding agreements with those unions that were ready to sell their rank and file at the cheapest price, and then trying to make these agreements the general pattern for subsequent contracts. The really harsh methods were reserved for those unions (mainly led by the Communist party) that were not ready completely to accept this general pattern. The greatest pressure was exerted on the building workers, whom the employers tried to crush with a total lockout.

But in general the lockouts, fines, and use of scabs were not really effective in crushing the strikes, many of which won considerable economic concessions. If the results of the hot spring were relatively meager compared with the breadth and militancy of the movement, the primary responsibility for this lies with the union bureaucrats, whose role was more openly traitorous and shameful than ever before.

After the wave of price rises and the ending of rent control during the winter, the union leaders opened a massive propaganda campaign around the themes of "responsibility," "moderation," and "social peace." After the first agreements were negotiated, the top leaders of SAK, the central organization of the unions, declared

that any wage increase greater than those in the early agreements would be inflationary and therefore harmful to the workers.

In the metal industry, the union leadership made a "counterproposal" that was essentially the same as the employers' offer. They then called a vote to choose between the two proposals and finally convinced the workers that it was "not worthwhile to go on strike just for six pence."

The CP-led construction workers union was involved in a strike and lockout for several weeks and then signed essentially on the employers' terms.

The transport workers union in vain tried three times to get the ranks to approve a miserable agreement. When the workers on the third attempt still voted 70 percent against, the bureaucrats simply declared the strike ended and signed the agreement. The weakness and lack of perspectives of the union opposition (mainly Stalinists) have helped convince the bureaucrats that they enjoy a secure position and can act accordingly.

As a whole, the struggles of the spring were evidence that the counter-attack of the bourgeoisie has not yet succeeded in breaking the will of the workers or in demoralizing them. The strike movement was the broadest since 1956, and it drew in many new layers of workers.

In many cases, the original wage pattern was broken. But demands linked to working conditions were as a rule not won. The demand for a sliding scale of wages, which was discussed in some unions, was not even considered by the employers.

It has become clearer than ever that it is going to be more and more difficult for the workers to resist with their present forms of struggle the "holy trinity" of state, employers, and union bureaucrats. The workers struggles need to develop in the direction of greater unity and solidarity, and toward methods of struggle crossing the limits of bourgeois legality: demands centered on workers control and a logic that centers on politics and the question of power. If they do not, then the bourgeois counter-attack already under way will crush these struggles, demoralize the workers, and create a real capitalist law and order in the form of a strong state. □

CP Seeks to Soften Grants Campaign

London

At an Emergency conference of the National Union of Students (NUS) held here June 9, delegates voted in favour of an executive motion to turn the focus of the grants campaign toward negotiations with the government leading up to the next triennial grants review. Such a policy, if pursued, signifies a retreat from any perspective of winning major changes in the system of grants to students before October 1974.

The Emergency conference culminated a year of militant student action on the part of the 500,000-member NUS. (See *Intercontinental Press*, March 26 and April 2.) The grants campaign has involved cafeteria boycotts, rent strikes (withholding of rent) in halls of residence, and national mobilisations. On February 21 approximately 60,000 students demonstrated in twelve centres throughout the country, and on March 14 students in Britain staged the first ever national student strike.

The widespread support for the campaign derives from the very real hardship that many students face because of inadequate grants. The campaign has focused on obtaining a £105 increase on the basic amount, which would compensate for the 25 percent erosion through inflation since 1962; on putting an end to the discretionary awards system that allows local education authorities arbitrarily to deny or limit grants to many students or potential students; on the abolition of the means test as a factor in deciding the size of a student's grant; and on abolishing the present discrimination against married women students, whose maximum grant is only about half of the full grant.

The students' mass action campaign has already forced the government to break its policy of not making increments between triennial reviews. On May 15, the government announced increases in student grants payable from September 1973. These amounted only to £20 on all main grants, and a raising of the starting point for parental contribution from £1100 residual income to £1500. The gov-

ernment made no mention of the discretionary award system or the discrimination against married women students.

The June 9 conference met to dis-



HEATH: CP wants to negotiate with his Tory regime.

cuss the government offer and to work out a perspective for the campaign. It was generally felt that the £20 was grossly inadequate to meet students' needs and that the campaign must continue. The dispute centred on the type of campaign and its demands.

A sizable left wing of about one third of the delegates voted to continue the campaign over the summer and to step up the actions when the colleges reconvene in October. They proposed a series of actions that, they argued, would force the government to grant their demands. These included nationally planned demonstrations, occupations, rent strikes and cafeteria boycotts, which could be undertaken by the NUS at the beginning of the academic year.

Against these proposals, the majority of the executive argued that the

campaign must be geared into the negotiations around the 1974 triennial review. They also argued that the main axis must be discretionary awards, since the government may not include this demand within the framework of the negotiations.

The final decision to focus on the triennial review is mainly a result of the policy of the Communist party, which leads the "majority" on the NUS executive. The latter has taken advantage of the temporary lull in student activism (many students have left their colleges for the summer or are presently involved in examinations) to channel the campaign toward goals which stop far short of those that students have been fighting for all year.

The CP-led "majority" justify their reformist leadership by depreciating the value of independent student action. They claim that students alone cannot win victories unless the workers come to their aid. In practice, this leads them to derail the movement by diluting its demands and taking less effective forms of action. A powerfully organised left wing to prevent this has not yet been consolidated.

Despite the bad time of year and the opposition of the leadership, the more than 800 delegates and official observers indicated that they did not wish to call off the rent strikes that have been central to the campaign over the past year. They agreed that existing rent strikes should be continued where possible over the summer. However, many of the strikes have had to be ended already, owing to threats of eviction, legal proceedings and withholding of grants and degrees. Continuation of strikes is made all the more difficult without the active support of the NUS leadership, which has been reluctant to give this.

The conference agreed to support actions taken on a local level at the beginning of the new term, but rejected a proposal to coordinate a national campaign as proposed. In effect, this leaves it up to local student militants to do the work that should be done by the national leadership. The depth of local support for the grants campaign may still produce important actions, but real success depends on mounting a militant national campaign for immediate changes. No doubt this will be one issue hotly contested at the November NUS conference. □

Italian Trotskyists Set National Conference

[The following article appeared in the June 1 issue of *Bandiera Rossa*, fortnightly newspaper of the GCR (Gruppi Comunisti Rivoluzionari—Revolutionary Communist Groups), Italian section of the Fourth International. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

A number of positive features have marked the life of the Italian section of the Fourth International in the period since the November 1971 congress and leading up to the one scheduled by the Central Committee for the end of this coming September. We have been able to develop some central campaigns on a nationwide basis, such as the one against the state's slaughter [the Milan bombings of December 1969, which the government tried to use as a pretext for a witch-hunt of the far left], our intervention in the elections, and the building of the May 12 internationalist demonstration [in Milan]. Likewise, we have been able to make a coordinated, systematic intervention into the struggles around the renegotiation of union contracts. We established our political presence in Milan, the city where we were most hard hit by the crisis that struck our organization in 1968. New local groups were established and others were strengthened. A good number of political cadres matured in various areas. *Bandiera Rossa* was transformed into a fortnightly. Our organizational structures were consolidated.

