

French Trotskyists Continue Fight Against Pompidou Ban



**A
Peron-Balbin
Ticket
in Argentina?**



***How the Healyites 'Answer'
a Polemic on Economics***

Hundreds Died in Poisoning Epidemic

At least 459 persons died last year in Iraq during an epidemic of mercury poisoning, according to Iraqi and U. S. scientists studying the disaster. Jeffrey A. Perlman reported in the July 19 *Wall Street Journal* that 6,500 poisoning victims were admitted to hospitals and that 459 of them had died. The number who may have died outside of hospitals is not known.

The epidemic, called "the most catastrophic ever recorded," was caused by wheat seed grown in Mexico and imported into Iraq. The wheat had been treated with a methylmercury fungicide. Mercury is an extremely dangerous poison. The human body cannot eliminate it and the initial symptoms of mercury poisoning are difficult to detect.

The sacks containing the wheat bore written instructions saying that the seed should be used only for planting, but many peasants also fed it to cattle and chickens. When the animals did not immediately become sick, the peasants assumed that the seed was safe and used it to make bread. Persons who ate animals that had been fed on the seed absorbed additional mercury from this meat.

"The grain itself was colored with a red dye," Perlman reported. "The dye, but not the methylmercury, could be removed by washing, the scientists said, giving farmers the impression that the poison had been removed."

All use of methylmercury fungicides has been banned in the United States by the Department of Agriculture. But the chemical is still manufactured in the U. S. and sold to other countries. □

Summer Schedule

There will be one more issue of *Intercontinental Press* before we begin our summer break. That issue will be dated August 6. We will resume our regular weekly schedule with the issue of September 10.

In This Issue

FEATURES	937	On the History of the Trotskyist Movement — Interview With George Novack
	942	How the Healyites "Answer" a Polemic on Economics—by Dick Roberts
IRAQ	914	Hundreds Die in Poisoning Epidemic
ARGENTINA	915	Peron Forging "National Unity" Coalition —by David Thorstad
	917	Right-Wing Peronists Attack Cordoba Unions
NEW ZEALAND	918	Committee Demands End to Ban on Ligue
	943	Antiwar Actions Planned
FRANCE	919	French Trotskyists Continue Fight for Legality —by Jon Rothschild
	920	Behind Marcellin's Pressure on Court
	921	"Nouvel Observateur" Looks at Krivine Case
	922	Why French CP Defends Far Left Groups
	923	"Rouge" Appeals to CP Members
	925	Call for International United Front to Defend French Trotskyists—Statement of the Fourth International
	928	International Actions Defend Ligue
GREAT BRITAIN	927	British Trotskyists' Open Letter to SLL on Defense of Ligue Communiste
	929	Workers Respond to the Threat of a Coup
	929	Statement Signed by Representatives of Left
	929	Statement by Vicuna Mackenna Cordon
INDOCHINA WAR	931	Officers Describe Nixon's Secret Air War
	932	Rising Pressure on Nixon to Dump Lon Nol
U. S. A.	932	Watergate Cover-Up Comes Further Unstuck —by Allen Myers
MOZAMBIQUE	935	More Evidence About Massacre of Civilians —by Joanne Smith
CANADA	940	Why Labor Party Needs Socialist Policies —by Howard Brown
REVIEWS	944	Behind the Rise of the Teamsters Union —by Allen Myers
DRAWINGS	916	Hector Campora—by David
	919	Raymond Marcellin; 930, Salvador Allende; 931, Nixon; 933, John Mitchell; 934, Robert Mardian—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.

Peron Forging 'National Unity' Coalition

By David Thorstad

"It is difficult for political observers, and much more so for suspicious Radicals, not to believe that a secret and more or less implicit pact between Perón and Balbin has existed since before the March elections," commented the Buenos Aires daily *La Opinión* July 14.

The "pact" between Perón and the head of Argentina's second-largest party after the Peronists, the Unión Cívica Radical (UCR—Radical Civic Union), has become the best-known secret in the country in the ten days since President Héctor Cámpora resigned July 13. What it involves is reportedly an offer of a vice-presidential spot for Balbin on a "national unity" ticket with Perón in the new elections scheduled for September 23. Although no formal offer has been made publicly, Balbin has indicated his willingness to accept such an offer if his divided party approves it at a convention called for July 28.

According to a United Press International dispatch published in the July 16 issue of the New York Spanish-language daily *El Diario-La Prensa*, three arguments are being stressed inside the Radical party as reasons for supporting a Perón-Balbin ticket: "1. the direct opportunity to share power; 2. Perón's age (77) and a physical state that, judging from how he looked on television, has considerably deteriorated; 3. growing indications that important sectors of the military are in favor of a Perón-Balbin solution."

There is considerable support for such a ticket among important layers of the bourgeoisie and the military. Ildefonso Recalde, vice-president of the CGE (Confederación General Económica — General Business Federation, the national employers' organization), said that "if a ticket of Perón for president and Balbin for vice-president is in fact put together, it would mean the most solid guarantee and backing for reinvigorating the economic policy that got rolling on May 25 [the day Cámpora took office]."

Far from changing this policy, he added, "they will implement it while being in a position to count on the largest possible political support in the country. Thus, the coalition that, it would appear, could be formed will encounter opposition from only an absolute minority of the left, while the vast majority of the country will go along with it till its program is fully achieved. The CGE feels that this could constitute a positive step for the country."

The military has its own reasons for supporting a joint ticket of the two longtime political foes, according to Philippe Labreux, writing in the July 17 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde*: "Such an alliance would undoubtedly make it possible to neutralize the 'extremists' of all stripes, but especially to implement a vigorous foreign policy that would take account of the offensive being waged by Brazil in the bordering countries. This, in fact, is one of the main things on the mind of the chiefs of staff."

In announcing his and Vice-President Solano Lima's resignation, Cámpora explained that his aim was to pave the way for the assumption of the presidency by Perón: "I retire from government to return the mandate that I received from General Perón."

"If there is no roadblock ahead," he added, "within a few more days the indisputable chief of our movement will be in this house [Congress] to certify before the Argentine people that he is in government and in power."

The resignation, which caught most observers by surprise, was well orchestrated and, to all evidence, done at the behest of Perón himself.

Later that night, Perón made a radio and television speech to the nation from his home. "If God grants me health," he said, "I will spend the last efforts of my life accomplishing the mission that befits me."

All three armed forces commanders met with Perón during the week leading up to Cámpora's resignation.

José Rucci, general secretary of the

CGT (Confederación General del Trabajo — General Confederation of Labor), sent the following gushy note to Cámpora, praising his decision to resign:

"We humans cannot always find words that adequately express our feelings; I do not know if I will be able to attain this goal, which comes from the very deepest part of my heart. You, Compañero Cámpora, have become a symbol of absolute loyalty to our leader, Lieutenant General Juan Domingo Perón, and an example of generosity and patriotism that extols you as a soldier of our cause who brings honor upon our movement — a patriotic gesture reserved only for the great men of our nationality."

Even before Cámpora announced his resignation, voices began to be raised suggesting that Perón become president. The Peronist bloc in Congress, for instance, held a special private caucus July 12, following which a spokesman emerged and said that "if the people demand that our dear General Perón assume the presidency, then we will not oppose them."

After Cámpora resigned, Raúl Lastiri, president of the Chamber of Deputies, was sworn in as interim president. Lastiri is the son-in-law of Perón's close adviser, conservative José López Rega. López Rega has been mentioned as a possible choice for the vice-presidential slot.

Associated Press reported from Buenos Aires July 13: "The move by moderate Peronists to place their leader in the presidential palace after his 18 years in exile was not without opposition. Radical Peronist youths and Communist and Socialist youth groups seized university law, philosophy and medical schools. They displayed banners showing their affiliations.

"One slogan painted on a university wall said: 'We oppose this right-wing coup.'"

Lastiri's new cabinet, reported *New York Times* correspondent Jonathan Kandell July 14, "has clearly taken a conservative turn." It included all the ministers from Cámpora's government except for two who were considered to be left-wing Peronists. They were Foreign Minister Juan Carlos Puig and Interior Minister Esteban Righi. Their replacements — Alberto

Vignes as foreign minister, and Benito Llambi as interior minister — are considered conservative Peronists.

Perón has reportedly been ill most of the time since he returned to Argentina in late June. For an ill man, however, he has apparently been quite active behind the scenes in attempting to forge a new coalition of national unity. Once the coalition is firmly consolidated — as it appears close to becoming — Perón is expected to move decisively against leftist guerrillas and dissidents. Kandell described Perón's maneuverings this way in the July 14 *New York Times*:

"During the three weeks he has been in Argentina, after an 18-year exile, he has virtually ignored the dissension within his movement and concentrated instead on building bridges with his traditional enemies — the armed forces and the opposition parties.

"Whether or not Mr. Perón decides to personally take over the Presidency, it seems clear by now that he has managed to quickly forge a broad working coalition between moderate and conservative Peronists, the leaders of the armed forces and the main opposition party.

"The military — distrustful of Peronism but even more fearful of the threat posed by Marxist guerrillas and by the growing strength of young left-wing Peronists — has backed Mr. Perón as long as he acts in accordance with the Constitution. For much the same reasons, conservative landowners, the clergy and businessmen, who despised Mr. Perón in the past, are now openly hoping that he will achieve the national unity he has promised."

The editors of the *Washington Post* on July 16 termed Perón's efforts to achieve this "great national agreement" a "virtuoso political performance":

"Since his homecoming, he has moved at once to his left and his right, doling out appointments, assurances and pledges to a broad spectrum of political factions and economic interest groups and apparently consolidating their support at every step. It has been, close observers agree, a virtuoso political performance, belying the simplistic label 'dictator' often placed on him. General Peron has not succeeded, or apparently tried, to accommodate the radical guerrillas held responsible for a continuing series of



HECTOR CAMPORA

kidnapings and takeovers. But it seems to be the expectation of practically everyone else that he will manage to cope with them once he formally takes power."

Perón appears to have neatly outmaneuvered his leftist supporters, in particular the Peronist guerrillas. In spite of all the evidence to the contrary, for example, their statements suggest that they believe Perón to be, not the author of the latest swing to the right, but a kind of captive of certain groups that have "infiltrated" the Peronist movement, and a victim of a "proimperialist" plot. "Although the youthful leftists in his movement have been caught off guard by this rapidly emerging coalition of conservative forces," observed Kandell in a dispatch from Buenos Aires July 16, "such is the prestige of Mr. Perón — particularly within the labor movement — that no left-wing Peronist has yet dared to attack him directly. And even Marxists outside the movement have preferred to take aim at those close political aides of Mr. Perón who are identified as rightists.

"Today, for example, the left-wing Peronist guerrilla groups attempted to outdo Mr. Perón's conservative followers by calling for his immediate designation as president, instead of waiting for elections."

The Peronist guerrilla groups were

the FAP (Fuerzas Armadas Peronistas — Peronist Armed Forces) and the Montoneros. In a statement, they warned that a "handful of traitors within the Peronist movement" were trying to take advantage of Cámpora's resignation to provoke a "bloody aggression against the working class." They identified Lastiri and López Rega as members of this "handful of traitors."

They also called for a program for government that would go well beyond Perón's moderate program for revitalizing Argentina's sagging capitalist economy. Their program included "socialization of the means of production, popular participation in all government decisions, and a rupture with and attack on imperialism and its agents, thus solidifying [Argentina] with the peoples of the third world."

In the present context, these personal appeals to Perón by the left-wing Peronists are pathetic. For the wheels are inexorably moving toward a showdown with the country's leftists — particularly the non-Peronist left. Cámpora's resignation has only further helped to set the stage for the showdown. The very same day that the Peronist guerrillas issued their statement, for instance, right-wing Peronists staged a machine-gun attack on the headquarters of leftist unions in the city of Córdoba.

On July 18, the Juventud Sindical Peronista (JSP — Peronist Trade-Union Youth) ran a full-page advertisement in *La Opinión* attacking, by name, the left-wing union leaders from Córdoba, Agustín Tosco and René Salamanca; and Juan Carlos Coral of the Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores (PST — Socialist Workers party).

The advertisement, heavily laden with irony, began: "To All Trotskyist, Marxist, Communist, and Gorilla Comrades: Our imperialist superiors are ordering us to mobilize. The fascist, McCarthyite 'union bureaucracy' of the central CGT is trying to bring about a Justicialist homeland with Perón as the President of Argentina." It went on to accuse the class-struggle forces in Argentina of having formed a "sinister alliance against the people" after losing the March 11 elections. Their opposition to Perón, it charged, "is a blasphemy that the people will never forgive." □

Right-Wing Peronists Attack Cordoba Unions

Right-wing Peronists carried out machine-gun and bomb attacks on leftist trade-union headquarters in the Argentine city of Córdoba July 16. The assault came in the context of a campaign by conservative Peronists, including the labor bureaucracy, to isolate the militant unionists, whose stronghold is in the interior city.

"In Buenos Aires and most other cities," *New York Times* correspondent Jonathan Kandell noted in a dispatch from Buenos Aires July 17, "conservative and right-wing Peronists are in firm control of labor unions. But through recent elections in Córdoba, an alliance of Marxist and left-wing Peronists has wrested control of the city's government and many labor unions from the more conservative followers of Juan Perón."

In their attack, the rightists first seized the headquarters of the automobile mechanics union, SMATA (Sindicato de Mecánicos y Afines del Transporte Automotor del Automóvil — Union of Automobile Machinists and Allied Trades), and the local office of the CGT (Confederación General del Trabajo—General Confederation of Labor). They then attempted to occupy the headquarters of the Sindicato Luz y Fuerza (Light and Power Union). They were held off by armed followers of the union's president, Agustín Tosco.

According to a United Press International dispatch from Córdoba published in the July 18 issue of the *New York Spanish-language daily El Diario-La Prensa*, the attackers were identified as members of a "Comando de Resistencia Peronista" (Peronist Resistance Commando).

Tosco told Kandell in a telephone interview that the attackers pulled up in several cars in front of the union headquarters just after 9:30 p. m. Tosco was in a meeting on the top floor of the building when the attack began.

"They blew open the front door with a bomb, and started shooting with machine guns, rifles and hand guns from behind their cars," he said.

"But we were ready for them. We turned off all the lights and started

firing back. After about 30 minutes the police showed up and fired machine guns in the air, and those Fascists ran away. But the headquarters is a mess. There are bullet holes and grenade fragments on the walls in the front lobby, and there aren't many windows left."

Tosco charged that the attackers were "paid assassins of José Rucci." Rucci is the head of the CGT.

The morning after the assault, the 3,000 members of the Light and Power Union and the 7,000 members of SMATA voted to stage a one-day strike to protest the attacks.

The attacks, according to Kandell, "appear to be an effort by rightists to set the stage for intervention by the national Government in Córdoba's labor unions and local government using the city's political instability as a pretext."

The effort has been going on for some time. The July 13 issue of the Buenos Aires daily *La Opinión* reported that the Córdoba Light and Power Union had received a telegram from the office of the national federation of light and power unions warning Tosco's local that it "will have to refrain from carrying out any activity that goes against the orders of the Federation or goes beyond the organic position, which is elaborated by the member unions as a whole."

And on June 28, twenty-one "orthodox" Peronist union bureaucrats from Córdoba traveled to Buenos Aires to denounce what they called "chaos and anarchy" and the strong "Marxist infiltration" in the Córdoba workers movement and in the provincial government. This alleged infiltration, they said, is endorsed by "leftist ideologues" Agustín Tosco and René Salamanca. Salamanca is the general secretary of SMATA.

Soon after the twenty-one bureaucrats had met with Rucci, rumors began to circulate about a possible intervention into the provincial CGT



and government. Rucci also announced his decision to dissolve all the regional secretariats of the CGT.

The July 11-18 issue of *Avanzada Socialista*, weekly newspaper of the Argentine Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores (PST—Socialist Workers party), reported that Tosco immediately responded by calling a news conference. He accused the twenty-one of having betrayed the workers movement and of having collaborated with the military dictatorship. The national labor bureaucracy, he said, wanted "the subjugation of the workers movement in the interior." He said that the Córdoba regional secretariat of the CGT would continue to function, ignoring Rucci's order.

Avanzada Socialista published the texts of statements from a number of Córdoba unions affirming their determination to continue to struggle against the Peronist bureaucracy. The executive committee of the Perkins union noted that at a July 3 general assembly, its members had voted to repudiate Rucci's decision to dissolve the CGT's regional secretariats. Its statement concluded:

"We see it as an immediate necessity that the workers throughout the entire country realize what the bureaucracy is, what role it plays within the unions and the state, and the need to eradicate it from the unions, internal committees, and delegates' bodies. By defeating it at the rank-and-file level, we will be regaining control of the unions in order to place them at the service of the political and ideological growth of the workers."

The provisional committee of the Materfer union declared, in part: "People can't even see Rucci here. His name cannot even be mentioned because he has been repudiated by 100 percent of the compañeros. His social truce is an antiworker measure, and it has been signed by people who are enemies of our class. Moreover, it was done behind the backs of the workers. There is no social truce at the rank-and-file level. This is the reason they are threatening us. Some already see this clearly, others do not yet completely see it, and still others are coming to us to ask what is happening. But everybody is opposed to any maneuver originating in Buenos Aires."

Avanzada Socialista called for unity on the left in defense of the class-struggle left in the Córdoba workers movement. The real object of the labor bureaucracy's vendetta is not individual labor leaders, it noted, but the class-struggle approach of the labor movement in Córdoba, which has gained the reputation over the years of being a kind of bellwether for labor struggles in Argentina. It described as follows the present political context in which the Peronist labor bureaucracy's campaign was unleashed:

"During the past month and a half, the workers in Buenos Aires took advantage of the respite offered by the government to occupy factories and settle accounts with some bosses. In Córdoba, on the other hand, these activists moved to impose leaderships that were representative of the ranks in various sectors. The 'orthodox' bureaucracy found itself at bay, without any important plant under its control. This is the reason why the bureaucrats took advantage of the hard stance the government has assumed in recent weeks in demanding an end to the occupations, and why they went to Buenos Aires to ask the help of the big brothers in the national CGT.

"The class-struggle wing counted on taking advantage of two things in

order to move forward and strengthen itself. The first was the fact that the Córdoba CGT has a leadership (in Tosco and Atilio López—the latter through his close collaborator Tapia) that, although not itself a class-struggle leadership, allows internal democracy within the unions, resorts to mobilization measures, and passively goes along with the fact that the class-struggle activists are continuing to gain in strength in the rank-and-file union organizations.

"The second advantage is the fact that the Obregón Cano-López government is a weak government that reflects the pressure of the tradition of struggle in the Córdoba workers movement, makes concessions to the workers, and also passively tolerates the activities of the class-struggle wing.

"With a CGT and a government that cannot hold back the advances of the class-struggle wing, it is obvious that Córdoba is the place where the policy of 'national unity' and 'pacification' put forward by the Peronist government, with the agreement of all sectors of the Argentine bosses, could break down—or at least give rise to serious problems. This is the explanation for the attack against Córdoba, which could again develop into a national problem." □

New Zealand

Committee Demands End to Ban on Ligue

The New Zealand Committee Against Repression in France is circulating an appeal for broad support to an international campaign to reverse the banning of the Ligue Communiste. The appeal, along with copies of the July 9 issue of *Intercontinental Press*, which extensively reported the facts of the ban, has been sent to a wide range of academics, trade unionists, and others. It urges them to sign an enclosed open letter to Pompidou, which sets out the main facts surrounding the ban and demands that the ban be lifted.

The open letter says in part:

"It is obvious that, by banning the Communist League, the Pompidou government aims to intimidate the en-

tire anti-racist and anti-militarist movement in France, in which the Communist League has played a leading role. Just as Pompidou overrides the worldwide protest against French nuclear testing, so he seeks to override and intimidate the protest by French people against his government's militaristic policies.

"We the undersigned add our voices to those organisations in France representing the sentiments of French people opposed to racism, militarism, and the restriction of civil liberties.

"We demand the immediate lifting of the ban against the Communist League and the release of Alain Krivine and Pierre Rousset." □

French Trotskyists Continue Fight for Legality

By Jon Rothschild

Alain Krivine and Pierre Rousset, leaders of the dissolved Ligue Communiste, formerly the French section of the Fourth International, remain in jail. In many respects, the French Trotskyists have already frustrated the ban on them imposed by the Pompidou government in the wake of an antifascist demonstration in Paris June 21 that erupted violently when police served as goon-squads for the outnumbered fascists. (See *Intercontinental Press*, July 9, p. 819.)

The weekly newspaper *Rouge*, formerly the Ligue's official journal, continues to appear regularly and on schedule; persons selling it have not been interfered with except in a few isolated cases. The offices of the Société Internationale d'Éditions (International Publishers), in whose premises the Ligue's headquarters was located, remain open, and the latest issue of *Rouge* lists on the masthead its old address, 10 Impasse Guéméné, Paris IV, an address it could not use only one week previously.

But the government appears determined to keep Krivine and Rousset in jail. On July 10 Judge Alain Bernard ruled in favor of a motion to grant Krivine provisional release, but the state prosecutor immediately appealed that decision. There is no immediate prospect for winning Rousset's release.

The broad movement of solidarity with the Ligue in France quickly took up the issue of the government prosecutor's appeal. Organizations like the Communist party and the Socialist party, which had already come to the Ligue's support, protested the regime's appeal and reiterated their demands that Krivine and Rousset be turned loose.

On July 10 Raymond Marcellin, the profascist minister of the interior who proposed the ban on the Ligue and is widely regarded as having set up the police to sustain many injuries on June 21 in order to use the incidents as an excuse for a witch-hunt, gave an interview to the Paris daily *France-Soir*. The aim of the interview

was obvious enough. Marcellin felt obliged to defend himself against the nearly universal and thoroughly justified contempt that has come his way since the June 21 events. But more



MARCELLIN: Dissolve the groups and arrest their leaders.

than that, he was trying to put pressure on the *chambre d'accusation*, the body that will rule on the government's appeal of Judge Bernard's decision.

But it is less than likely that the *France-Soir* interview will sway public opinion.

One of the main charges that has been made by all the workers organizations in France (not to mention most of the democratic organizations, and even the largest police union as well) was that the police protected armed fascist goons of the organization *Ordre Nouveau*, escorting them to their headquarters after the conclusion of a racist meeting against workers immigrating to France. "How did it come about," *France-Soir* asked

Marcellin, "that the *Ordre Nouveau* supporters on June 21 were conducted out of the *Mutualité* and back to their headquarters by the police, even though they were helmeted and armed"?

"At the end of the meeting," Marcellin replied, "150 participants who wanted to return to the headquarters of their association [sic] feared that they would be attacked by leftists along the way and asked the police to assure their safety.

"As is the rule at the *Mutualité*, regardless of the political orientation of the meeting, this protection was accorded on the condition that those concerned not be carrying arms. The exiting [from the *Mutualité*] was effected without difficulty. No member of *Ordre Nouveau* appeared to be armed."

The former Vichyite went on to explain that along the way some of the fascists slipped clubs out from under their jackets, and that there were a few incidents. He also noted—somewhat off-handedly—that there was a "panel truck that was intercepted at Place Mauberg. This vehicle, driven by an *Ordre Nouveau* member, was transporting seventy-nine iron bars, about fifteen clubs, and 156 Molotov cocktails."

Marcellin did not explain whether the panel truck became visible only after some *Ordre Nouveau* member carelessly allowed his jacket to fall open. It may be that he felt compelled to mention the truck because members of the Ligue have publicly charged that they observed the very same truck delivering arms to the *Mutualité* during the day on June 21 right under the eyes of Marcellin's police. And while Marcellin may insist that no *Ordre Nouveau* member "appeared to be armed" during the march to the headquarters, it must be said that his powers of observation fall short of those of the entire Parisian press—even the conservative press—which universally noticed the iron bars and helmets of the *Ordre Nouveau* contingent.

Marcellin also presented his explanation of why he opposed banning the *Ordre Nouveau* meeting in the first place — a controversial point, since many organizations (the police union included) have stated that the meeting should have been prohibited under the 1972 law prohibiting incitement of racial hatred.

"Should the *Ordre Nouveau* meeting have been authorized or not?" asked *France-Soir*. After noting that the *Mutualité* has long been a popular site for political meetings and asserting his vigorous support for the right of free speech, Marcellin explained that some "*Ordre Nouveau* meetings in the *Mutualité* had been prohibited previously, notably the one planned for February 26, 1970; because of their neofascist and neo-Nazi character, they could have set off serious public disturbances. Such was not the character of the June 21 meeting, which dealt with immigration."

The fact that Marcellin chooses not to notice the basis on which *Ordre Nouveau* opposes immigration calls into question either his honesty or his political insight. But be that as it may, the entire discussion of the June 21 meeting and *Ordre Nouveau's* "apparently unarmed" goon squads, was but a prelude for the main point.

"Mr. Krivine asserts that he wanted to organize a peaceful demonstration on June 21," *France-Soir* asked. "What is your opinion of this?"

"It is not true," answered Marcellin. "*In the written orders that were given* — which came to light after the demonstration [?] — it is stated that the *Ordre Nouveau* meeting at the *Mutualité* had to be *prevented*. How can you prevent the holding of a meeting without using violence? [Emphasis in original.]

"Besides, for Krivine, violence constitutes a constant line. On May 27, 1969, he declared at a meeting in Toulouse: 'We will work for a new May that this time will end in victory for the revolution.'"

Perhaps suddenly realizing that his alleged quotation was less than convincing and that nobody has yet heard of any written orders relating to the June 21 counterdemonstration, Marcellin quickly tacked on a quotation, dubious at best, in which Krivine urged radicals to enter the armed forces (which is compulsory for males in France) so as to learn how to use

arms "and make Molotov cocktails."

This answer alone constituted a clear attempt by Marcellin to put pressure on the courts to hold Krivine in jail indefinitely. In case anyone failed to get the point, the following exchange was added on:

"Q. How can this violence be ended?"

"A. By banning all violent groups and by imprisoning their leaders on the basis of the sections of the penal code relating to internal state security. The more we recoil from taking these legal measures, the more disorder threatens to spread, for those who spread it become emboldened. Public peace therefore demands that the law be firmly applied whenever necessary.

"Q. Isn't there a danger of inferring from this that it doesn't matter what democratic organization is threatened with dissolution?"

"A. This idea is false from any point of view. Krivine's organization is not democratic and misses no opportunity to proclaim that power grows not from elections but from the street.

"Q. You have been accused of seeing plots everywhere.

"A. Purely an invention. Show me even a particle of proof of this. There is none. This legend was born five years ago when in a speech to the parliament and in a book published later that included the speech, I explained the international connections of the leftists."

Krivine's lawyer, Yves Jouffa, protested formally that Marcellin's interview was a violation of due process, on the obvious grounds that he was trying to set up a damaging image of Krivine at the exact moment that

an appeal of a motion for Krivine's provisional release was pending. And the minister of the interior's intent in that respect cannot be denied, despite his dull-witted equating of violence with extraparliamentary action and his equally dull-witted, though perhaps more colorful, failure to acknowledge the connection between a baroque speech about international leftism with seeing plots everywhere.

But the idiocy of some of Marcellin's remarks should not divert attention from the fact that they reflect an important process. They represent a counterpropaganda campaign on the part of that wing of the French bourgeoisie that favors attempting to roll back the broad support the *Ligue* has gotten rather than retreat before it. There have been a number of indications that such a division does in fact exist in the French ruling class. In the July 6 issue of the British magazine *New Statesman* David Leitch wrote:

"He [Marcellin] wanted Krivine arrested, and Pompidou supported him (the President of the Republic owes Marcellin some debts . . .). Jean Taittinger, the Minister of Justice and champagne millionaire, has no such links with Pompidou. But he has some horse sense. And he suspected the decision would lead to trouble.

"It has."

That it has led to trouble is in itself a surprise to the regime. But the Marcellin interview and the fact that Krivine and Rousset remain in jail indicate that while the government's hand has been stayed, the repression is far from defeated. □

Behind Marcellin's Pressure on Court

[The lead editorial in the July 13 issue of *Rouge* dealt with Marcellin's attempt to interject his views into the court's deliberations on the motion for Krivine's provisional release. Below is an *Intercontinental Press* translation of the article.]

* * *

On Wednesday [July 10] Judge Alain Bernard had ruled favorably on a motion to provisionally release Alain

Krivine. It seems that the regime, and more specifically the minister of the interior, took this as a rebuff. In fact, the prosecutor immediately appealed; the *chambre d'accusation* will have to rule on the matter within one month.

Actually, if the judge decided to free Krivine, it was because his detention did not appear to the judge to be necessary for continuing the inquiry. The judge's decision went some way toward placing some limitations on preventive detention.

Under these conditions, the prosecutor's appeal takes on a political rather than juridical significance. The offensive launched by Marcellin has run aground; his manipulations on June 21 have become known to all; the dissolution of the Ligue Communiste has triggered a broad current of protest.

Marcellin feels himself denied a victory. If Krivine is freed, if Krivine's image as a dangerous rioter is washed away, then Marcellin's balance sheet would be a meager one indeed—a big attack for almost nothing.

Behind the prosecutor's appeal, which keeps Krivine in prison temporarily, lurks ministerial rage.

In fact, Marcellin could not wait to make known his own reaction to Judge Bernard's decision. Just the day after it was announced, Marcellin gave an interview to *France-Soir*, which was published on page one with a big headline quoting one of Marcellin's assertions: "Krivine had given the written order to prevent the Ordre Nouveau meeting."

A bizarre coincidence: Marcellin plunges in to justify Krivine's detention, a detention that a judge considers unnecessary. After having manipulated the police, Marcellin engages in manipulating public opinion. His interview in *France-Soir* amounts to intolerable interference by the regime in the course of justice, overt pressure by the minister of the interior.