These achievements show that the growing interest in our organization is not a result only of the international crisis of spontanéism and Maoism (or the national crisis of centrist formations like *il Manifesto*) but is directly related to the political activities of our groups, to their increasing ability to influence the radicalized vanguard.

Nevertheless, it would be completely out of order to draw up a glowing balance sheet. Some projections for strengthening the organization have not been realized, or have been only

partially achieved. And the general relationship of forces within the revolutionary left is not yet favorable enough for us to be able to play a role commensurate with our analyses (which have proved correct and timely on every occasion) and with the tasks we have set out for ourselves.

The tasks of the coming national gathering of the GCR flow from the lessons of these past two years, from the critical balance sheet of our work, and from our newly acquired experience: to review and to enrich the line of the last congresses, to strengthen our ability to intervene and exert influence.

In order to facilitate the greatest development of the discussion and at the same time to compare and present concrete proposals, it has been decided that the pre-congress discussion should unfold in two distinct phases. The first will deal with the full range of questions we are faced with (from the general political situation to the analyses of the development of the far left, from the balance sheet of our activity to the creation of more suitable instruments for carrying forward our work). The second will discuss two more specific and detailed documents, one on organizational structure and one on the aims of the current phase of class conflict.

The Central Committee has opened the discussion by publishing two documents, draft theses presented by the majority of the national secretariat and another document by one comrade of this same body. It is clear from these documents that an important aspect of the discussion will hinge around the process of building a revolutionary party. Already at the time of the 1970 and 1971 national congresses, this process was projected as a convergence of three factors: "the coming together of vanguard groups around a clear platform based on experiences of struggle preliminary to a process of more general political clarification; the polarization along the same lines of the worker and student forces emerging from struggles and able to assimilate basic generali-

zations; the breaking from the control and influence of the bureaucracy of those sectors of workers that are still under its control and influence."

How is the Italian section of the Fourth International intervening and how must it intervene in this dialectical process? According to the theses of the majority of the national secretariat, "the process leading toward the building of a revolutionary party has in essence continued to develop in an ascending manner, but in rather contradictory forms and at completely insufficient tempos with respect to objective needs. And it has been marked precisely by the three elements we enumerated in our preceding definition. . . . The establishment of revolutionary Marxist hegemony over the revolutionary left will be the result of the development and deepening of the above-mentioned process and therefore cannot be postulated as a short-term process. The task of our organization is to help this process along in the following ways: We must win the kind of positions among the workers vanguard that will enable us both to make an impact on the general struggles of the far left and to offer important practical examples of a revolutionary Leninist orientation and method. We must intervene in the student movement with the same goals and following the same guidelines. We have to offer precise political formulations and theoretical analyses that can clarify the most profound lessons of experiences.

"In setting standards for membership, we cannot disregard the objective fact that a large majority of those coming around our organization in the current phase are youths who have had no previous experience in political formations or in trade-union organizations, or have come under the influence of the far left, with all its ideological deformations. From this it follows necessarily that these elements will assimilate the general conceptions of revolutionary Marxism and our overall political orientation only after formally joining our organization, and not before."

This last section is what gave rise to the differences in the national secretariat. Here is how the minority opinion is presented:

"Through a special process of rapid education, politicized sectors of the vanguard may come closer to

Trotskyism more by reacting to Maoism and spontanéism than through an actual adherence to the methodology and conceptions of revolutionary Marxism. The most pressing task that we will have in this phase, therefore, will be to win over such sectors to our conceptions fully. A precondition for achieving this is a qualitative advance in the functioning of our national leadership. Crises of growth and lack of national direction are indissolubly linked; we cannot proceed on a case-by-case basis as before. We need to establish basic norms for our development in the coming phase on a centralized basis. We must prevent the GCR leadership of the 1970s from taking a centrist attitude toward the various tendencies of opposition to Maoism and spontanéism and toward the local trends, already existing, that will inevitably combine with these various tendencies. For these reasons, in this phase we cannot count on winning

important sectors of the vanguard to revolutionary Marxism directly to our organization. Instead, we need to plan for a series of sympathizer organizations in order to assimilate these currents politically and to initiate common work on the basis of our conceptions. At the same time, we must take steps toward achieving more complete homogeneity within our own organization, which can provide the basis in the coming period for the emergence of a larger secondary leadership cadre."

These, in outline, are the terms of the discussion that promises to be rich in contributions. Through a dialectical process, even before the time arrives for the congress the discussion can lead to a positive resolution of the differences and, in any case, will allow for a deepening of analysis and of perspectives not only for us, but for the whole revolutionary left. □

Thailand

Bangkok Students Make Regime Back Down

The politicization of Thai students, a Bangkok daily wrote June 23, has passed "the point of no return." The regime would no longer be able to satisfy the students with "empty promises."

This comment came after at least 25,000 students — backed by clear support from the majority of the population of Bangkok — had demonstrated in the center of the city against the military government of Thanom Kittikachorn. The immediate demands of the student demonstrators were that nine students recently expelled from Ramkum Hareng, one of seven state-run universities, be reinstated and that the rector of the university be dismissed. They also asked for an inquiry into a violent incident at the university on June 20, during which two youths were said to have been wounded.

Late June 22 the regime granted the demands partially. The expulsion of the nine students was rescinded; while the rector was not fired, the regime did agree to conduct an "investigation" of his conduct. With the government's

announcement, the students ended their demonstrations and returned to classes.

The rapidity with which the regime yielded to the students' demands reflects the precarious situation it finds itself in. Rising prices have combined with food shortages (particularly of rice) to erode living standards. The continued presence of thousands of U. S. troops on air bases from which the bombing of Cambodia is conducted has generated anti-U. S. sentiment among the students and other sectors of the population. The National Student Center of Thailand, according to a report in the June 2 *Christian Science Monitor*, plans to begin in July a national campaign against the American bases.

The delicacy of the regime's position may be seen in the excuse it used to expel the nine students from Ramkum Hareng. They had published an article in a student paper satirizing Thanom and Deputy Premier Praphas Charusathien because they are still in office despite the mandatory retirement age of sixty for military of-

ficers. (Thanom is sixty-three, Praphas sixty.)

The government is somewhat testy about satire, especially so since the "Thung Yai affair" last May. That caper came to light when four high-ranking army and police officers were killed in a helicopter crash. The regime announced that the crash had occurred as the officers were returning to Bangkok from a top-secret military mission whose purpose obviously could not be disclosed.

But it was soon discovered that the fourteen-year-old son of one of the officers had been along on the trip and that the helicopter had been loaded with carcasses of rare species of animals — officially off-limits to hunters. "In fact," the May 21 issue of *Newsweek* reported, "as Thailand's normally docile press disclosed last



THANOM: Embarrassed by "Thung Yai affair" and student demonstrations.

week, the men had been on a five-day orgy in the woods — hunting by day and frolicking by night, with liquor and women in generous supply."

The officers had set up a "luxurious hunting camp at Thung Yai, in the state forest reserve." Game wardens who discovered that the officers were killing rare animals protested. They were warned to keep quiet, but instead sneaked a group of journalists into the forest. Then came the helicopter crash.

Even after the wreck was investigated, the regime stuck, Nixon-style,

to its story about top-secret missions, claiming the carcasses were "cover."

But then reporters published their photographs of the hunting camp. The ensuing public turmoil has put the regime on the defensive and is no doubt partly responsible for the students' willingness to take on the government.

On June 22 in a national radio speech, Thanom charged that the student demonstrators had been manipulated by a "group of youth" who were working for their own end, which was to plunge the country into "disorder." Apparently, the speech did not have

its desired effect. "The press," Jean-Claude Pomonti reported in the June 24-25 *Le Monde*, "did not fail to note that nobody believed this. 'Accusations like this,' the *Bangkok World* remarked, 'can only stir up even more trouble and show a lack of interest in the real problems at issue.'"

In any case, the students returned to their classes with the feeling that they had won a victory. One footnote to the student demonstrations is that they occurred at the same time that Bangkok was receiving its first-ever delegation of visiting ping-pong players from Peking. □

groups that took part rebuffed all rumors about splits and made the demonstration into a strong and disciplined show of opposition to NATO.

The Danish speakers at the demonstration were Erik Sigsgaard of the Left Socialists, Gert Petersen of the Socialist People's party, union leader Vagn Damgaard, Hans Paulstrom from the Faroe Islands, and Niels Enevoldsen of the Social Democratic Youth. Enevoldsen provided proof that NATO materiel is used in the Portuguese colonies. "It is claimed that NATO weapons are not used in Africa; yet I have proof here that, among other things, deliveries of planes from West Germany to Portugal are being made," he said, holding up a piece of a plane shot down in March by the liberation movement in Guinea-Bissau. The piece of wreckage, which has both West German and French production markings on it, is to be turned over to Danish Foreign Minister K. B. Andersen.

Foreign speakers were Stasis Rigas, of the Greek antidictatorship committee; Mario Fernandez, a Portuguese deserter living in Denmark; Bob Purdie, a leading member of the Anti-Internment League, the British Irish solidarity organization and a member of the International Marxist Group, British section of the Fourth International; and Vigfusson.

"This spring we were attacked," Vigfusson said. "Who is it that is attacking us? It is our NATO ally Great Britain. But don't we have NATO troops in Iceland to defend us? Sure, but the American troops are not lifting a finger. Therefore, I ask, what should we do with the American army?" To thunderous applause, Vigfusson added: "Get them out!" □

Denmark

20,000 March Against NATO Meeting

Copenhagen

While the Danish government was hosting the Council of Ministers of NATO, which held its semiannual meeting here June 14-15, thirty-four organizations that had formed a United Committee Against NATO staged a counterconference.

The conference was organized under the slogan "Fight NATO—a Tool for Imperialism." It included speeches by a long list of persons from NATO countries, as well as representatives of African liberation movements, who presented information exposing the undemocratic and militaristic designs of NATO. The many presentations were intended to offset the words of praise for NATO that emanated from the ministers' meeting, where representatives from the worst dictatorships sat side by side and where the concerns of the masses were not on the agenda.

Daniel Saul Bonze, representing FRELIMO [Frente de Libertação de Moçambique—Mozambique Liberation Front], called for support to the continuing struggle against Portugal. Although NATO supplies to Portugal are officially supposed to be used only in Europe, for lack of a war in Europe they are used in Africa. "In our day-to-day struggle," said Bonze, "we have taken weapons that were not produced in Portugal."

The head of the Icelandic People's Alliance, Thor Vigfusson, said that

the probability that the Americans and NATO will have to get out of Iceland is greater now than ever before. "With the cod war, even the Conservatives have had their eyes opened up to the iron grip the Americans have on Iceland," he noted.

The counterconference concluded with a militant anti-NATO demonstration of 15,000 to 20,000 persons, who wound through the streets of Copenhagen, chanting "Denmark Out of NATO!" The march ended up at Bella-Centret, where the NATO ministers, protected by a thousand policemen, were holding their meeting. None of the demonstrators let themselves be provoked by the police, and the bourgeois press's dire predictions of splits among the participating groups were exposed. The more than thirty

Glasgow March Protests Cambodia Bombing

Approximately fifty persons marched through the city of Glasgow June 23 to protest U. S. bombing of Cambodia.

The slogans of the demonstration, organized by the Glasgow Indochina Committee, were:

Stop the bombing now! Hands off Cambodia now! U. S. out of Indochina now! End British support for U. S. aggression!

Dozens of placards and banners, and a loudspeaker van broadcasting the aims of the demonstration, attracted the attention and the sympathy of people in the streets.

At the postdemonstration rally, there were speakers from the Glasgow Indochina Committee, the International Marxist Group (British section of the Fourth International), and the Scottish Student Conference on Indochina.

In a resolution passed at the rally, the participants pledged to do their utmost to build a mass movement in defense of the Cambodian people. They demanded that Washington withdraw *now* from Indochina, and that the British government cease its support for Nixon's "bloody war of genocide."

The Radicalization Then and Now

[The following interview with James P. Cannon was obtained at his home in Los Angeles, California, by Dick Roberts. Cannon was one of the founders of the American Communist party, then of the American Trotskyist movement in 1928, and ten years later of the Fourth International. The interview has not been corrected by Comrade Cannon.]

* * *

First Session, May 17, 1973

Question. I have been wondering how the American revolutionists in the early twenties met the big turns of those days, such as the boom and the stock-market crash and so on.

Answer. Well, there were sharp turns in the early twenties right after the first world war. There was a lot of pent-up energy in the working class that had been restrained during the war, and there was a big upsurge of labor action. For the first time in history there was a general steel strike, in 1919. A general packinghouse strike preceded that. These were organized by [William Z.] Foster, who at that time was in the AF of L. Then, I think in 1920 or '21, there was a railroad shopmen's strike.

Q. What were the specific issues they were striking over?

A. Money, and union recognition.

Q. Had wages been frozen during the war?

A. Everything was pretty much frozen during the war. They broke all of those strikes. There was a very beligerent and apparently united capitalist class that confronted these strikes head on. Judge Gary, the president of United States Steel, wouldn't even meet with the strikers' representatives—they never got one conference. They just broke the strike. They broke the railroad shopmen's strike in '21. And then they made a big offensive against the workers, using the open shop and sort of pseudo company unions.

This was accompanied by an economic upsurge. There was a brief depression in 1921, but they came right out of it and the twenties were a period of boom. Even railroad unions that had existed before were subordinated to practically a company-union status. I recall an expression: "the B&O clan." On the Baltimore and Ohio railroad a form of company-union relationship was set up. There were no concessions to the workers at all. The economic upsurge made it a little easier for the bosses.