It is clear that Marcellin wants his scapegoat and that a clash is under way at the highest levels between those who want to fight by making a tactical retreat and those who want to press on. These contradictions within the bourgeoisie also explain a little campaign that has been undertaken in the columns of *France-Soir*, the *Nouvel Observateur*, and on the provincial radio airwaves: a campaign to spread around the rumor that Krivine supposedly had disagreements with the form of the June 21 demonstration and was in a minority in the Political Bureau on this point. Like all the members of the Political Bureau of the dissolved Ligue Communiste, Krivine has reaffirmed his solidarity and agreement with the June 21 initiative.

The speculations concerning hypothetical divisions within the Ligue's Political Bureau before June 21 illustrate the regime's embarrassment

about the real question: Was the holding of a racist and fascist meeting in Paris on June 21 tolerable? Gérard Monate [head of the largest police union] now acknowledges that this meeting was "surely not" legal. As to Marcellin, even he gave himself away when, in the same *France-Soir* interview, he explained that the difference between the June 21 Ordre Nouveau meeting and the neofascist meeting that was banned on February 26, 1970, was that the former had been authorized because it did not have the same character, since it only "dealt with immigration."

Judge Bernard's Choice

'Nouvel Observateur' Looks at Krivine Case

[*Rouge's* analysis of Marcellin's interference in the "judicial process" was shared by a substantial section of the bourgeois press. Below is an article on the factors at work in Judge Bernard's decision to grant Krivine provisional release that appeared in the July 9 issue of the weekly *Nouvel Observateur*. It may also be noted that the article reflects the "little campaign" that the *Rouge* editorial referred to. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Judge Alain Bernard took until Tuesday night [July 10] to respond to a motion for provisional release filed by attorney Yves Jouffa for his client Alain Krivine. The judge found himself, as it were, confronted with a serious problem of conscience, the same problem of conscience that faced Christos Sartzetakis, the "little judge" in *Z*.

It was Judge Bernard who, on June 29, had ordered Krivine imprisoned. The latter had refused to answer questions put to him in the absence of his attorney. This attitude, which was both normal and expected, determined the judge's decision. "There are charges," he said, "but there are no explanations forthcoming. I am obliged to indict."

But, after Thursday, July 5—that

So the scandal of Krivine's detention is breaking out. But we must not forget about the equally gross scandal of Pierre Rousset's detention.

Pierre Rousset is in prison for having been found in a headquarters in which there were two firearms. Thirty persons were arrested along with him in the same headquarters; no relation has been established between Rousset and these arms. Rousset is therefore being held as a hostage, no more, no less.

These arbitrary detentions must end!

Immediate freedom for Krivine and Rousset!

is, after the initial interrogation took place—a new situation was created. Judge Bernard then had at hand all the elements that allowed him to decide that holding in prison a man who declares that he does not want to go underground (and who, in fact, allowed himself to be arrested at his own apartment) was not necessary for "finding the truth."

Through scrutinizing the reports of the police, the judge came to three conclusions:

1. Alain Krivine was opposed to the form of the June 21 counterdemonstration. On this point he was in a minority in the leading group of the Ligue Communiste.

2. He did not participate in two meetings that were held June 16 and 19 to prepare the demonstration.

3. On the day of the counterdemonstration he was in Nice.

Naturally, Krivine concedes the truth only of the second two points, which are publicly known. On the first, he declares his total agreement with his comrades and refuses to acknowledge the slightest difference.

But the fact that he is considered the one responsible for the call for the counterdemonstration is not enough to justify his imprisonment. The following still must be proved:

1. *That the motives for this counterdemonstration were illegitimate.* Now, the prime minister himself admitted

that the racist themes developed by *Ordre Nouveau* were in contradiction to French law.

2. *That the organizers deliberately sought to provoke violent clashes with the police.* Now, detailed evidence, which the leader of the *Ligue Communiste* will present at the proper time, tends to demonstrate that on that day certain elements of the police were aiming at a provocation. It is said that some radio transmissions broadcast over the police airwaves will be submitted. They are said to contain, notably, this exchange: "There are demonstrators with Molotov cocktails up on the roofs."

"Don't worry about it. We know." The *Ligue* did make mistakes and

acted rashly, but mainly it fell into a trap.

Why was the judge hesitant? Basically because of the pressure brought on him. Messmer's and Marcellin's declarations left no room for doubt: They wanted Krivine to be sentenced heavily and they wanted him to sit in prison until that sentencing. Needless to say, Marcellin, who had been vigorously criticized by some of his colleagues but had the support of the president of the republic [Pompidou], would not forgive the "little judge" a ruling that would go exactly in the opposite direction

But that is precisely the question: Can justice in this country still show any independence? □

But since 1968 the Communists have had serious scores to settle with the far leftists in general and with the Trotskyists in particular. So why be surprised at the gut reactions last Wednesday? How can one fail to note that, while formerly the CP members were strongly incited toward anti-far-leftism, they have now come to a "correct" political attitude (as they say at Place Colonel-Fabien) and that, fighting all the while against "ultra-leftist errors," they are throwing themselves into organizing a serious, solid, coherent defense of the victims of repression?

As was noted, no doubt with optimism, by a young leader of the Paris federation [of the CP]: "The old Marcellin/far-left confrontation is over. Now it's the whole workers movement against Marcellin. And if the CP and the CGT demand that Krivine be freed, he will be freed."

So the Communists have come a long way. A fantastic road to traverse. Nobody has forgotten the insults of May '68: "Cohn-Bendit, who's he?"; "Who is this German anarchist?"; "fascist ultralefts"; and "Marcellin ultralefts"—to recall only the slogans. But there were even worse things. When on February 25, 1972, Pierre Overney, a Maoist worker, fell under the bullets of the Renault private police and when a powerful demonstration (100,000 persons) was organized, in which SP members participated, the Communist party did not lift a finger; it even put the killers and their victim in the same bag.

So today, when we hear a Jacques Duclos firmly and intransigently demanding "the freeing of the imprisoned" and recalling that democratic rights must always be defended because they "have never been a gift of the ruling class," this is already a sign of a deep shift for the leadership of the Communist party.

There are two reasons for this shift:

1. *Political analysis.* The regime was weakened by the latest elections, the CP says. Numerically it won them, but politically it lost. It must therefore find some way out of the situation. It is impossible for it to find one either within parliament or through reforms that it doesn't have the means to carry out. So the regime is tempted to find a solution to its crisis by strengthening its au-

'Nouvel Observateur' Evaluates Cirque d'Hiver Meeting

Why French CP Defends Far Left Groups

[The July 9 issue of *Nouvel Observateur* also published an article on the July 4 meeting at the Cirque d'Hiver in Paris. The meeting to protest the ban on the *Ligue* was called by a wide range of organizations and attendance at it was massive. But the CP organizers of the meeting refused to grant speaking rights to members of the ex-*Ligue*. The *Nouvel Observateur* article, by Marcelle Padovani, was called "The End of the Ghetto." It sought to examine the shift in the CP's old policy of refusing to come to the defense of the far-left organizations. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

With its Baroque ceiling, flying trapeze, and thronelike loges lined with velvet and suspended ten yards off the floor, the Paris Cirque d'Hiver is surrealistic and Felliniesque. On Wednesday July 4 the Collectif pour la Défense des Libertés [Coalition for Defense of Democratic Rights], which includes leftist parties and trade unions, held a meeting there to protest the dissolution of the *Ligue Communiste* and the arrest of Alain Krivine and Pierre Rousset.

Two thousand persons were in the hall (two-thirds of them Communists

and Socialists, one-third Trotskyists), and another 5,000 were outside in the street (the great majority of them far leftists). A strange situation! For it was the first time in quite a while that Communists and far leftists had come to the same place for the same fight.

So, funny things went on in that hall. You could see an old Communist militant leap up along with the Trotskyists to shout "The only solution is revolution!" and see his daughter grab him by the arm and say, "No, no papa, not now." And then, what a hornets' nest when Gérard Filloche, a member of the Political Bureau of the ex-*Ligue*, tried to speak! A CP member: "We defend them, fine; but we won't let them speak!" And a very agitated woman: "No mixing, no mixing!"

Getting beyond this anecdote, what needs explaining is the CP's attitude. That the Socialist party protests against any attack on democratic rights, that François Mitterrand invites Alain Krivine to the SP headquarters to protect him for a while from Marcellin's jails is all quite normal. The Socialists had done this before, and a number of them had protested against the arrest of Alain Geismar [editor of the far-left newspaper *Cause du peuple*] in 1970.

thoritarian character. An authoritarianism that it displays under apparently constitutional forms, like its campaign for a "real" presidential system. And also under pernicious forms, like the carefully planned provocation of June 21. At bottom, the Communists conclude, the regime (and not only Marcellin) was hoping for two things: that some policeman would die and that the Communist party would not "move" in favor of the far leftists. That was a double error.

2. *Tactical motivation.* The Communists noticed that during these past months, and especially during the election campaign, the most "electric" questions their sympathizers were asking them were those dealing with the defense of democratic rights. They also noted the voters' sensitivity on this point. Thus, in May they launched a big campaign for democratic rights, and conducted, nearly by themselves, a street demonstration on June 20. But, while in Paris 80,000 persons took part, in the provinces the response was a lot weaker. [The Ligue supported the June 20 demonstrations — *IP*.] So when Marcellin "mounted his provocation" on June 21, the Communist party was the first to protest, publishing in *l'Humanité* the first elements of an inquiry that seemed to prove that the police had been manipulated. In some sense, it could be said that the arrest of Krivine came along just in time to concretize the CP's fears and that the organization of last Wednesday's meeting was the logical consequence of its analysis.

And the other movements? Curiously, it was from the ranks of the far-left groups that the most severe criticism was leveled at the Ligue's "infiltration by police" and at its "propensity," according to them, "to fall into provocations." And a certain feeling of revenge can be detected here, too. For the Ligue was an "annoying" group. One that recruited a lot of people, that educated its members, that organized actions with impunity, that had the best defense guards and the best press of the far left. This was embarrassing for everyone. So to see the Ligue dissolved this way was not exceedingly tragic for everyone, even if the attack on democratic rights was regretted somewhat.

A leader of the ex-Ligue Communiste was well aware of this at the



Overflow crowd at Cirque d'Hiver on July 4 protested ban on Ligue and imprisonment of Alain Krivine and Pierre Rousset.

Wednesday meeting. Pointing to some members of other organizations, he said: "Look, they came to get a whiff of our corpse."

Yes, the Cirque d'Hiver meeting was not a profound and unanimous pact against repression and for the democratic rights of those imprisoned. But

it was an event that was not at all to Marcellin's taste. From now on, whether he likes it or not, the minister of the interior will find himself confronting representatives of the whole workers movement every time he might want to snatch up anyone—even a far-leftist. □

'Rouge' Appeals to French CP Members

United Front of Workers Must Answer Regime's Repression

[The following "open letter to members of the French Communist party" appeared in the July 13 issue of *Rouge*. It represents part of the ex-Ligue's political response to the CP's shift in policy on coming to the defense of the far-left organizations. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Comrades,

We have noted, as you have, the intensification of the employers' and police repression against the workers struggles and the workers organizations: the layoffs at Renault, the attack by a CFT [Confédération Française des Travailleurs — Confederation

of French Workers, a company goon squad posing as a union] commando at Peugeot, the police provocation at the Lip factory, the development of a racist campaign highlighted by the Fontanet memorandum [which tightened repressive laws on immigration], the Grasse demonstration [against immigrant workers], the June 21 *Ordre Nouveau* meeting, the murder of a Portuguese worker at Ivry.

If the employers and the government are seeking to cow, to divide the workers, it is because they are afraid of growing discontent, of the ongoing struggles that have gone so far as to "expropriate" an employer like Lip.

But to assure the victory of these struggles it is necessary to oppose

the bourgeoisie's maneuvers and above all to respond to all its attacks with a solid united front of all workers, a nonexclusive united front of all workers organizations. The bourgeoisie knows who its enemy is: the working class and its organizations. So we also must save our blows for the common enemy.

Recall, comrades, that after the murder of the Maoist militant Pierre Overney, you refused to respond shoulder to shoulder with the "ultraleftists." A few months later, a gangster murdered Michel Labroche, a member of the French Communist party. Today, Marcellin dissolves the Ligue Communiste at the same time that fascist commandos attack a local CP office in St. Denis and a CP festival at Val-de-Marne. So, in face of repression, there is one solution: the united front against repression.

On June 20, despite its being excluded, the Ligue Communiste marched with its own banners along with the CP, the CGT [Confédération Générale du Travail—General Confederation of Labor], and the PSU [Parti Socialiste Unifié—United Socialist party]. The Ligue Communiste called on all workers organizations to demand the banning of Ordre Nouveau's fascist meeting on June 21. Your only response was a short communiqué that appeared in *l'Humanité* on June 21 itself.

The Ligue Communiste therefore took the risk of demonstrating with only a part of the revolutionary far left and a few old members of the Resistance who had not forgotten. But today this point must be considered: *If all the workers organizations had called for a demonstration on June 21 Marcellin's efforts would have come to nothing.* And there would have been no need for a meeting at the Cirque d'Hiver to protest the dissolution of the Ligue Communiste and to demand the freeing of Alain Krivine and Pierre Rousset.

Comrades, we congratulate you on the fact that the time has passed when *l'Humanité* treats revolutionists as "Marcellin ultraleftists" or as "left fascists." But you must go further, not only to divest yourselves permanently of all such slanders, but also to stop excluding the revolutionary far left. You cannot claim to be the "party of unity" and refuse to let a repre-



Pierre Rousset, left, and Alain Krivine.

sentative of the ex-Ligue Communiste speak at a meeting protesting the dissolution of the Ligue!

That is indefensible, and it only benefited the bourgeoisie, which did not fail to pick up on your error in its press. We repeat: We have political differences; let's discuss them, but let's not forget that the only enemy is the bourgeoisie!

One of our basic differences is exactly on how to respond to the attacks of the bourgeoisie's armed bands. In *l'Humanité* G. Bouvard tells us that the only correct response is a mass response, and with this we can only agree. Without a mass response, nothing is possible. But it is not enough. Do you believe that a demonstration like the June 20 one is enough to prevent the CFT from attacking at Citroën, Simca, Peugeot, and from digging itself in with the complicity of the employers and the government at Berliet and elsewhere? If the CFT develops, it will be a significant curb on workers struggles. And the workers movement cannot

count on the police and the judicial system, for these institutions are at the service of the bourgeoisie.

Remember the release of the murderer of Marc Lanvin! Remember the murder of Pierre Overney! Remember the CFT commando that attacked militants at Issy-les-Moulineaux — they were also released! Remember the CFT commando at Peugeot!

Certainly there are some policemen and judges who struggle against the role they are forced to play, and we must support them. But to rely on the police, the judicial system, or the army is a trap. Have you ever seen the police aid strikers against the employers? No! At Joint Français, at Fos, at Lip, etc., they always stand with the employers!