Q. What direction was the radicalization going at that time?

July 16, 1973

A. It was going down. The only thing radical in the country was the Communist party and it was pretty well isolated, and numerically weak. You've heard about the reaction after the war, the Palmer raids. For a time we went underground. We started with the majority of the Socialist party—a big majority, an estimated 60,000 members—in the 1919 split. But these were about 90 percent foreign-born, who had not yet become assimilated, even to the language of the country. They had separate federations in the party—the Russian federation, Ukrainian federation, Jewish federation, Polish federation. It seemed like all the immigrant groups had socialist federations. They were really affiliated to the party rather than being assimilated. By the time the party came out from underground and got going as a legal organization in 1922-23, it was down to 10,000 members. And 90 percent of them were in the foreign-born federations.

Q. What kept them going?

A. The Russian revolution, cadres, a professional apparatus. It was a new type of party, with a professional staff. That was the decisive thing, in my opinion. This country had never known anything like that. It was a party completely assimilated into the Russian revolution; too much so, in my opinion.

Q. How do you mean?

A. It looked more toward Moscow than to its own problems here. It became a sort of unofficial wing of the Russian party, in practice. You've read, I think, some of the things I've written about the first ten years: the faction fights. We always went to Russia to settle them.

Q. About when did the radicalization pick up again?

A. Not until, I would say, 1934. The crash of '29 hit an unorganized and atomized working class. The AFL had less than three million members at the end of the twenties, less than they had started with at the beginning of the decade. There had been a decline, and they were restricted largely to the skilled trades, such as the building trades (the construction trades) and the printing trades—highly skilled crafts. I'd say the first years of the depression were years of passivity. It was as though the working class was stunned.

Q. Well, you had expected the crisis to take place and had said so. When a crisis like that occurs, you say that the masses of people are stunned; how about the party itself?

A. Well, I was out of the Communist party by then; since 1928. They continued to talk very radical, but they didn't get much of an audience. I said they had 10,000

members, but that's a misleading figure, because the 90 percent who were foreign-born were not really participating in American life unless they had to. They lived in their own communities, largely, and spoke their own languages. They had their own daily papers.

The working class as a whole didn't have the slightest idea how to fight this terrible catastrophe that had suddenly thrown them out of work and on the unemployment lines. What were they going to do?

The CP was active in organizing unemployed councils. The central core of this was the Communist party members themselves. There were a few marches and demonstrations.

Q. They were just demanding jobs? What was their main programmatic demand?

A. They were demanding relief, demanding rent, demanding anything they could get. They were very active in opposing rent evictions. Do you know how an eviction takes place?

Q. Not personally.

A. I do. The landlord gets an order from the authorities against a tenant who hasn't paid the rent. And they send a squad of deputies—I've seen it often—and just take your furniture and put it on the sidewalk outside the place where you're evicted. What are you going to do? You hustle around and get some relative or a friend or someone to take you in, carrying your few sticks of furniture with you.

The CP developed, I thought, a good, militant tactic of putting the furniture back in. Right after the deputies leave, a squad of militants from the unemployed councils would come, take the furniture, carry it back into the building, and then say to the landlord, "What are you going to do about it?" And he'd have to go through the whole process again. Now, I considered that a very militant action, but it was limited, of course, to small areas where they had the strength to do it.

Q. Did they make any attempt to link these unemployed councils up to the organized union movement?

A. I don't think so. The unions weren't interested in the unemployed.

Q. The CP was in its ultraleft period in the time you're talking about.

A. It was just going into it. They went to some extremes in the unemployed councils and the tactic of replacing the furniture. At the same time they made headway in Harlem, and a good deal of this furniture replacement was done in Harlem. They got credit for that.

But the working class as a whole, as I say, was atomized and stunned. You've heard about the Hoovervilles on the edges of cities; people were hungry. Soup kitchens and things of that sort were set up by people just trying to keep alive. You couldn't have much prospect for strikes or anything like that when nearly half of the workers were unemployed. Wages were slashed right and left and there was no resistance. There were a number of strikes

of desperation which were broken. The turning point came in '34.

It was in 1934—five years after the depression hit in October 1929—workers began stirring and organizing. There had been a slight upturn. Some people had gone back to work. There were three successful strikes that year: Minneapolis, West Coast maritime, and the Toledo Autolite strike led by the Musteites.

The Musteites had their own unemployed leagues in various sections of the country; one of them was in Toledo. The leaders of this unemployed league became leaders of the strike. As against the conventional expectation that the unemployed could be organized to break the strikes, they organized the unemployed to help the pickets.

The Minneapolis strikes started in the coal yards in December. Then there was the general transportation strike in the early spring, which was won: The chief demand was recognition of the union.

Minneapolis was an open-shop town. There was an organization there called the Citizens' Alliance, an organization of reactionary employers who just ran the town. They even broke strikes in the building trades. That was always the keystone in those days for measuring how far unionism and nonunionism went. When you couldn't even organize the building trades, it was a scab town, because those are traditional unions with strong craft-union sentiments.

But this strike happened to involve a group of Trotskyists who had done the organizing in the coal yards and went from there. Our people were working in the coal yards, not because they were expert coal shovelers, but because it was the only place they could get. They ganged up in certain places where they could work together.

And they won the coal strike. It hit Minneapolis like a ton of bricks. They'd never seen anything like it: people who would organize picket squads and when someone would try to drive a truckload of coal in from anywhere, the pickets would attack it and dump it right on the street. Things like that. Except hospitals; they left hospital supply trucks alone.

The bosses made a settlement, the provision of which was to recognize the union and then to negotiate wages. But the bosses tried to renege on it. After they'd settled the strike, they tried to get around it. And that brought about, in July, the big strike, which was eventually won.

But to give you an idea of the wage question, this victorious strike was settled on the basis of a wage scale of fifty-two and a half cents an hour for drivers and forty-two and a half cents an hour for helpers and inside workers.

Minneapolis introduced a new feature into the Teamster organization. Prior to that it had been strictly a craft union. Their specialty was organizing bread drivers and milk drivers, things of that sort, who worked on a semi-commission basis. It was a very small union nationally. As a matter of fact, it was named the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Assistants Union. That was the name of it. Stablemen. It was a relic of the horse-and-buggy age. But Minneapolis introduced the idea of a broader union. That's what made the strike so powerful. They brought the warehousemen in.

At the same time that the Toledo Autolite strike and

the Minneapolis strikes were going on, there was the West Coast maritime strike. That was led primarily by the Stalinists, although the Sailors' Union was led by syndicalists, ex-Wobblies mainly. Harry Lundberg came in there; he was a syndicalist.

All three of these strikes were recorded as victories, and they gave a tremendous impetus to the organization of the workers.

The depression never really was overcome until the war, but there was some progress made, and some factories reopened, and some workers went back to work. When I cite those figures—fifty-two and a half cents an hour—you can get an idea what kind of wages were paid to people who didn't win strikes. For a lot of workers the problem was just working any number of hours the bosses wanted to impose and getting as much as he was willing to give, which was barely enough to keep body and soul together.

Q. If you retraced a little bit before 1934, let's say a few years earlier, at the bottom of the depression, what did people like you in the leadership of a small revolutionary party think was going to happen? Where did you look toward some future progress?

A. Well, we emphasized very strongly that the unions would grow, and we tried to prepare for that; to colonize our people wherever we could in what would be strategic unions. We had people already then in the early thirties going into auto in preparation. Industries like auto had a big turnover, even bigger than they have now. You could get in there and get them to give you a few days work now and then.

In Minneapolis, which wasn't the most important industrial center, we had a strong cadre that we carried over from the Communist party. They were traditional union men—they knew a lot about it. They had worked on the railroads and other places.

Q. Farrell Dobbs says in his book¹ that they had been trying to get in there from 1931, I think. Would that be about right? They were trying to get something going?

A. I guess so. They were always trying. Little things helped, like Vincent Dunne was an inspector or something like that in a coal yard. He could influence the hiring of people, and naturally he made places for our own people. We had little groups here and there.

Our work, of course, in the first years was aimed almost entirely at the Communist party. We understood our task to be to create a cadre of revolutionists, and what revolutionists existed were there. We called ourselves a faction of the party. Not a separate party, but an opposition group. And we pounded away on the big issues. Of course, we had Trotsky, and the issues of the Russian revolution and Stalinism and so on. Our paper was pretty much a cadre paper. It wasn't an agitational paper. We had some arguments and conflicts over that—some people wanted to plunge right into mass work. We didn't have the cadres and the masses weren't ready for mass action.

1. *Teamster Rebellion*, by Farrell Dobbs, Monad Press. Distributed by Pathfinder Press, Inc., 410 West St., New York, N. Y. 10014. 190 pp.

And that paid off. We gradually built up sort of a die-hard cadre. Did you ask how they kept together? I expressed it one time in a convention speech. I said the pioneers and the old guard leaders were blessed with a peculiar form of ignorance. They never learned how to quit. They never learned how to give up. And they don't know it to this day.

Of course, even then we had some losses. There's a common expression over the generations: "The revolutionary movement is a great devourer of people." (The expression then was "a great devourer of men.") Those who survive maintain the continuity and there are always new people joining.

By the time we came to '34 we had, I guess, about a hundred and fifty or so people around the country. Not much more. But we threw all our resources into the Minneapolis strike. We sent in four people: Shachtman came along with me. There was Herbert Solow, who was a close sympathizer of the party, one of the Jewish intellectuals whom we had broken away from the Stalinist periphery, a journalist. And Hugo Oehler, who was a good organizer.

How the hell we got to Minneapolis I don't know. We didn't have money for carfare or for anything. This is maybe a small illustration of an important aspect of revolutionary strategy. When you have a struggle on, you pour all the forces in at the point of attack. Our little party sent four people into Minneapolis. Hugo Oehler's assignment was to work with the unemployed committees there. Max Goldman was in Minneapolis at that time and he was involved in it. He organized the unemployed to help the strike rather than to scab.

And we started a daily paper. The audacity of that just really staggers you to this day. How are you going to run a daily paper when you haven't got money enough to buy a pack of cigarettes? Well, we decided on a two-page tabloid. We would scrape the money up somehow. The union didn't have any money to speak of.

Shachtman and I worked on it, and Solow. We put out a bright little paper. It hit the town like a thunderbolt—they'd never seen anything like that. The strikers were exhilarated at the idea that we were hitting them with a daily paper when the bosses were running half-page and sometimes full-page ads in the daily papers announcing that Trotskyist revolutionaries were taking over the union. We were answering them and ridiculing them in our two-page tabloid. We had a lot of free distribution. Workers and strikers would take bundles and peddle them at a nickel apiece. Then practically every saloon in downtown and in the working-class neighborhoods would take a bundle and put them on the end of the bar with a cup for donations—a nickel or anything you want. The paper made money. It was funny, but it proved to be a big success.

Q. What effect did the strikes have on the circulation of The Militant?

A. Well, the fact that the Trotskyites were leading the strike gave us a standing for the first time in broader circles than we had before. *The Militant* was naturally playing it all over the paper. We who had appeared to be merely a hair-splitting sect were actually mass leaders,

and it helped *The Militant*. It helped the reputation of our organization immensely. You couldn't talk to us about hair-splitting sectarians any longer: How about the Minneapolis strikes? Nothing speaks louder than an action. And the fact that the strike was finally won in August gave us an enormous prestige. We put everything we had into it.

Q. When did you begin thinking about fusing with the Musteites?

A. That same year the Musteites had organized the unemployment organization, the National Unemployed League, throughout Ohio and Pennsylvania, and West Virginia I think it was. And they had quite a circle around it. They had organized what they called the American Workers party, but it was a provisional organization. They had a conference and announced their intention of organizing a radical revolutionary party.

They had Muste, who was a prodigious worker and an influential figure. And they attracted quite a number of people. Professor Hook, who was chairman of the Department of Philosophy at New York University, was a member. James Burnham was a member, and J. B. S. Hardman, the editor of the *Advance* of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union. These were in fact among the instigators and members of the National Committee. A lot of people joined it.

The thing we noticed and kept our eye on was the fact that they had these Unemployed Leagues, which were actually organizations of unemployed workers. They had shown what they could do in the Autolite strike, and that predisposed us very strongly to say that they were the kind of people we wanted to have. So we approached them for unification. This was in 1934.

As soon as we got back from the Minneapolis strike, we went into negotiation with them. The Toledo people were all in favor of it, because to them we meant Minneapolis. To us, they meant Toledo and the Unemployed Leagues. I told about that in the *History*.²

The Stalinists got a tremendous lift from the West Coast maritime strike. They absolutely dominated what there was of American radicalism. While the SP was fiddling around with a part-time national secretary and a book-keeper in the office, they had a full-time staff. And field organizers, district organizers. They had enough volume to have a gravitational pull when the radicalization began to take shape. Everything was pulled toward them.

Q. When did the Spanish events begin to have a major effect in America? The CP must have capitalized on that one.

A. That began in '36. Yes, they claimed to represent the Loyalist government, and ours was the critical position. They got more benefit out of their treachery than we got out of telling the truth. They had the official franchise and they'd begun to grow enormously in the thirties.

Q. When would you say they began to grow? They

2. *The History of American Trotskyism*, by James P. Cannon, Pathfinder Press, Inc., 410 West St., New York, N. Y. 10014. 268 pp.

were very small in the beginning. You said ten thousand members, mostly foreign-born.