So, comrades, don't you think that it is not enough to protest, but that we must organize workers self-defense through formation of strike pickets and through mutual aid among the workers to repulse all attacks? Don't you think that it's not enough to demand that Marcellin, a protege of Pé-

tain, ban the CDR [Comités de Défense de la République—Committees to Defend the Republic], the SAC [Service d'Action Civique—Civic Action Service], and other gangster outfits, but that we must provide ourselves the means to prevent these groups from doing their damaging work? Must we tolerate that distribution at Citroën or Simca of leaflets of the CGT, the CFDT [Confédération Française Démocratique du Travail—French Democratic Confederation of Labor], the SP, the CP, and the far left be impossible without risk?

We ourselves think—and the history of Germany and Spain backs us up—that the workers movement

must crush fascism in the egg if it does not want to be devoured by it later. Blum and the Popular Front government were content to protest against Franco and Hitler, but then they were forced to give way to Pétain, and the same Chamber of Deputies that put Blum in power outlawed the Communist party three years later. The members of the Ligue Communiste may be younger than some others; but they have not forgotten.

Today the editorial board of the newspaper *Rouge* proposes to you and to the whole workers movement:

Let us jointly assure the defense of our salespeople in the market places against any fascist attack and against any provocation by Marcellin;

Let us jointly defend the distribution of leaflets of workers organizations at Citroën and Simca despite the CFT gangsters;

Let us not allow the murder of the Portuguese worker Fernando Ramos in Ivory to go unanswered;

Let us demand the immediate dissolution of the SAC, CDR, and CFT;

Let us struggle for the repeal of the dissolution of the Ligue Communiste, for the freeing of Alain Krivine and Pierre Rousset, for the dropping of all charges;

Let us demand the resignation of Marcellin.

The fight goes on.

Henri Weber
Editor of *Rouge*

Statement of United Secretariat of Fourth International

Call for International United Front to Defend French Trotskyists

[The following statement was issued July 10 by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.]

* * *

The dissolution of the Ligue Communiste, the arrest of Alain Krivine and Pierre Rousset, and the searching and sacking of the offices at impasse Guéméné are not accidental incidents standing out in an otherwise normal situation. They are the deliberate actions of a bourgeois regime faced with a rise of the class struggle in France and, more generally, in the other countries of Western Europe.

No one has been fooled by the false symmetry invoked by the French government in simultaneously dissolving the Ligue Communiste and the pro-Nazi organization *Ordre Nouveau*. The French government permitted the racist meeting organized by *Ordre Nouveau* on June 21 in the Mutualité to take place and had its police protect it. It allowed the fascist gangs to carry their arms into the hall; it made sure these same gangs were escorted when they carried this material back to their headquarters after the meeting. And it has also been

shown that the disposition of the police against the counterdemonstration had been worked out in such a way as to result in serious injuries to the police; all the official denials on this point have not convinced anyone.

Accordingly, the government machinations had the following aims: on the one hand to be able to strike at the Ligue Communiste; on the other hand, within the police, to strengthen an independent trade union favorable to fascism at the expense of the syndicat autonome [Fédération autonome des Syndicats de Police—Autonomous Federation of Police Unions] (which includes the majority of the police) and thus increasingly to push forward the present minister of the interior's conceptions on maintenance of law and order.

The Ligue Communiste's call for an antifascist demonstration was in no way aimed at setting off street fighting or an urban guerrilla operation in which the revolutionary vanguard would substitute itself for a mass demonstration of the working class. On the contrary, the Ligue Communiste's action was aimed at drawing the workers' attention to the potential fascist threat that has been

flourishing under the protection of government complicity and at showing that the only way to win victory over fascism is to set up an adequate defense organized by the working class and not to rely on vain appeals to the bourgeois state.

The organization *Ordre Nouveau*, with its restricted audience and small number of activists, is only the advance guard of fascism. Behind it lurk more disquieting threats, above all the supposed trade union the CFT [Confédération Française des Travailleurs—French Confederation of Workers, a company goon-squad that poses as a union], supported by the employers in order to spread terror in certain factories (like Peugeot at St. Etienne, Citroën, etc.).

Furthermore, the present process of decomposition of the UDR [Union des Démocrates pour la République—Union of Democrats for the Republic, the Gaullist political organization] is giving rise to murky phenomena, to racist and anti-Semitic demonstrations within which is beginning to mount a fascist potential that, finally, could give rise to a mass threat.

The government Messmer formed

just after the elections was an attempt to assemble all the energy of a decaying bourgeoisie facing a powerful rise of working masses seeking a socialist solution to the crisis of the capitalist system.

In less than six months, a succession of mass movements has shown that the UDR's victory in the elections was only a Pyrrhic one. High-schoolers and university students took to the streets by the hundreds of thousands, challenging the role of the capitalist army. Tens of thousands of women, supported by the overwhelming majority of the population, flouted the infamous law against abortion. The intellectuals and the artists lined up against the "moral order" proclaimed by the minister of cultural affairs. Finally and above all, in all the regions of France, the working class—from the OS [ouvriers spécialisés—semiskilled workers] and especially the immigrant workers, to the most highly skilled—rose up not only for better working and living conditions but against the capitalist order as well.

Temporarily bottled up by the hopes of an electoral victory for the Union of the Left, the rise of the masses burst forward with ever greater vigor.

The most dazzling example, the one most rich in significance, which created a national furor, was provided by the Lip workers at Besançon. Threatened with layoffs due to the announced bankruptcy of this company, the workers at Lip began by setting aside a good number of watches as a guarantee that they would be paid for their work. Then they decided to manufacture new watches and put them on sale at cost-price. And thus began to function, in open violation of bourgeois law, a factory without employers, the equipment and raw materials of which were being used by the workers and the watches produced being sold—the whole thing going on in the context of general sympathy from the workers of France.

Some thousands of men and women thus disregarded capitalist ownership, the employers' authority, and bourgeois law; and the government did nothing about it, for fear of touching off a social explosion.

It was in such conditions that the government decided to move against the Ligue Communiste, whose prog-

ress, while still modest, was disturbing. This sort of preventive operation was a matter of striking at the largest far-left organization with the hope that it would find itself isolated from the masses, thus ensuring the success of the operation.

But the French government's calculations went awry all the way down the line. It took only a few days for the trap to be exposed so that the fascist danger and the government's complicity with it were completely brought to light. And, what is far more important, *the whole* workers movement, and along with it broad democratic layers, denounced the government's maneuver and took up the defense of the Ligue Communiste and its members.

Never before had such unity been shown in France—the Communist party and the Socialist party, the CGT [Confédération Générale du Travail—General Confederation of Labor], the CFDT [Confédération Française Démocratique du Travail—French Democratic Confederation of Workers], and FO [Force Ouvrière—Workers Force], the FEN [Fédération d'Enseignement Nationale—National Education Federation], the League for the Rights of Man, all of which had failed to respond when the racist meeting was announced, and the far-left formations all made common cause with the Ligue Communiste.

Who would have thought a few weeks ago that the Communist party, through its daily *l'Humanité*, would wage an intense campaign and send Jacques Duclos to speak in the CP's name at a meeting against the dissolution of the Ligue Communiste! The minister of the interior went on television to vent his wrath in virulent terms at the general mobilization that rose up against this attack. Finally, thousands of men and women learned the lesson that the Ligue Communiste had wanted to get across: that the struggle against fascism cannot be limited to political denunciation but must involve proletarian action, including physical struggle, to crush such a danger in the egg.

The workers movement and the working masses of France responded with a unanimity rarely seen in the past. Solidarity demonstrations took place internationally, especially in the European countries near France,

where the example of May '68 had touched off the greatest response and where the stakes in the situation were seen most clearly.

The French government's plans have been frustrated, but the repression has not been halted. The Ligue Communiste remains dissolved; Alain Krivine and Pierre Rousset are still in prison; many Trotskyist militants are being prosecuted. Solidarity must therefore be pressed forward in France and internationally to force the abrogation of the decree dissolving the Ligue Communiste and the release of those imprisoned, to assure full freedom of expression, of organization, and of demonstration for the revolutionary organizations, especially so that no attack can be launched against the Trotskyist press, and to annul all antidemocratic measures that the French government has taken since May 1968.

But the struggle cannot stop merely with the reestablishment of the democratic rights that have been trampled on by the government's arbitrary acts. The class struggle in France is pointing toward great tests of strength. For the international revolutionary vanguard, the struggle to beat back the government repression will be the point of departure for preparing the workers for these great tests of strength in which they will be confronting capitalist forces made all the more fierce in that they have their backs to the wall and will therefore defend their profits and privileges by any means necessary.

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International assures all French militants who are victims of the repression of its total solidarity. The Trotskyist movement in France, created in 1929, has known many ups and downs. It courageously came through the bloody test of the Nazi occupation and the Pétain regime. Dissolved once before, just after May 1968, it surged forth much more powerfully the next year with the founding of the Ligue Communiste. This new test will end with new progress for the Fourth International in France—no one can doubt it.

United front to free Alain Krivine and Pierre Rousset!

United front to force abrogation of the decree dissolving the Ligue Com-

muniste!

United front to break the repression!
Long live the struggle of the French

working class, the youth, the working masses, for a workers government laying the basis for a socialist society!

Deal With Real Positions, Not Myths

British Trotskyists' Open Letter to SLL on Defense of Ligue Communiste

[The following open letter to the British Socialist Labour League (SLL), a sectarian grouping headed by Gerry Healy, was distributed by the International Marxist Group (IMG), British section of the Fourth International.]

* * *

Dear comrades,

Whilst we would have preferred one united joint demonstration of all the revolutionary left and other socialist organisations, we welcome the firm solidarity you are displaying today in defence of our comrades of the now dissolved Ligue Communiste, the French section of the Fourth International until its dissolution.

The dissolving of the Ligue constitutes a further escalation of the attacks by the European bourgeoisie against the advanced layers of the working class movement and in particular against its organised revolutionary vanguard. As your statement (*Workers Press* July 4th) correctly states, "Involved here is not just an act of repression against one organisation, but the first of a series of blows designed to cripple the working class itself."

The statement further says that you defend the democratic rights of the Ligue Communiste despite your differences "in order to facilitate the struggle for correct policies against centrism, Stalinism and revisionism in the Labour movement."

But, the statement then goes on to make a series of political points which cannot possibly facilitate any struggle for correct policies, for they are quite simply false.

1) The Ligue Communiste and the United Secretariat of the Fourth International [USFI], far from "failing to prepare for the present situation," have in every country been in the *forefront* of the defence of militants of revolu-

tionary, socialist and other workers' organisations.

We have consistently analysed and opposed the moves by the European bourgeoisie towards a "strong state". We have in our resolutions on Europe and on party-building there laid great stress on the need to fight the growing danger of repression (see our journal *International*, Vol. 2, No. 1).

2) We have never counterposed "single issue" politics to the preparation for power through a turn to the working class. In particular, no one who knows the work of the Ligue Communiste over the past few years, its very considerable implantation in the French working class, the way it has led some important working class struggles, and the inroads it has been able to make into the Stalinist-controlled CGT would do anything but laugh at such statements in relation to our French comrades.

3) Comrade Mandel has *never stated anywhere* (and we challenge the SLL to prove the contrary) that students and intelligentsia "had replaced" or ever could replace the working class "as the material force for the overthrow of capitalism". The United Secretariat of the Fourth International has never held such a position, nor has it ever "advocated" petty-bourgeois leaderships in the Third World. We are for the construction of revolutionary parties of the working class as sections of the Fourth International. We do, however, recognise a social revolution when we see one, whether in China or Cuba, even if the leadership is petty-bourgeois or Stalinist in ideology.

4) We have never "abandoned Trotskyist positions on Stalinism", nor abandoned the fight against Stalinism. However, we do reject wild statements like "Stalinism is the principal counterrevolutionary force in the world arena", since it is clear that it is *im-*

perialism which plays that role, while Stalinism is in the last analysis a reflection of imperialist interests in the workers movement.

Your statement makes the point that it is vital to learn the political lessons. Indeed it is: vital to learn the lessons of the comparative histories of the USFI and of the "International Committee of the Fourth International" [ICFI] to which the SLL belongs.

According to the SLL leadership, for over 20 years the USFI has suffered from some mysterious liquidationist infection known as "Pabloism". The facts, however, demonstrate that this "liquidationism" is of a most remarkable kind: the FI grows as the "liquidationism" gets "worse". Thus the FI today has more sections in more countries, and bigger sections at that, than at any time in the history of the Trotskyist movement. It has more influence on political struggles, a larger working class membership, and greater involvement in practical struggle than ever in its history. Such is the real fruit of 20 years' so-called "Pabloite liquidationism".

On the other hand, the history of the ICFI is much less illuminating. In 1963, the SLL and the OCI [Organisation Communiste Internationaliste—Internationalist Communist Organization, a French organization headed by Pierre Lambert] refused to reunify the world Trotskyist movement along with the former International Committee majority and the International Secretariat. Since then, the ICFI was touted as a rival, "real" international. But in 1971 it split into fragments. For the French section, Lambert's OCI, and Lora's POR [Partido Obrero Revolucionario—Revolutionary Workers party, former Bolivian affiliate of Healy's ICFI] in Bolivia had taken the line of relying on the *bourgeoisie* to arm the workers against a rightist coup in that country [Bolivia]. Earlier, without any condemnation from the SLL, the OCI refused to fight on the barricades in Paris in May 1968, denouncing the defence of the students as adventurism.

In fact, the history of the past ten years shows the so-called anti-Pabloites making all the mistakes of which they accuse the USFI, and fragmenting into national groupings, while the USFI, far from "liquidating itself", is

stronger today than ever before in its history.

We make these points because we feel it is essential [that] organisations who unite in action in defence of democratic rights against state repression should have a real understanding of what are their respective positions. We agree that an essential part of our struggle against the repression is to defend the possibility of fighting for correct policies against centrism, Stalinism and revisionism in the Labour movement. But, for that it is essential to deal with the *real* positions of opponents, not with *myths*.

Having said this, we stress again

that we welcome the solidarity shown by the SLL in defence of our French comrades and we look forward to extended joint work on this and other questions of defence against state repression. In particular we urge you to unite with us in campaigning in the localities for every working class organisation to take up the defence of the Ligue Communiste against the dissolution by the French Government and to see that its representatives abroad are inundated with the protests of the Labour Movement.

Lift the ban on the Ligue Communiste!

Release Alain Krivine!

Communiste!" and "United front against repression!"

Sweden: When the ban was issued, the Revolutionära Marxisters Förbund (League of Revolutionary Marxists, the Swedish Trotskyists) issued a call to all workers organizations to support the Ligue. Demonstrations were organized at the French Embassy in Stockholm and at the consulate in Gotesberg. A petition against the ban is being circulated in factories.