A. They grew on what radicalism there was. They got the benefit of it. I would say they were growing—I haven't got the exact figures—from the beginning of the depression. Because they were the only ones around of any consequence and size. They had a daily paper. And they had daily papers in a dozen different languages. And they had district organizers and full-time organizers in all the main cities. They had an editorial staff and writers. And they got the benefit of everything. For example, one of the manifestations of radicalism ahead of the workers radicalization was the radicalization of the intellectuals. They pounced on that. They organized the John Reed clubs, which were organizations of intellectuals, supposedly.

Q. When was this?

A. The early thirties. And they were very adept in organizing the peripheral organizations to meet any need for special people, like the John Reed Clubs. They were the natural center for intellectuals who were beginning to dissent. And they had their unemployed leagues for the unemployed workers. They organized the League Against War and Fascism, in which they tried to integrate an indiscriminate mass of people who didn't want a war, or fascism either. This was just after Hitler had come to power. Up to then they had had an ultraleft policy in the unions and in general.

Q. Trotsky, in that whole period, was polemicizing against the German Stalinists above all, in issue after issue of The Militant. What effect did that have in America?

A. What Trotsky was writing? It appealed to the vanguard of the vanguard. We only reached the vanguard with that. The great mass were not interested in it. But we recruited a lot of people out of the Communist party with that, and with other arguments. Our original cadres came primarily from the Communist party.

Q. Let me ask you a sweeping question here. From the period of atomization of the American working class, when there must have been very deep-seated pessimism, until 1934 with the three successful strikes and the beginnings of a huge upsurge, of optimism, how fast did the change in consciousness take place?

A. Well, it began to steamroll. There had been attempts in auto to organize. John L. Lewis and a few others began to recognize a new movement coming. I think it was in '35 they organized, at first within the AFL, the Committee on Industrial Organization, the CIO. Lewis above all saw what was going on. They got some favorable labor legislation from Washington, and Lewis exploited that very cleverly, first of all to reorganize the miners, who had been cut down to shreds in the preceding period. He had his organizers going into the field with such slogans as "Your president wants you to join the United Mine Workers." And they would quote the Labor Relations Act.

The auto workers began to organize. The Lewis forces at first attempted a paternalistic control. They would appoint a member of their own staff as head of an organizing committee. It wasn't called the United Auto Workers Union; it was an organizing committee under the CIO. In '35 it began to blossom. In '36 there were flare-ups; then in '37 the Flint sit-down turned the tide. Next thing you knew, by god, they had a contract with General Motors and then with Chrysler. And it just began to snowball.

The same thing happened in steel and with the electrical workers. The Stalinist cadres were everywhere in that. You see, the Stalinists had been very active on the campuses, and they had strong student organizations, built around the slogans of antiwar and antifascism.

This is interesting from the point of view of where you get your cadres and what you do with them. You get your cadres where you can and then you put them where they are most needed.

I don't think this was the design of any Stalinist genius; it just happened. They recruited hundreds and hundreds, perhaps thousands of college students into the Young Communist League. And they had a broader organization, Students Against War or some such thing—something like the Student Mobilization Committee.

Half of these kids graduating from college or dropping out couldn't find jobs, so they were put to work in the unemployed councils. And the skills they had acquired in the meetings of the student organizations came in very handy going to meetings of workers who are not accustomed to taking the floor and so on. They had a big advantage. It helped to lead the demonstrations and marches and one thing or another. Then, when the factories especially began to open up, a lot of these same people, who started out as innocent college boys who had gone through the mill of the unemployed councils, ended up in the auto plants as Communist cadres. They were very effective, too.

Q. We know that one of the great disasters of that period was that no labor party emerged from it. What was the agitation or propaganda towards it?

A. There was tremendous sentiment for a labor party. It was so strong that in the United Auto Workers the only way Reuther could dodge it was to say, wait another year. "You want to organize a labor party? Let's wait another year." There was a great popular sentiment for a labor party, but it was maneuvered around and choked by the Reutherites on one side and the Stalinists on the other. The Stalinists didn't want it—they wanted Roosevelt. They were well satisfied with Roosevelt.

* * *

Second Session, May 21, 1973

Q. I was wondering if you had any further thoughts on what we discussed before, any ideas you wanted to add before we go on?

A. The development of the thirties was the classic radicalization in American history. It took place under the

July 16, 1973

impact of the terrible depression, the terrible hardships, which the present generation can hardly understand or feel—it was so sweeping. I think an interesting thing to remember is that the radicalization found its first expression, not in the working class, but in the intellectual circles, in literary circles. The CP attracted a wide circle of sympathizers and fellow travelers among the intellectuals. I mentioned the John Reed Clubs. That was one of the forms which it took, but there were others, too. It was reflected in the writings of the time. It was also reflected on the campuses.

The CP developed a quite strong movement of college students, both as members and as sympathizers in peripheral organizations. And graduating from college or from high school or whatever didn't mean you walked into a good-paying job. It was more apt to mean you walked into unemployment.

And a great many of the radicalized youth that the CP recruited or influenced became activists in the unemployment movement, which was a much bigger movement and had much wider appeal than the trade-union movement at the time.

I think this is interesting to remember in connection with the argument over whether we should be working so hard to recruit college students.

A lot of the very most effective cadres of the Communist party were college graduates or dropouts, who had served some time in the heated life of the campus organizations—debates and conflicts and demonstrations. They then carried over their skills into the unemployment movement and became leaders among the unemployed. Then when a slight economic upturn took place and some jobs opened up, they were colonized into factories.

I'll bet if it were possible to take a census of the different people that the CP had at its disposal in the big radicalization in the unions, you'd find that a lot of them had been recruited on the campus or in the unemployment movement.

One important thing to remember in this is that in an activist movement people acquire certain skills—how to operate in a mass organization. And that isn't given as a birthright; that's something that has to be learned. And we can anticipate something, perhaps, of the same kind when the radicalization next reaches the working class. The CP just stumbled into it, it just worked out that way. But we should be conscious about it.

A young comrade who has learned how to deal with opponent organizations in campus struggles and debates and so forth, and then has had some experience in the antiwar movement with the Stalinists and the nuts and kooks and freaks and everything else—that will not be wasted when we get the chance to work in a living union movement. And above all, when we talk about a trade-union orientation, as some people have been doing, as a panacea of some kind, we should remember that a small organization has got to enter the trade-union movement with some conscious design and at some place where they are going to operate most fruitfully. That includes colonization. That's what the CP did in the thirties, and that's what we did when we began to acquire some trained cadres. And you don't colonize where you choose always; you colonize where a door is open.

At one time in the late thirties we had not less than eighty members of our party sailing the seas in the mari-

time unions. Now that wasn't because they were natural-born sailors or there were more jobs at sea than anywhere else. That was because, as the result of our participation in the maritime strike in San Francisco in 1936-37, we established contacts and an opening. And that's not always easy to find. We got an opening to send as many people as we wanted to—at that time maritime was picking up—into the Sailors' Union of the Pacific.