Antilles: The militants of the Groupe Révolution Socialiste (GRS—Revolutionary Socialist Group) organized an immediate response to the sacking of

Solidarity Campaign Grows

International Actions Defend Ligue

The July 13 *Rouge* reported some of the international solidarity actions demanding that the ban on the Ligue be lifted and that Alain Krivine and Pierre Rousset be freed. A summary:

Switzerland: A statement demanding abrogation of the ban and freedom for Krivine and Rousset was signed by the Geneva Socialist party, the Valais Socialist party, and the Autonomous Socialist party (Tessin). Joint leaflets were distributed in Berne, Lausanne, Geneva, and Zurich. Demonstrations took place in front of French consulates in Zurich, Berne, and Geneva. The paper of the Parti du Travail (Labor party, the Swiss Stalinists) devoted three articles to the banning of the Ligue and the protest against it. On June 30 a special issue of *Brèche-Rouge*, combining the newspaper of the Swiss Trotskyists and *Rouge*, was sold massively by members of the Trotskyist Ligue Marxiste Révolutionnaire (Revolutionary Marxist League) in the French-speaking section of Switzerland and in the Franche-Comté region of France.

Mexico: The French Embassy in Mexico City was occupied by militants of the Mexican section of the Fourth International. They stayed for nearly two hours to protest the ban on the Ligue.

Lebanon: The Lebanese Revolutionary Communist Group distributed a protest leaflet the day after the ban came down. It said in part: "The French government's decision to dissolve the Ligue Communiste after having authorized the holding of a racist, anti-Arab, and anti-Semitic meeting and after using its police forces to protect that meeting, is proof that this government, while it looks favorably on Arab capital and Arab oil wells, does not hesitate to openly show its claws to Arab workers and their defenders. . . . Down with the ban on the Ligue Communiste! Solidarity with those who have shown their solidarity with our brother workers!"

Japan: The militants of the Japanese section of the Fourth International occupied the French Embassy in Tokyo and sent a message pledging full solidarity with the Ligue.

Denmark: The Revolutionære Socialister Forbund (Revolutionary Socialist League, Danish section of the Fourth International) initiated a united front meeting in front of the French Embassy in Copenhagen on June 30; there were demonstrations at French consulates in the main provincial cities; a broad propaganda campaign is being waged around the slogans "Lift the ban on the Ligue

Marcellin's Men in Action— Interrogation of an Immigrant

Her name was Malika. Eight years old. Lived in Fresnes, in a transit camp. It was tough. The police are always there; surveillance of the immigrants is continuous.

At 10:00 in the morning on June 24, 1973, two police officers came to Malika's home. They were looking for her fourteen-year-old brother. Not there? That was all right; they took Malika instead. After having slapped her around in front of her parents, they interrogated her alone in a room for a quarter of an hour.

By the end of the interrogation the kid had lost consciousness. The cops left her and took off. Malika was taken to the hospital, but she never came out of the coma. She died on the morning of June 28.

—*Rouge*, July 13

the Ligue's headquarters June 22 as well as to the ban and the arrests. On July 3 a solidarity meeting of 120 persons was held in Fort-au-France. Contributions totaling 300 francs were collected to support the Ligue. The journal *Le Progressiste*, edited by Aimé Césaire, deputy from Martinique and a signer of the call of the French national committee to abolish the ban, published a strong protest. Support for the Ligue is growing fast in the Antilles, not only because of the GRS's activities but also because of the tour of the islands made by Krivine early this year.

Chilean Workers Respond to the Threat of a Coup

[The following two statements reflect the response of the workers to the continuing threat of a coup in Chile. The first was signed on June 29—at the very moment that the anti-Allende coup was in progress and that tanks were in the center of Santiago. It was drawn up and signed in the Elecmetal factory, out of which the council of the Vicuña Mackenna Industrial Cordon in Santiago operates.

[Among the signers were representatives of the Communist and Radical parties. Although the line of these two parties differs considerably from

the line expressed in the statement, neither of the representatives from these parties was subsequently rebuked.

[The second statement was issued July 9 by the council of the Vicuña Mackenna Cordon. Aside from its reference to the "armed forces, loyal to the people," it puts forward a clear and concrete description of the immediate tasks facing the Chilean workers and peasants.

[The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Statement Signed by Representatives of Left

We representatives of the undersigned left-wing parties express our total support to the measures taken by the Command of the Vicuña Mackenna Industrial Cordon in its Instructions Numbers 1, 2, and 3 [a reference to factory take-overs and preparations to defend the cordon with all means available at a time when the attempted coup had not yet been put down].

The workers will not allow the government, installed by us, to be overthrown by the bourgeoisie. We will not permit the gains we have achieved over long years of struggle to be swept aside by a fascist mob. The workers will crush sedition; we will make no truce with the bourgeoisie, but will crush it once and for all.

1. All plants will become part of the Social Sector of the economy; not one plant that is important for the

workers will remain in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

2. *Workers Leadership.* Production and distribution will remain in the hands of the workers, and the people will exercise complete control over community territory.

3. *Popular Militia.* The organized people must protect their gains. Create a Defense Committee and arm it in every industry and neighborhood.

4. The leadership of the defense, and the advance of the people will be assured only if they rest in the hands of the organized working class.

Eloy Bustamante, Socialist Party
José Urrutia, Communist Party
Augusto Alcayaga A., Radical Party
Sergion Sotomayor, Christian Left
Enrique Fernández, Revolutionary Socialist Party [Chilean section of the Fourth International]

Statement by Vicuña Mackenna Cordon

The events of Friday, [June] 29, as a culmination of all the provocative activities of the right, clearly showed that democracy and defense of the Constitution, loudly proclaimed by the right, become nothing but empty words when it sees that the people

are extending their rights and conquests.

Imperialism and the bourgeoisie and its parties understood that their parliament and their courts were not adequate instruments for crushing the people. Thus they turned to a military

coup. After this, they no longer have the right to talk about democracy or constitutions.

The coup was prevented from succeeding by the quick and vigorous response of the workers and the other exploited sectors of the people together with the armed forces, loyal to the people and the government they elected. Faced with the response of the workers and the people, the sectors that are bent on a coup have for the moment delayed their action. We must be clear about one thing: The people stopped the coup by crushing the political offensive that provided the framework for the military offensive.

Nevertheless, the danger persists. The plotters who did not surface during the June 29 coup are preparing for a decisive blow.

The workers and the people must not lose a minute. Let us prepare to repel the next coup, taking into account the fact that the June 29 coup was only a small test in which just a few of the plotters became visible.

We must hold assemblies in workplaces, shantytowns, and in the countryside to discuss the measures and forms of organization and struggle that we will have to adopt in the face of the attacks of the right wing and of the next coup.

We must devote this period to gathering forces and organizing organs of popular power.

In view of the seriousness of the present situation, the council of the Vicuña Mackenna Industrial Cordon has passed the following resolutions:

— The only way to overcome the crisis that the country is experiencing as a result of the sabotage by the bosses is to see to it that all of production and all essential distribution of goods is transferred to the Social Sector of the economy (as is the case with other work centers, where the workers are deciding this), and that they be placed under the guidance and control of the workers.

— Imperialism, the capitalists, the fascist bands, and the coup-bent military are demonstrating day after day

that the bourgeoisie will not allow the process to move forward peacefully, but that as long as it has the strength to do so, it will use violence against the people.

To every blow from the right, we will respond with a blow where it will hurt them the most.

— Let us advance the right of the people to defend themselves and de-



SALVADOR ALLENDE

fend their gains, and to move forward, without compromise, toward socialism.

Only the leadership of the working class will guarantee that the process will move forward.

The specific measures that must be taken in this respect are:

— The workers in every plant will name an administrative committee to run the plant. The committee can be replaced at any moment by an assembly of the workers.

— Production in the Social Sector will give priority to products for popular consumption.

— Factory and farm goods will go essentially to People's Stores in communities where they exist; they will be administered by the workers and squatters, who will distribute the goods through their own groups. Small merchants who are part of the exploited will be allowed to take part in the distribution if they observe the norms laid down by the squatters: Either they place themselves at the

service of the people or they will find themselves squeezed out of the distribution process.

— Certain areas will be specified as having preferential status with regard to distribution, such as shantytowns, industries, governmental bodies, hospitals.

— Only through these measures—such as the transfer of Loncoleche and Luchetti into the hands of the workers and their direct entry into distribution at the hands of the people—will it be possible to guarantee that goods find their way into the hands of the workers.

— Creation by the workers and the peasant communities of a Committee for the Defense and Protection of Industries, in line with the call issued by the CUT [Central Unica de Trabajadores—Workers Central Union].

— Prohibit the sale of newspapers used by the capitalists to slander and denigrate the workers.

This program must be discussed in the assemblies of all factories and other workplaces, and in every shantytown and peasant community.

The industrial cordons must assume their responsibility of linking up with the other mass bodies in order to organize community councils.

The Vicuña Mackenna Industrial Cordon calls on the other cordons,

the community councils, all the mass organizations, the left-wing political parties, and the union rank and file to support and struggle for these tasks.

At this time we must put aside harmful sectarianism. All those who take upon themselves these tasks will constitute a *single force*.

Our cordon cannot be divided by sectarian attitudes, which constitute suicide and irresponsibility, such as the attempts to bring into existence a parallel and last-minute cordon in Progreso.

A unified leadership for the cordones industriales and other mass bodies is necessary and urgent; for this reason we propose the opening of discussions between the leading bodies of the cordones industriales and other organs of popular power.

Finally, we must point out that *the members of the military who fell were ordinary soldiers. Those who have now been soldiers for a few months were workers and peasants, and within a few months they will return to that status. They must struggle alongside the people, of whom they are a part. They must struggle for the people's cause, which is their cause. They must not let themselves be won over to fascism. If they must die fighting, let it be for the interests of the workers, who are the people.* □

Irish Militants Victimized in Belfast Jail

The Anti-Internment League in Britain is circulating a statement concerning Michael Farrell and Tony Canavan, of Peoples Democracy, both now on hunger strike in Crumlin Road jail, Belfast. The statement explains that the two are victims of "a blatant piece of judicial victimisation." An accompanying petition, directed to the Parliamentary Labour party, urges it to press for immediate granting of political prisoner status to the two.

Farrell and Canavan were charged in May with "behaviour likely to lead to a breach of the peace" for organizing a demonstration in Belfast on February 10 to protest the British army's failure to stop sectarian murders. Eight British soldiers were flown from Germany as witnesses to ensure conviction.

Farrell asserts that the charges were

an attempt to silence PD's opposition to the White Paper during the build-up to the Assembly elections.

Canavan was sentenced to six months, Farrell to eight—nine would automatically mean political prisoner status.

Both men are being held 23 hours a day in a basement cell, in a wing full of loyalists who continually threaten their lives. On protesting probable physical danger, they were promised protective custody—but only after any future attack.

The AIL is demanding political prisoner status for Farrell and Canavan, and that they be placed among Republican prisoners. It also wants an explanation from the Northern Ireland Secretary of State for the reason for this political victimization. □

Officers Describe Nixon's Secret Air War

Confronted with the disclosures of a former air force officer, the Nixon administration admitted July 16 that it had carried out a secret air war against Cambodia during 1969 and 1970.

Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger acknowledged that between March 1969 and May 1970—when Nixon sent U. S. ground troops across the Cambodia-South Vietnam border—U. S. B-52 bombers conducted 3,630 raids and dropped 104,000 tons of bombs on Cambodia.

This confession was brought about by the testimony of Hal M. Knight, who served as an air-control officer in South Vietnam. Knight told members of the Senate Armed Services Committee of elaborate precautions for keeping the raids secret, including a "double entry" system of reporting the attacks. Within the regular air force secret channels, the raids were described as occurring in South Vietnam, and all evidence indicating the truth was burned.

"Military sources did confirm, however," Seymour M. Hersh reported in the July 18 *New York Times*, "that information about the Cambodian raids was directly provided to President Nixon and his top national security advisers, including Henry A. Kissinger."

Even after the U. S. invasion of Cambodia and the subsequent publicly admitted air raids, Nixon continued to conceal the 1969-70 attacks. Classified reports on the bombing in Indochina provided to members of Congress in 1971 and again early this year said that there were no B-52 raids in Cambodia prior to May 1970.

The continuation of the cover-up even after that date was presumably designed to keep another of Nixon's lies from being exposed. On April 30, 1970, Nixon went on television to announce the Cambodian invasion and said:

"For the past five years . . . North Vietnam has occupied military sanctuaries along the Cambodian frontier with South Vietnam. For five years,

neither the United States nor South Vietnam has moved against those enemy sanctuaries because we did not wish to violate the territory of a neutral nation."

It appears that Nixon did inform a few members of Congress of the raids if it was clear in advance that they would approve. After Knight's testimony, Senator Barry Goldwater



NIXON: Another cover-up uncovered.

said that he had known of the attacks. Goldwater said that the raids were carried out at the request of Prince Norodom Sihanouk.

"Administration officials," Hersh reported in a July 18 dispatch, "have justified the stringent security surrounding the secret bombing raids by contending that a delicate understanding permitting such raids had been negotiated with Prince Norodom Sihanouk, then the Cambodian Chief of State. One of the conditions of that agreement, officials said, was the Prince's insistence that no public announcements be made."

While any statement from the Nixon gang is made suspect by its source,

Hersh's report gains credence from the fact that Sihanouk, prior to his overthrow by a CIA-engineered coup, never publicly denounced the raids. It would hardly be likely that 104,000 tons of bombs could completely escape his notice.

The disclosure of the secret Cambodian bombing naturally raises the question of what other secret operations have been, or are being, carried out. In an interview with Hersh, Knight observed: "We were all S. A. C. [Strategic Air Command]. If somebody could have punched the right number into the right spot, they could have had us bombing China if they wanted to."

Apparently moved by Knight's disclosures, another former air force officer has volunteered further details about Nixon's war in Indochina. Hersh reported that former Captain Gerald J. Greven had contacted Senator Harold Hughes, a member of the Armed Services Committee, to describe a deliberate bombing attack on a National Liberation Front hospital. Attacks on hospitals are outlawed by both the Hague and Geneva Conventions.

Greven said that the attack occurred in late March or early April of 1969. He told Hersh that he was a forward air controller and radioed a report from ground troops to planes, instructing them as to the location of the hospital they were to attack. Hersh continued:

"At a ground briefing after the mission, Mr. Greven recalled, 'I was admonished' for mentioning the word hospital over the radio. 'The senior officer in charge said, 'You know you're not supposed to use that terminology.' I remembered using it and felt bad about it, because I had been briefed prior to not use it. I know that I shouldn't have,' Mr. Greven related." □

Yes, He Really Meant It

This month's Spiro Agnew Foot-in-Mouth Award goes to British Tory MP Ronald Bell, a defender of South Africa's racist regime, who explained that Britons shouldn't concern themselves with events there:

"It is thousands of miles away; and few people in Britain know anything of how to arrange affairs in a country where the white community is outnumbered by an immigrant coloured community. . . ."

Rising Pressure on Nixon to Dump Lon Nol

". . . in Cambodia itself," the *Wall Street Journal* argued in a July 16 editorial, "the best that can be hoped for is a nebulous outcome, perhaps the return of Prince Sihanouk as head of a coalition with heavy Communist representation. From the American viewpoint, this would not matter in any immediate sense. Even the complete fall of Cambodia to the Communists would not directly endanger American interests, and given Mr. Nixon's detente with China and Russia, it probably would not especially encourage subversive war elsewhere."

The editorial was one of the most forthright statements of the reluctance on the part of increasing sectors of the U.S. ruling class to risk further military involvement to prop up the tottering puppet regime in Pnompenh. This reluctance is reinforced by the continuing successes of the liberation forces and the obvious inability of Lon Nol's "government" to defend itself even with the aid of the massive bombing campaign.

Writing from Pnompenh in the July 19 *New York Times*, Sydney H. Schanberg observed:

"The Americans acknowledge that they are baffled by the determination of the other side. They say that the air strikes have inflicted heavy casualties and that after five months of almost nonstop offensive operations, the insurgents must be reaching their breaking point. If so, it is not showing noticeably. The Government side is the one that keeps faltering and breaking."

As the *Wall Street Journal* hinted, Nixon is counting on the bureaucracies of the workers states—particularly the Chinese—to pressure Sihanouk and the rebel forces into a settlement acceptable to U.S. imperialism. Sihanouk has publicly stated that the liberation forces are no longer receiving material support from China even though they are seriously short of ammunition.

In return, Nixon has indicated his willingness to make certain cosmetic concessions, such as the removal of Lon Nol and perhaps other leaders of the puppet regime. Lon Nol has been informed that he is in poor health

and that he needs to be treated in the United States.

In a July 17 dispatch from Pnompenh to the *Washington Post*, Elizabeth Becker quoted reports that Lon Nol had finally been pressured into accepting Nixon's "invitation."

"The ailing president reportedly declined the offer initially," she wrote, "but was persuaded to accept during two visits last week of Gen. Frederick C. Weyand.

"Sources close to the president had been predicting for some time that he would go to the United States. This is the first time, however, that Mr. Nixon has sent a personal invitation, which, it is presumed, implies a strong suggestion that Lon Nol leave Cambodia."

On July 18, the White House issued a formal statement denying the plans to remove Lon Nol. "We know of no plan at this time for Lon Nol to visit the United States—we know

of no discussion about it," the statement said.

The White House comment was a lie, of course. What it indicates, however, is that Lon Nol is resisting Nixon's plans to retire him.

In a July 17 interview with Agence France-Presse, Sihanouk suggested that negotiations could be opened through President Moktar Ould Daddah of Mauritania. Sihanouk said that during his visit to Mauritania May 29-30, Daddah had transmitted Sihanouk's "final proposal" for a settlement to Washington.

"The exiled Cambodian Head of State indicated," Agence France-Presse reported, "that the American Ambassador to Mauritania had orally transmitted Washington's refusal of this proposal, which consisted essentially of an immediate reconciliation with the United States as soon as it put an end to the bombing and broke off all military aid to Phnom Penh."

That proposal presumably would fit the category of "nebulous outcome" acceptable to the *Wall Street Journal*. What remains to be seen, however, is whether Nixon can bring his diplomatic plans to fruition before the Pnompenh puppet show is driven from the stage. □

Nixon Denies He Will Resign

Watergate Cover-Up Comes Further Unstuck

By Allen Myers

"I only hope," Alexander Butterfield concluded his testimony before the Senate Watergate committee July 16, "that I have not . . . given away something which the president planned to use at a later time in support of his position."

The obscure former White House aide had, in fact, put Nixon in his most difficult position since John Dean implicated him in the Watergate cover-up. The surprise witness revealed what had been one of the best-kept secrets of the Nixon gang: Nixon bugged not only the antiwar and socialist movements, not only his opponents in the Republican and Democratic parties, but even the White House itself.

Butterfield testified, and the admin-

istration admitted, that recording devices were installed in the White House Cabinet Room and Nixon's Oval Office and in Nixon's office in the Executive Office Building. In addition, there are four telephone recorders: two in the White House, one in the Executive Office Building, and one in the presidential retreat at Camp David, Maryland.

Knowledge of the bugging was limited to a handful of persons. They included—in addition to Nixon, Butterfield, and the Secret Service agents who installed the devices—H. R. Haldeman, former chief of the White House staff; Lawrence Higby, who was Haldeman's assistant; Dwight Chapin, Nixon's former appointments

secretary; and Steve Bull, who replaced Butterfield when the latter left his job last March. Butterfield said that even such high-level aides as John Ehrlichman and John Dean were unaware of the bugs.

Nixon in a Corner

"We now know there are records of those meetings," the chief counsel of the Senate committee, Samuel Dash, told reporters. "I don't have to draw the line underneath and add it up."

The meetings that Dash and the senators are most interested in are those described by John Dean in which, Dean said, Nixon demonstrated his knowledge of the Watergate cover-up and discussed promises of executive clemency and the funds paid to the burglars to buy their silence.

The fact that Nixon attempted to conceal the existence of the tapes is in itself a strong indication that they must at least partially confirm Dean's testimony. Even though Nixon knew that the tapes were being made and would therefore have spoken carefully, the recordings must contain highly embarrassing material about the operations of the Nixon gang.

But it is equally damaging to Nixon's defense for him to continue to refuse to release the tapes. Attempts to cloak such refusal in verbiage about "executive privilege" and "separation of powers" are too transparent to be of much use. On July 21 Sam Ervin, the committee chairman, pointed out the obvious:

"John Dean has said he told the president about the Watergate cover-up, and an unaltered tape of that conversation would offer the best contemporary evidence that Dean was telling the truth. I can think of no rational reason for the president not turning over the tapes unless the evidence found in them would be against him. Those seeking the truth will draw the inference—and a justified inference—that the reason for not producing the tapes is because the evidence would be adverse to him."

Even Senator Edward Gurney, Nixon's staunchest supporter on the committee, warned Nixon that keeping the tapes secret would "hurt him politically."

Under mounting pressure from the continuing Watergate revelations and

the committee's request for the tapes, Nixon found it necessary to deny speculation that he would resign. After being released from the hospital July 20, Nixon, using the royal plural, told reporters:

"What we were elected to do, we are going to do, and let others wallow in Watergate, we are going to do our job."

Nixon was reported to have told Ervin, during their July 12 telephone conversation about written documents



MITCHELL: Stories of his own innocence contradicted by witnesses.

that the committee is seeking, that he thinks the committee is "out to get him." In the July 22 *New York Times*, James M. Naughton quoted unidentified officials of the committee on the substance of the Nixon-Ervin conversation:

"One source said . . . that the gist of Mr. Nixon's reaction was that he would not cooperate by turning over the Presidential papers because he had concluded that the committee was 'out to get' him.

"'It was incredible,' the official said. 'I wish I could repeat the whole thing. The President seemed to be in an emotional state.'"

Whatever Nixon's "emotional state" may be, it is unlikely in the extreme that he will be able to withhold the tapes indefinitely, as the *Wall Street Journal* warned him in a July 18 editorial:

"If the President does not reconsider

his initial instinct to withhold the tapes, he will only prolong the Watergate agony, and intensify the never-quite-resolvable impression of his own guilt. . . . Even if the tapes show him guilty, he needs to recognize that the alternative to disclosure is continued doubt and increasingly ill-tempered national discourse.

"It would seem clear to us that at this point the overwhelming duty that Richard Nixon owes the nation is to get this singular evidence before the public and end the turmoil one way or another."

When an influential bourgeois paper like the *Wall Street Journal* finds it necessary to remind Nixon that his personal career must be subordinated to the interests of the ruling class, he is obviously in trouble.

It is unlikely, in fact, that Nixon expects to withhold the tapes indefinitely. They can be, and presumably will be, altered—if that has not already been done. Even the capitalist press has been filled with speculation on this subject, most of it centering not on whether Nixon would alter the tapes but on whether such changes could be detected.

Other Gangsters Heard From

Butterfield's disclosure of the tapes tended to overshadow the testimony of other members of the Nixon gang. During the week July 16-20, the committee questioned Herbert Kalmbach, formerly Nixon's personal attorney; Frederick LaRue, who was an assistant to John Mitchell at the Committee to Re-elect the President (CREEP); and Robert Mardian, a former assistant attorney general and former CREEP official. Gordon Strachan, who was H. R. Haldeman's assistant at the White House, read a prepared statement but was not questioned before the committee recessed for the weekend.

Kalmbach and LaRue testified primarily about the payoffs to the Watergate burglars, which totaled nearly \$450,000. Kalmbach admitted raising \$219,000 in cash for the Watergate defendants between late June and early September 1972. The payoffs, he testified with a straight face, were not intended to buy silence but were merely "humanitarian" aid.

Kalmbach provided the first direct testimony linking Ehrlichman, Nix-

on's top domestic adviser, to the pay-offs. Kalmbach said that he was first asked to raise the money by John Dean, but that he soon became disturbed by the secrecy surrounding the payoffs. In July, he testified, he went to see Ehrlichman and asked whether Dean in fact had the authority to direct him in his "assignment." Kalmbach said Ehrlichman replied: "Herb, John Dean does have the authority. It is proper, and you are to go forward."

Kalmbach would seem to have been less than completely convinced by this reassurance, since in early September he refused to do any further fundraising for the burglars. At that point, the job was taken over by LaRue.

LaRue, who has already pleaded guilty to a charge of conspiracy to obstruct justice, admitted distributing another \$230,000 to lawyers for the burglars.

LaRue also contradicted John Mitchell's testimony on two important points. Mitchell had testified that he disapproved the espionage plan worked out by Gordon Liddy at a meeting with LaRue and deputy CREEP director Jeb Magruder on March 30, 1972. But LaRue testified that Mitchell's reaction when the plan was discussed was: "Well, this is not something that will have to be decided at this meeting."

LaRue also confirmed Magruder's testimony, which Mitchell had denied, that shortly after the Watergate burglars were captured, Mitchell told Magruder to burn files containing records of wiretaps.

Mardian, also, provided evidence indicating that Mitchell had lied about not approving the break-in at the Watergate. The *New York Times* transcript of the July 20 hearings records that Mardian said he had met with Mitchell and Magruder on June 23 or 24, 1972:

"I asked Mr. Magruder in the presence of Mr. Mitchell how much money he had given to Mr. Liddy. He said he had given Mr. Liddy \$40,000. I must have registered surprise and said, \$40,000? And Mr. Mitchell did much the same. And he [Magruder] turned to Mr. Mitchell and he said, well, that is not much out of the total budget of \$250,000.

"Mr. Mitchell's answer was, but the campaign has not even started yet. . . .



MARDIAN: "Clear impression" that Liddy implicated Nixon.

"His response was not I did not authorize 250 [thousand dollars], his response was, the campaign has not started yet."

But the most interesting part of Mardian's testimony concerned Richard Nixon. Mardian was assigned immediately after June 17, 1972, to interview Gordon Liddy and find out the details of the undercover operations he had been running. Testifying on July 19, Mardian described the interview:

". . . [Liddy said] that they were all real pros, that they had engaged in numerous jobs. And when I asked him what kind of jobs, he said, we pulled two right under your nose.

"I inquired as to what he meant by that, and he said that they had invaded the office of the psychiatrist

of Dr. Ellsberg and that they were the ones who got Dita Beard out of town. . . .

"I asked him on whose authority he was operating, and I wish to be very careful here, because I don't know that he used the name of the president, but the words he did use were clearly meant to imply that he was acting on the express authority of the president of the United States, with the assistance of the Central Intelligence Agency."

Mardian's testimony thus provided unexpected support for John Dean, who said that he learned from "plumber" Egil Krogh that Nixon himself had ordered the burglary of the psychiatrist's office.

It is likely that more surprises will be forthcoming as additional witnesses are heard from. The crimes of the Nixon gang are so far-reaching that even the grand jury is having trouble dealing with them all.

On July 19, special prosecutor Archibald Cox asked for the creation of a second grand jury in Washington to deal with the widening investigation. The original panel is expected to continue hearing evidence specifically on the Watergate break-in and the related cover-up.

"Sources close to the special Watergate prosecutor's office," David A. Andelman reported in the *New York Times*, "said that the areas to be covered by the new grand jury would include violations of Federal campaign financing statutes, conspiracy to defraud the United States Government, campaign contributions by corporations, extortion by Federal officials and obstruction of justice."

There's a category there to fit nearly every member of the Nixon gang. □

Pacific Islanders Suffer From Fallout

"On the island of Mangareva 250 miles southeast of Mururoa Atoll, where the French Government has been testing its nuclear bombs," reports the Australian revolutionary-socialist fortnightly *Direct Action*, "the Polynesian inhabitants are sceptical about French claims that the bombs are safe.

"After each test, French scientists equipped with gloves and gumboots collect shellfish and coral samples on the island's beaches. After the tests also, the islanders are told not to eat fish or drink water for a day or two.

"After one test boxes of dead birds, fish and pigs had to be taken away in ships and several women who ate fish became ill and had to leave the island for treatment. The islanders are now unable to eat the fish they catch; they depend upon tinned supplies.

"Many of the islanders are suffering from back pains and diarrhoea and some have patches on their bodies where the skin has gone pale. . . . in the French barracks there is a ban on . . . island water."

More Evidence About Massacre of Civilians in Mozambique

By Joanne Smith

The storm of protest in Britain over allegations of Portuguese massacres of unarmed Mozambique villagers (see *Intercontinental Press*, July 23, p. 900) continues to mount. Members of Parliament from the Liberal and Labour parties, which proposed motions in the House of Commons calling for the cancellation of Portuguese Premier Marcello Caetano's London visit, decided to boycott all engagements connected with the visit.

The 1.7-million-member Transport and General Workers' Union agreed July 12 at its annual conference to send a telegram to Tory Prime Minister Edward Heath demanding cancellation of the Caetano visit. The telegram, signed by the union's general secretary, Jack Jones, said:

"In view of the reported atrocities committed in Mozambique by the Portuguese authorities, and the fact that the regime continues to deny basic trade-union rights and imprisons Portuguese trade unionists, the conference calls upon Her Majesty's Government to immediately withdraw the invitation to the Portuguese Prime Minister to visit this country."

The exact details of Caetano's itinerary were not released by the Foreign Office "because of security problems." Numerous demonstrations, pickets, and meetings were planned to protest the visit, including a national demonstration June 15.

The July 17 London *Times* reported on demonstrations in London that greeted Caetano's arrival the previous day. About forty people from the End the Alliance Campaign and the Committee for Freedom in Mozambique, Angola and Guinea shouted anti-Caetano slogans and slogans calling for an end to the British-Portuguese alliance as Caetano arrived at the Portuguese Embassy. Fifty demonstrators picketed Downing Street to await his arrival there, but police enabled him to enter by a back route. Later in the evening more than 1,000 demonstrators lined the entrance to the Royal Naval College, where a din-

ner was to be held in Caetano's honor. Carrying placards, the protesters booed and hissed each guest, particularly Prime Minister Heath and two Labour party MPs who had ignored a party decision to boycott all engagements connected with the Caetano visit. Angry demonstrators shouting "assasino, assasino" broke through a cordon of more than 200 mounted and uniformed police as Caetano's car drew up. After scuffles, three persons were taken away by police.

Further demonstrations were scheduled for the rest of the week, despite organizational difficulties due to the withholding of Caetano's program.

The reaction in Britain to the massacre allegations and the minimum effect of the Portuguese government's immediate and total denials forced the Lisbon regime to make a shift in its strategy for dealing with the protest. According to the July 13 *Manchester Guardian*, Caetano personally ordered a government inquiry into the allegations.