That's how Frank Lovell became a sailor. If I'm not mistaken, he was at that time a philosophy major, or something of that sort, whatever the hell that means. His first assignment was in the Sailors' Union of the Pacific and in that capacity he learned a certain trade—ship's carpenter, I think—so that when he went into auto, he already had a specialty that enabled him to get a job in the Fisher Body plant.

We colonized our people in the coal yards in Minneapolis because we had an opening there. Because Vincent Dunne had an inspector's job which enabled him to place people at a time when the other job markets had dried up. He got them jobs shoveling coal with the idea of organizing them into a union. The great development of the Minneapolis union struggles began in the coal yards in December 1933.

Farrell tells about that in his book. He got a job shoveling coal. He was going to be an engineer and later on maybe a vice-president of some corporation. The best he could do in the depression was get a job shoveling coal and he happened to run into a bunch of Trotskyites there and the first thing you know he joined the party and the union at the same time.

Do you know Harry DeBoer in Minneapolis? He was also one that was recruited into the union and the party at just about the same time. And Carl Skoglund, who had been a railroad worker, a shopman, and a number of other things. And Grant and Miles Dunne, two brothers of Vincent. I'm getting off on this track and it may take up all our time.

To get back to this argument that we should have a trade-union orientation. We don't answer that by saying, "No, we should have a campus orientation." We have never changed our conception of a proletarian party. We're just recruiting where the opportunities are open. We don't change our basic idea that they're going to be colonized in unions. And we're recruiting workers if we can at the same time. Don't you think that's a more effective way to answer it? Some of the people were quite worked up about that lack of union orientation. Apparently. As if we had given it up, which was not true at all!

No. We had a very strong fraction in the maritime unions and we wielded a great deal of influence. But the combination of the cold war, the brutal interference of the Coast Guard, which refused credentials to anybody looking like a Red, plus the bureaucratic officials, all in combination—in a very short time they wiped us out. Many of our people were moved over into auto and other places.

Q. I wanted to ask you some other questions, going back to the initial radicalization. What role did international questions play in the radicalization? How important are events in other countries in a developing radicalization?

A. They have an influence, I guess, that's not recognized. The workers begin to move when their material conditions become too oppressive. That's why, as I said, the early radicalization was represented by people who responded to ideas and international politics and so on. The fact that the Soviet Union was driving ahead with the five-year plan when America and the other capitalist countries were deep in depression made a tremendous impression on them. And they saw the menace of fascism and its ideological expression much quicker than the workers in America did. This fact, which can probably be repeated, can lead to misunderstandings, to the idea that the radicalization was made by the peripheral circles, but that isn't true. The radicalization becomes serious when the workers begin to say, "To hell with it all!"

The workers were influenced by events in France—they didn't know how much they were influenced. The sit-down strikes didn't begin in Flint; they began in France and in Italy. I think they called them occupations, and they began, I think, in '33 and '34. The workers began to rebel there and began occupying the factories.

And that had its impact here, first, as I recall, in rubber. After the 1931 strike had been broken, they imposed a company-union setup—with a congress and a senate and a whole damned rigamarole as a substitute for unions, with company stooges in the strategic places and a murderous regime in the factories. The foremen were especially brutal. The poor devils would come in from the mountains of West Virginia, the bayous of Louisiana, and were looking for work and were taking anything they could get at any wages they could get. You talk about the assembly line. If somebody wasn't working fast enough it was a common thing for a foreman to come and bump his head on the line. They couldn't do a damn thing about it.

But when they began to rise up, they went the whole French route. They occupied the factories, and I think the first thing they did was grab every single foreman in the plant by the scruff of the neck and beat the hell out of them and throw them out the door and say, "Don't ever come back!"

They occupied the factories and when they finally got a settlement, the company had to get a whole new staff of foremen, because the old ones were not allowed back and were afraid to come back. So, workers who had been not only unorganized but manipulated in the company unions and deprived of all human rights, within a space of months, became one of the vanguard forces in the country, in the union movement. The same thing happened in auto.

As I say, 1934 was the great divide. I think the psychological effect of the fact that strikes could be *won* had a tremendous influence on the thinking of the workers. And when they got ready to go, they went far beyond the existing union structure, and of the CIO, which started as a committee within the AFL and only later became an independent organization.

Everywhere in the basic industries the workers wouldn't have anything else but industrial unions. I, as an old Wobbly, take that to be a partial vindication of the IWW's great work in popularizing the idea of industrial organization as opposed to craft organization.

The 1919 general strike organized by Foster in the

steel mills—that was a craft union setup. It was not a new union; it was a federation of all the existing crafts in the AFL. It was like a patchwork quilt. But in the late thirties there was a new steelworkers union in the struggle. Why, the labor skates in Washington were scared to death of that. They contributed practically nothing to it. They arrested it as much as they could, but the tidal wave swept past them.

Q. We talked a little bit about the labor party at the end of the last talk. I was interested not only in the question of how the labor party was prevented then, but in what prospects you think there are for the labor party today.

A. Concomitant with the industrial union upsurge in the thirties came the demand for a labor party. It was very strong, very widespread, and was throttled only by the manipulations of the leadership, and, of course, the Communist party. The Communist party was the decisive force in strangling the political radicalization of the thirties. I personally think that all things were possible in the late thirties. If the Communist party, which was then very strong—probably eighty to a hundred thousand members, and had its cadres everywhere—had been a revolutionary party, nobody knows what might have happened.

Maybe that's a good time to switch over to the point I've got in mind about the next work of our party. We can't make the radicalization of the workers; we can only wait for it to come. We can perhaps anticipate it, but we shouldn't try to manufacture it or try to say it exists when it doesn't. The workers are not moving in America today. I would say there's an attitude of wait-and-see. I don't think it's an attitude of submission or an atomization as there was in the early thirties. Wait and see. And all the time, prices go up and wages are locked—they see that. We don't have to send them any messages; they see it each time they cash their paychecks at the grocery store.

If there's a big movement of workers in Europe, it will have its influence here, as it did in the thirties. I cited the rubber workers as a good example, but the Flint sit-down strike, I think, was a delayed reaction to the French example. Not many of them may have recognized it, but it was there.

In this period we are not paying sufficient attention to the problem of dealing with our opponents in the struggle for leadership on the left. We can take advantage of the lull—if there is a lull—in mass activity, in the antiwar movement, and take some time out to settle accounts with some of these sons of bitches who are claiming to be representatives of the left.

The Communist party is number one, of course. We do quite a bit of that, but not enough. And the tone is not harsh enough and disdainful enough. There is no debate with the Stalinists. It's not a dialogue, you know, of gentlemen who are expressing different opinions. It's a desperate life-and-death struggle between the greatest traitors the world has ever known and the revolutionary vanguard. It's a fight, and that's the sense in which we should be dealing with it. We should never let them get away from the history of the fight.

The Moscow Trials, the great terror that followed, the

great betrayal in Germany to fascism and all that has followed from that—never let them get away with a single thing. All of our people and all those whom we influence should be permeated with a knowledge of the history of Stalinism and of our implacable, uncompromisable antagonism to it. They've got to be knocked out of the way. We've done a pretty good job in this country so far, but it could go a little further.