Dr. Feytor Pinto, director of the Portuguese government's Information Department, who was in London as part of Caetano's advance party, revealed July 12 that an inquiry had been ordered and was already "under way." No details were given on how the "inquiry" would be carried out. In the past, similar inquiries have been conducted by the governor-general and the commander in chief of the armed forces in Mozambique. The present commander in chief is one General Kaulza de Arriaga, author of *The Portuguese Answer*, due for publication July 16. The July 13 *Guardian* quotes the general: "We made clear that the alternative was relentless suffering, and frequently death, for those who persist in belonging to anti-Portuguese movements, especially Frelimo [Frente de Libertação de Moçambique — Mozambique Liberation Front] and Coremo [Comité Revolucionário de Moçambique — Mozambique Revolutionary Committee]; or those who support these movements

through folly or fear."

The general describes the Portuguese policy of regrouping the Africans into fortified villages (*aldeamentos*) in order to isolate FRELIMO, and the methods by which the armed forces seek to "win the hearts and minds of the people":

"We try to stress the advantages of being Portuguese, whether black or white, and of being on the side of Portugal; and on the other hand, the misery of the war, and the automatic pardon which is given to everyone who surrenders to the Portuguese authorities."

The British section of Amnesty International issued a statement July 12 calling for an "independent international inquiry" into the massacres. The inquiry announced by Caetano fell far short of what was needed, Amnesty said, "in view of the seriousness and scope of the allegations."

The July 13 *Times* of London published a "diary of events" compiled by Spanish priests and in an editorial in the same issue stressed that the account represented, not hearsay, but "the collective experience, including eye-witness, of this group of missionaries." The editorial, stating that a Portuguese army inquiry into allegations made against itself can have no value, detailed other sources of evidence of massacres; for example, the White Fathers, a Roman Catholic body quite separate in organization and nationality from the Spanish missionaries, has a 400-page dossier of atrocities and claims that the known victims add up to several thousand.

The "diary of events" published in the *Times* tells of reprisals by Portuguese troops following the execution of an African chief by FRELIMO on April 27, 1971, and of subsequent killings and torture in 1971 and 1972. The authors, unnamed for fear of reprisals, are two priests from the Burgos Fathers who were attached to the Mucumbura mission.

According to the report, the Portuguese army on May 4, 1971, round-

ed up African workers, torturing them and forcing them to confess their relationship with FRELIMO. One man was killed, and the two priests themselves buried the body.

On May 7, 1971, soldiers and an agent of the Directorate-General of Security (DGS) beat, tortured, and murdered fourteen African men, whose only crime had been to give corn and other food to FRELIMO guerrillas. These men were from the villages of Catacha and Kapinga. The priests saw the graves, and spoke to survivors, including the man who had been forced to dig the graves.

They reported: "Some twenty feet from the grave we found a human head with hardly any flesh on the bones, [and] ribs, legs and parts of the hands. The man from the village said that some of their companions had not been shot to death but beaten, tortured and cut up. He showed us big sticks full of blood with which the victims must have been beaten."

The priests met a man who had been forced to join in the killing, and found near the grave empty ration tins of the type used by the Portuguese army. The same day troops killed seven Africans in the nearby village of Mahanda, and another four in the village of Antonio May 8. The priests helped to bury the dead, all of whose names are given in the report.

The diary continues: "We wish to point out that all the dead were African farm labourers, peaceful villagers. Among them there was not a single guerrilla."

During the first fortnight of October 1971, the villages along the river Dack were the scene of much torture and killing. The priests reported that the "soldiers forced the people to stay in their huts and threatened they would kill anyone who tried to flee or anyone who was in the jungle. After this they started on interrogation, beatings, torture. . . . everyone who was suspected received a terrible beating until he confessed something about the guerrillas. Those who did not speak were considered to be accomplices of FRELIMO and shot in cold blood in front of the villagers." Others were beaten to death. Survivors spoke to the priests and gave them the names of the dead and of those taken prisoner after terrible torture. These events occurred in the villages of Guvanseve, Kampemberumbe, Karuvi,

and Traquino (also known as Nyambidzo).

The report gives detailed information on intervention in Mozambique by Rhodesian troops: In August 1971 the Rhodesian authorities discovered that FRELIMO guerrillas had crossed the border to carry out an operation. The diary describes the aftermath of this discovery:

"On September 1, a big force from Rhodesia entered Mozambique and stayed for a week pursuing the guerrillas." Many people were killed in the villages under the jurisdiction of the Mucumbura mission. When the priests arrived in the area, they found that in one village the people were "so full of fear and terror that they had not dared even to bury the burnt bodies." The priests sent films of the scene to the bishop in Tete, who sent it to the capital to be developed. They did not expect to see the film again, as the Portuguese government had heard of it. Many witnesses told the priests that between September 1 and 7 helicopters landed in Mucumbura with wounded and dead, who were quickly buried by Portuguese soldiers. About twelve persons were taken back to Rhodesia for interrogation.

The diary goes on: "On November 2, 1971, Colonel Craveiro Lopez arrived at Mucumbura. He called together the military and civil authorities and informed them of his plans: 'Within a very short time our aircraft and commandos will be all over the villages in the area of Buxo. Now is the time to burn and exterminate that area, as we have given them time to get to the camp and not to ally themselves with the terrorists.'

"A group of 40 Portuguese commandos arrived in helicopters in the area of Buxo . . . on November 3. They had orders to burn and exterminate everything they found. . . . We ourselves saw more than 50 huts burned. Among them were our school in Antonio and the house of the teacher."

The priests had warned the people in the villages to flee, as they had heard the villages were to be bombed, but sixteen women and children were found by the commandos November 4 in Antonio and were burned alive. Only one woman managed to escape; she gave the priests the names of the dead. Many others were killed in the same village.

The report also gives details of torture and killings in March and April 1972, including actions by the Rhodesian army in Debetebe in the first week of April.

Controversy in the British and foreign press has centered on the existence or nonexistence of the villages named in the various reports, and on the reliability of the priests, whom the Portuguese government accuses of being agents of FRELIMO. Much has been made of the statement by FRELIMO July 11 that it knew nothing of the Wiriyamu massacre in December 1972. But, according to the July 12 *Daily Telegraph*, FRELIMO also said that guerrillas in Mozambique "did not report atrocities against civilians as they had become an everyday occurrence," and that first-hand accounts of a number of other massacres by Portuguese troops could be given.

During the week before Caetano's London visit, members of Portuguese emigre organizations living in London were visited by Special Branch police officials seeking information on activities projected for the following week. A member of the Portuguese Workers Coordinating Committee said that the Special Branch appeared to have received lists of names from Portuguese security officials. Some of the people the police wanted to see were not even publicly associated with organizations in Britain, and others had never used their full names in Britain.

In the House of Commons debate scheduled for July 17, Opposition leader Harold Wilson was expected to give details of another massacre, alleged to have taken place in Chawola, a village a few miles from Wiriyamu, on the same day. Evidence of the atrocity is contained in a report handed to Wilson by the *Observer*, which had received it from an Italian priest who had been in close contact with priests in Mozambique.

A list of alleged eyewitnesses of the aftermath of the massacres in 1971 and 1972 has been delivered to Hugh Byatt, the British consul general in Lourenço Marques, capital of Mozambique, reported the July 15 *Observer*. Byatt so far had been unable to contact the bishop of Tete Province, who heads the list. Others on the list are three Spanish nuns, two African schoolteachers, and Felix Niza Ribiere, bishop of João Belo and formerly of Tete. □

On the History of the Trotskyist Movement

[The following interview is reprinted from the June 18 issue of *Socialist Action*, a revolutionary-socialist fortnightly published in Wellington.]

* * *

Question. Could you tell us when you joined the socialist movement?

Answer. I came into the Trotskyist movement of the United States in 1933 after having been radicalised by the great depression, and becoming acquainted with people in the left wing of the Socialist Party and around the Communist Party. I was very active in some of the most important labour defence and civil liberties struggles of that period, including the Scottsboro case. I helped form some of the first groups of Black supporters in Harlem for the Scottsboro case. This was only one of a number of such campaigns that my associates and I conducted.

We came into conflict with Communist Party policy on two points. One was their highly factional and sectarian attitude in defence cases against people who didn't completely agree with their policy. But more importantly we began to raise questions after Hitler took power in February 1933, about the policy of the Communist Party in Germany, its calling the Social Democrats "social fascists"—making them the main danger, rather than the fascists—and the refusal to fight for united front action of the Communists and Socialists, and their respective trade unions. We felt that this opened a big gap through which the Blackshirts marched to power.

The Stalinists called us "Trotskyites." Well, we didn't know Trotskyism from rheumatism. But when we were so characterised and condemned, this drove us to find out what Trotsky and the Trotskyists really stood for. And that's when I began to read Trotsky, and *The Militant*, which was the paper of the Communist League of America—the name of the Trotskyist organisation—and I and a group of others were won over to the ideas of Trotskyism, which we saw then as

genuine Marxism and Leninism.

Q. You were involved with Trotsky himself not long after that, is that correct?

A. My first communication with Trotsky came about in 1934. At that time he was living incognito in France and he was hounded by both the fascists and the Stalinists, and the French government was anxious to get him out of the country. They considered the presence of the revolutionist a great liability. And I was asked to initiate a committee to try and get a visa for Trotsky in the United States.

The Roosevelt government refused to give him a visa, so the effort came to nothing. A little bit later, the Norwegian Labour Party came into office in Norway and they offered asylum to him.

The first Moscow Trial broke out in the middle of 1936, when the most infamous charges were levelled against Trotsky and his son Sedov. They were accused of conspiring with the Nazis, accused of wanting to assassinate Stalin, wreck railroad trains, poison the food of workers, and many other nefarious activities. The Norwegian government, which was under heavy pressure from the Norwegian shipowners who had contracts with the Soviet government, interned Trotsky and his wife, so that he was unable to reply to these allegations.

At that time an emergency call went out to us in the United States as well as to other cothinkers of Trotsky throughout the world to do what we could to get him out of internment, so that he could answer the infamous charges against him.

So we revived the American Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky, and through our connections with Diego Rivera, the mural painter in Mexico, who went to President Cardenas, we secured a visa for Trotsky to come to Mexico. I can very well remember telephoning Oslo to break the news that Trotsky had secured an invitation to Mexico. And I travelled from New York to Mexico

along with Max Shachtman, one of the leaders of the American Trotskyist movement, to greet the Trotskys upon their arrival in Tampico. That was my first personal acquaintance with him.

Q. What was your estimation at that time of Trotsky's role in the revolutionary movement?

A. By that time I had become convinced that Trotsky was the continuator of the programme and the traditions of the Bolshevik movement, as Lenin had applied them. I had begun to learn the true history of his role in the revolutionary movement both inside Russia and on an international scale. I knew that he had led the October insurrection, that he had served in many important posts in the Soviet Republic, that he was the creator and commander of the Red Army.

I also knew that he was one of the first of the top Bolshevik leaders to resist the antidemocratic, bureaucratic, nationalist policies of the sections of the party that were becoming heavily bureaucratized and conservatized under the leadership of Stalin.

Q. I understand you played some role in the commission which was set up to hear Trotsky defend himself against the charges of the Stalin regime.

A. The American Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky, of which I was the national secretary, had two objectives. One was to get asylum for Trotsky, which we did, and the other was to provide a channel through which he could state his refutations of the base charges against him. He had demanded from the beginning of 1936 the formation of an international commission of inquiry, which would take testimony from him, and then weigh the merit or demerit of the slanderous accusations against him and his son Sedov. And one of the matters which we discussed together on the train going from Tampico to Mexico City and subsequently during the next time we met was the steps to be taken in the creation of such an international commission of inquiry.

Several months later, we succeeded in convincing a number of prominent intellectuals, headed by the noted educator and philosopher John Dewey,

to go to Mexico City in order to hold hearings. I was largely instrumental in helping to constitute that commission of inquiry. I went with the group of which Dewey was a member on the train from New York to Mexico, and listened to the eight days of hearings. The testimony that Trotsky gave in response to the interrogation of the Commissioners has been reprinted in a book entitled *The Case of Leon Trotsky* [New York: Pathfinder Press, 1969. 617pp. \$10.00].

Although Trotsky did not have as good a command of English as of some other languages, he nevertheless for eight days answered in English all the questions, and they were very searching questions, indeed, which were directed at him. After the commission had compiled all the evidence that it could, after it had studied the testimony both in the Moscow Trials and the answers given by Trotsky, it delivered its judgement in the fall of 1937.

The verdict was that Trotsky and his son Sedov were innocent of all the charges against them and that in effect the Moscow Trials were frame-ups. At that time, only a restricted number of people credited the judgement of the Dewey Commission. But after Khrushchev confirmed a large part of the truth about the frame-ups of Stalin (though not all of it by any means), most of the world, including many people who retain a general allegiance to Moscow, no longer believe in the charges laid against the defendants in the Moscow Trials.

I might add that our aim was not simply to give Trotsky a hearing and enable him to answer his accusers, but also to save the lives of Lenin's associates, members of his political bureau who were put on trial during the three Moscow Trials from 1936 to 1938, including such celebrated revolutionists as Bukharin, Rakovsky, Sokolnikov, Krestinsky, Smirnov, and many others who had taken leading parts in the struggle against Czarism for workers power, and in leading the first workers state. Unfortunately our efforts were unavailing, and Stalin, as is now known, not only put these associates of Lenin to death after trying to discredit their reputations, but murdered or sent into exile hundreds of thousands and even several million people, including some of his most faithful followers. A great deal

of this, as I say, was confirmed by Khrushchev in his well-known 1956 speech to the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist Party.

Q. Why was Stalin so concerned about the activities of Trotsky and his followers, when they weren't very numerous and Trotsky was in exile?

A. Well, it may have been that Trotsky's followers were not in numbers so many, but they did represent the cream of the people who had led the Russian revolution and helped establish the first workers republic there. It included many of the youth, and many people in responsible positions in the Red Army.

Moreover, they represented a constant threat to the Stalin tyranny; they were a standing reproach to it, because they kept counterposing the genuine ideas of revolutionary internationalism and workers democracy to what the Stalin gang was imposing on the Soviet Union. Stalin feared that when there was any kind of crisis within the Soviet regime, this would open a breach through which the opposition could return to power and to the path of Lenin. After having expelled the leaders of the Left Opposition from the Communist Party, demoting them from any positions of responsibility, and exiled them to Siberia, this was still not enough. At the climax of his dictatorship he felt it necessary to wipe them out entirely, so that they would no longer present any alternative, even in exile, to his exclusive rule. And therefore he was free to rewrite the history of the Russian revolution, his own history, and impose these untruths upon the Soviet people, as well as his other practices.

Q. In 1938, Trotsky and his followers around the world established the international party called the Fourth International. What was the significance of that step; why was the Fourth International formed?

A. For the first ten years of the Communist Left Opposition, from 1923 to 1933, its objective, under great difficulties, was to try and change the course of the Communist parties and the Communist International, and redirect it toward a genuine Leninist path.