That brings up the question of the *Guardian's* attempt to create a Maoist party. I read the latest issue in which this fellow Davidson tries to defend the Communist party against us. He manages to speak about the whole period of the thirties as if the Comintern was right in Germany and in dealing with us, as if we had been unfair in not being frank enough with Lovestone and Foster in 1928, when they were just waiting for a chance to kick us out of the party before we had a chance to even make known our documents. He even shows consideration for the Social Democrats—we weren't quite fair with them.

Now, he can be a good punching bag to hit the Stalinists and the Maoist variation of it, too, by taking him on. And not just simply answering his accusations, but taking the offensive. He says the betrayal in Germany was the fault of the Social Democrats, which it was, but it was also and primarily the fault of the Stalinists, who had the power at that time to force the Social Democrats, or a large section of them, into a united front—which they didn't do or try to do. And then he defends the whole period of the Stalinist terror. Our aim is to destroy all variations of Stalinism, and he has set himself up as an accomplice after the fact.

Don't ignore this Davidson. Trotsky took great pains to answer almost every nut in the world. You're not going to convert a screwball into an intelligent, rational human being, but you're going to educate your own people. We were educated on Trotsky's polemics against a lot of crazy people, you know. And you should have that in mind. We are educating our own people in the truth of the history of the movement and the principles underlying it.

As you say, Davidson is a hack. But he's a hack in the cause of the blood and filth of Stalinism, and that's the way we should talk about him. No gentlemen's finesse here at all. No. Just call him by his right name. And in fighting against him, you are insuring the party against Maoist tendencies. That's an important thing to keep in mind; in fact, the most important.

But also, if there is an expanding radicalization, every panacea will get its sympathizers and supporters and suckers, and we should try to reduce it to a minimum. You can't eliminate it. No matter what it is you want to sell, no matter how crazy an idea it may be, you can find somebody to buy it. If it's a bottle of medicine that will cure anything that ails you or a little piece of bent metal that you can put under your tongue to make you a ventriloquist, you can stand up on the street corner and have some fellow demonstrating this thing, throwing his voice, and you can sell them for two bits apiece. I happen to know, because I bought one once when I was a kid. I wanted to go home and start throwing my voice around the house and fool the family and make them think I'd become a ventriloquist. But it didn't work.

You can't prevent, but you can limit. You can limit

the number of people that they disorient by being on top of them and being absolutely merciless and tireless in pounding away. Don't yield to the temptation to say, "Oh, well, they're a bunch of nuts, so let them go." No. They can confuse a lot of people. And the *Guardian* has got such a dubious history. My god, it's changed administrations and lines three times.

The same approach holds true to a lesser degree with these new Social Democrats, the "Social Democrats, USA." They're a good target.

We're not just a bunch of good fellows in the general radical community, "We're all trying to do good and let's all get together and cooperate" and so on. No. We're out to build our party and the revolutionary-socialist youth organization. We're for cooperation and united fronts on anything where we agree, but you know, the united front as devised by Lenin was not simply a form of cooperation; it's also a form of struggle. In the united-front actions we show ourselves to be the most militant and most aggressive and we attract the most radically inclined workers. On the other hand, as is usually the case, the allies falter and we let them have it. Not to break off the united front, but to set an example.

I won't give you any advice on the NCLC, because I have never heard of anything more fantastic than the National Caucus of Labor Committees. How did they develop this idea that they're going to wipe out all other organizations by physical force when they've only got a handful of thugs? Provocateurs. That should be the constant element in our counterattack in the press. Provocateurs. I've seen individual aberrations here and there, but a group of people that are going to obliterate organizations a hundred times bigger than they are by physical force is not "logistically correct."

Q. You haven't said very much about what you think of the promise of the future of the radicalization.

A. Well, I'm playing that cagey. I think Engels once said that if we could predict the ups and downs of the stock market accurately, we could make a tidy fortune to finance the movement. I think there could be a tendency, perhaps, to see more radicalization than there is right now. I read an article by Max Lerner, one of the editors of the *New York Post*. He's also a college professor and a "knee-jerk lib" as they call them. He said he's been to a lot of campuses and that the mood there is very quiet as to any actions and demonstrations and so on. Much more so than it used to be a few years back. We should always try to see the situation as it is.

You know, in the fifties they called the college students the "silent generation." It just seemed like they were completely overwhelmed with one idea: to get through, get a degree, and get a job. No monkey business.

The first reaction was, I think, in '59. It was a sympathetic reaction to the Black struggle for civil rights that started in the South and blew up into quite a breeze.

If there's a lull now, it still may be that the students are open to discussions; they're not averse to discussion, but they're averse to plunging into action. We shouldn't be jumping in trying to create actions when we haven't got the base for it.

We've been riding the tide of radicalization for quite a while. It might be a tendency of some, if the experience of the past is any guide, to see it as going up in a straight line—more and more radicalization. And, if they run into some difficulties, to be discouraged.

It's very important, based on the experiences we have been through, to always keep in mind that the class struggle in general and radicalization in particular have their ebbs and flows, and not be taken aback. We shouldn't be disappointed when it begins to ebb just when we think it should begin to flow. Don't substitute our own subjectivity for the reality. Frankly recognize it and expect it.

I'm afraid some of our new recruits of the last few years are not prepared to accept that, because they have come in on a tide of radicalization, and they may be terribly disappointed if it subsides.

That's a good time to remind them of the history of our movement; of the long time when we were completely isolated. When we got a chance to get into mass action, we took full advantage of it. Then we rode that tide up through the uprising in the labor movement in the immediate postwar period.

And then we ran into the cold war and McCarthyism and prosperity combined, and bang—everything was down again. We had to live through the fifties on our nerve. We couldn't get any particular action anywhere. That was when I gave my lectures on "America's Road to Socialism"³ here in California. That was right at the height of the McCarthy period and there wasn't anything doing anywhere.

So we decided it was a good time to talk about socialism. It proved to be very effective and successful, with good audiences. It helped to revive the movement and inspire it again with the great vision of the future, which is the real driving force of our movement. □

3. *America's Road to Socialism*, by James P. Cannon, Pathfinder Press, Inc., 410 West St., New York, N. Y. 10014. 79 pp.

Feliciano Frame-Up Trial Set for September 4

The beginning of Carlos Feliciano's second trial on frame-up charges of attempted bombing and possession of explosives has been set for September 4 in Manhattan (New York). Last year, the Puerto Rican independence activist was acquitted of essentially

the same charges by a jury in the Bronx.

On July 2, Feliciano's lawyers moved unsuccessfully for the dismissal of all charges on the basis of the earlier acquittal, the subsequent suspension of the arresting officer, and

the likelihood of federal government involvement in the case.

A statement issued by the defense committee June 28 notes that Feliciano's arrest in 1970 fits the pattern of Nixon's secret plan of harassment of political activists. □