The big turn came after Hitler came

to power in Germany without any resistance from the German Communists and without any reconsideration of its catastrophic policies by the Communist International. At that time Trotsky said the whole international outlook had been changed, the Third International had proved itself to be completely exhausted as a revolutionary agency, and it was necessary to set about immediately to form new parties of a revolutionary Marxist type in all countries as the basis for the formation of a new, or fourth, international. There was a period of initial preparation between the proclamation of the need for an international, beginning with 1933, until that international was actually founded in 1938.

Q. The Fourth International has developed since that time. Could you tell us a bit about how the Fourth International today compares with the body set up in 1938?

A. Well, the Fourth International was launched right on the eve of the Second World War, and this created incredibly difficult conditions for its existence. It is really a miracle that it managed to go through the war and survive, because it had many enemies: the fascists, who would wipe out any Trotskyists they found; the Stalinists were against them; even the United States government put the leaders of the Socialist Workers Party, both its trade union and its political leaders, in prison during the Second World War. The Trotskyists of Europe were active in the resistance against Hitler; a number of them lost their lives as a result.

And the movement after the war was able to reconstitute itself somewhat slowly. Then came the period of the Cold War and the witch-hunt, which made it very difficult for a revolutionary movement, and an international, to expand very rapidly. We especially had a very difficult time in the United States under the sway of McCarthyism.

What put fresh wind in the sails of the world Trotskyist movement was the revival of radicalism beginning with the Cuban revolution in the early 1960s. And since that time we have seen not only the longest-standing sections experience considerable growth, as we have in North America—the

United States and Canada—but above all in countries which have never previously known a Trotskyist movement.

This is because of the increasing discredit and disintegration of the Social Democratic reformists on the one side, and the decomposition of Stalinism on the other. The young people want, above all, the truth. They want to rally around a stainless banner—they're looking for a genuine programme of revolutionary internationalism, and they have found it in the principles and the programme and the organisation of the Fourth International. That's why, for example, we have the phenomenon of the growth of the Trotskyist movement in such countries as Australia and New Zealand. But these are only two examples of a much broader process.

We find that in a great many countries where there had previously been no groups of Trotskyists there are the beginnings, and in some cases even more, of a Fourth International movement. One striking case is what is happening in Spain under Franco. Today the Trotskyists there are probably the second-largest grouping that exists in Western Europe. These are comrades who have earned their spurs in the fight to get rid of the Franco dictatorship, and who through their own experiences have made their way to agreement with our basic ideas against those of the Stalinist movement, the Maoist movement, and the "socialist" reformists.

Q. You joined the socialist movement during the depression period. People look back on the depression as the period of great social ferment and radicalisation. How would you compare that period, and the growth of the socialist movement then, with the prospects today?

A. Well, the radicalisation of the 1930s had many features which were quite different from those of the radicalisation which began in the 1960s and is continuing in the first part of the 1970s.

There it was the workers who came to the forefront and acquired the leading role in the struggles. Quite a different order in the entrance of social forces onto the arena of struggles has taken place in the radicalisation of our time. In the United States this began

with the civil rights struggles of the Blacks, which then passed over into the fight for Black nationalism and Black power.

The Blacks gave an impetus to the student radicalisation which began in 1964 with the free-speech fight in Berkeley, which had already been inspired by the Cuban revolution. After the students went into motion, they inaugurated the first antiwar demonstrations. And it has been the antiwar movement which has done more than anything else to change the atmosphere in the United States.

But that was not at all the end of the process. Since then we have seen the emergence of the women's liberation movement, gay liberation, the Chicano movement, the Native Indian movement, which has just come to a climax in the battle of Wounded Knee. However, the radicalisation has been restricted and somewhat weakened by the fact that the masses of white American workers have not as yet taken up a very combative position in relation to the powers that be. However, we think that this is not an enduring situation. We are quite familiar with changes in the attitudes and activities of the American workers, as well as workers in other countries under the stress of changed circumstances. And we look forward to a revival of workers' militancy as the climax of the present radicalisation.

This radicalisation is already, in our view, the widest, the broadest, the most diversified of any that the United States has known in the twentieth century. And we think that the end is by no means yet here.

Q. When you joined the Socialist Workers Party in the 1930s, Trotskyists were a relatively small group compared with other left tendencies. How does the balance of forces in the American radical movement stand today?

A. In the 1930s we Trotskyists had to contend with two very formidable rivals; one was the Socialist Party of the United States which had several tens of thousands of members, and the other was the Communist Party, which had a great influence in the trade-union movement and in intellectual circles, and which by the end of the Second World War could count 100,000 members. But since 1948

there has been a slow but steady reversal in the relationship of forces.

The Social Democrats today are simply a skeleton of their old self. All of them are immersed in the Democratic Party, and the chief issue in contention between the different tendencies is, or at least was in 1972, whether, as the right wing wished, they should support Humphrey; or whether, as the left wing wished, they should support McGovern. They've no longer any conception of independent socialist politics.

The Communist Party has suffered a steady haemorrhaging ever since 1950 which was accelerated by the Khrushchev revelations and the continuing decomposition of world Stalinism. Although today they have more formal members on their rolls than the Socialist Workers Party, I don't believe that they can mobilise more activists in any struggle that goes on. Certainly that has been demonstrated in connection with the antiwar movement, the feminist movement, and others.

In addition, the Young Socialist Alliance—the youth movement that is in agreement with the Socialist Workers Party—is the strongest, best organised, the most cohesive of all the youth organisations on the left. It has stepped into the void left by the self-destruction of SDS; it has representatives on almost 200 campuses and publishes the only regular magazine or publication of radical youth, called *Young Socialist*, which last month actually sold 22,000 copies.

So we think that this is very good growing weather for North American Trotskyism. I could tell a similar story about our Canadian cothinkers, and we try to establish very close working relationships with our cothinkers in the different English-speaking countries—they're able to utilise our publications, which are quite abundant, in their work, in helping to build their movement. And it is of course a great gratification to come to countries like Australia and New Zealand and find the expanding response that our common ideas are receiving, especially among young people. □

Too Enterprising

A funeral director in Kuala Lumpur has been fined for trying to sell coffins to patients in a hospital.

Why Canada's Labor Party Needs Socialist Policies

By Howard Brown

[The following article is reprinted from the July 9 issue of *Labor Challenge*, a revolutionary-socialist fortnightly published in Toronto.]

* * *

Massive unemployment, runaway inflation, anti-labor legislation, together constituting a general attack on working people's standard of living: these are central issues confronting delegates to the federal NDP [New Democratic party—the Canadian labor party] convention in Vancouver July 19-22. While the corporations receive multi-million-dollar tax concessions, social services are cut back. Natural resources are developed anarchically, in the interest of capitalist profits, at the expense of native rights, and causing ecological destruction and regional underdevelopment. The weight of monopoly agribusiness squeezes farmers from the land at an accelerated pace. All these pressing problems must receive the delegates' attention.

The student and antiwar movements, the women's liberation movement and the growing Québec independence movement will have their impact on the convention's deliberations.

The challenge before the NDP convention is the elaboration of a program aimed at resolving the many problems which confront working people as part of their everyday lives. The imperative is not merely a legislative program, to be broadcast during irregular election campaigns, but a program of struggle. A program which can organize the widespread discontent of working people into campaigns in defense of their interests and against capitalist power.

Not commentary from Parliament Hill but real involvement on a day-to-day basis in the struggles of working people must be the center of the NDP's activity. The party must commit its resources to building mass movements against capitalist oppression and exploitation, from the women's liberation movement to trade-union struggles.

Rooted in capitalism, the fundamental problems confronting working people will be finally resolved only with the establishment of socialism: social ownership of the resources, factories and financial institutions and planned production controlled by working people.

The NDP leadership has shown itself incapable of a consistent defense of the interests of working people. At most it defends them in part and falteringly, and only when under the pressure of the party ranks and mass movements independent of the NDP. It astutely avoids any showdown battles with capitalist power.

Yet such battles are unavoidable in the struggles of working people. It is up to socialists in the NDP to pose the class struggle alternative to the reformism of the party leadership. Organized in a left caucus for the convention they can most effectively fight for socialist policies.

Open Corporation Books! Nationalize the Profiteers!

While the corporations rake in near record-making profits, inflation spirals upward at a pace not seen since the Korean war. Leading the consumer-price index are runaway food prices which have leaped nearly 15 percent over the last year. The cost of housing has not been far behind as the land speculators and developers reap super profits at working people's expense.

Mounting inflation makes it increasingly difficult for working people to obtain even the basic necessities of life. It hits hardest all the most exploited and oppressed: the poor and unorganized, those on fixed incomes.

The government's only response to the escalating cost of living has been appointment of a high-salaried food-prices review board, limited to monitoring food price increases, and completely powerless to stem the rising tide of inflation.

The NDP's parliamentary caucus has called for a prices review board

with the power to roll back food-price increases. Such a board, under workers' control and with complete access to corporate records, could be a powerful measure in combatting the rising cost of living. An effective prices review board could only be implemented under the pressure of massive mobilizations of the trade union movement. The NDP has failed to recognize the necessity of such mobilizations. And it hasn't elaborated a rounded program to protect working people from the rising cost of living.

The NDP, in conjunction with the trade unions, farmers' and consumers' organizations, should launch a massive campaign to open the books, the records and financial transactions of the monopolies in food—and all the other corporate profiteers. The supermarket tycoons have spent hours of testimony before the House of Commons special committee on food prices denying responsibility for the high cost of eating. Let them prove it!

As part of a campaign to defend working people from the escalating cost of living, struggles must be launched for wages geared to keeping up with the rising cost of living. Workers need cost-of-living clauses written into every union contract, assuring that wages keep pace with rising prices. Similar clauses should be written into retirement benefit schemes, Canada's unemployment insurance program and so on.

The present organizing drive among white-collar workers by the Canadian Labor Congress should be intensified and expanded in a general campaign to organize the unorganized. The NDP should campaign against legislation inhibiting union organization. NDP provincial governments should revise minimum wage standards sharply upward to levels comparable with trade union rates of pay.

The giant food monopolies, many of them integrated from field or feedlot to supermarket shelf, are reaping superprofits at every level of production. The same supermarket chains which rob the consumer at the check-out counter decree the price of agri-

cultural products at the farm gate. Together with the farm supplies monopolies—the machinery, farm-chemical and fertilizer outfits—and the banks, they catch farmers in a cost-price squeeze which threatens to drive two-thirds of them from the land by 1980.

Both from the standpoint of consumers and farmers the nationalization of the giant food empires should be placed on the order of the day. Under the control of workers and farmers, working people can be guaranteed cheap, nutritious food while farmers are assured a fair return on their labor.

The 'Tories' proposal for a freeze on wages and prices must be firmly opposed, as a matter of principle, by the NDP. Wherever such policies have been pursued by capitalist governments, it has been at the expense of working people. A wage freeze, enthusiastically enforced by the employers, would make it impossible for workers even to begin to catch up with the inflated cost of living. A price freeze on the other hand is almost impossible to enforce, for to be effective it would have to be applied at every level of production, while individual capitalists would circumvent the freeze. Moreover, prices frozen at their present level would only guarantee the corporations continuing massive profits.

A Shorter Work Week

Faced with increasing international competition, Canadian capitalism attempts to protect its profits by cutting back on its production and overhead costs by forcing down wages, cutting back on social services and shifting the burden of taxation onto working people.

That is the meaning of the "corporate tax ripoff" and the cutbacks in education spending, which have sparked massive resistance from teachers and students. In the interests of forcing down the capitalists' wage bill the Liberal government, in the guise of "fighting inflation," has deliberately created massive unemployment, maintaining a cheap labor pool, which at the same time weakens the bargaining position of the trade union movement.

Canada now has the highest rate of unemployment of any country in the advanced industrialized world.

The NDP in parliament has advocated increased government expenditures on public works and has lobbied for tax measures stimulating consumer demand in an effort to create employment. Yet the parliamentary caucus voted for the Liberal government's budget, which even its authors predicted would not reduce unemployment to less than 5.2 percent of the work force. Hardly a satisfactory objective from the standpoint of working people!

Central to any serious campaign for fighting unemployment must be the demand for the shorter work week, which has been made an issue in contract negotiations by several major unions this year. The thirty-hour work week without reduction in weekly pay ("30 for 40"), can be a powerful measure for providing employment by spreading available work around. Through such measures as the sliding scale of hours, the new technology can benefit workers by shortening working hours and preventing layoffs.

The NDP should mobilize behind union struggles for a shorter work week while popularizing the demand in parliament. Where the NDP has formed governments the shorter work week should be immediately legislated. If the companies complain that they can't operate under such conditions, they should be nationalized under workers' control—as should all plants shut down by the employers.

Cutbacks in social services should be reversed. Increased corporate taxes can fund a massive program of public works—schools, hospitals, tenant-controlled public housing—creating socially useful employment. Jobs must be guaranteed to all; the unemployed should be compensated at trade union rates of pay as long as they are out of work.

Defeat Antilabor Laws

Coupled with the maintenance of high unemployment as a measure to hold down wage rates, the use of anti-labor legislation directed against the right to strike and inhibiting union organization has become an increasing problem for the labor movement.

Workers in British Columbia are confronted by compulsory arbitration through Bill 33, which the NDP government has yet to withdraw. On May 1, 1,200 Edmonton construction

workers demonstrated against Bill 35, Alberta's new trade union legislation, which allows compulsory arbitration to be applied in strikes interrupting what the government deems "essential services." The same day 30,000 Québec trade unionists made opposition to Bill 89, which would deny civil servants the right to strike, a central theme of their May Day demonstration. On June 14 Ontario hospital workers demonstrated against compulsory arbitration legislation applying to hospital employees.

Delegates to the 1973 federal NDP convention must put the party firmly on record in opposition to legislated curbs on the right to strike for any group of workers. Where the NDP is in office, as in British Columbia, anti-labor legislation must be wiped off the books. The NDP must mobilize its full membership in mass actions by the labor movement against strike-breaking legislation.

In the past the NDP's parliamentary caucus has betrayed the cause of labor by supporting parliamentary strikebreaking legislation against the British Columbia dockworkers. With railway workers presently in negotiations, the NDP must firmly oppose the use of parliament by the big business parties to undermine the right to strike.

Self-Determination for Quebec

Rooted in the domination of the Québec economy by Canadian and U. S. capital under the supervision of the federal state, the national oppression of the Québécois is evident in the superexploitation of Québec workers, distortion of the nation's economy by the investment policies of foreign capital, and in the prevailing system of language discrimination.

The past decade has seen growth of a massive sentiment, encompassing broad layers of Québec society, in favor of Québec independence. This resurgent nationalism has been reflected in the movement in defense of the French language, which is continuously eroded by the domination of Québec economic life by English-speaking capital.

At the same time, their consciousness of national oppression has served to reinforce the combativity of the Québec working class. This increased militancy was demonstrated in May 1972

when the Québec economy was paralyzed by a general strike which involved, in some instances, the takeover of entire towns, seizure of the media, and experiments in various forms of workers self-management.

While the burning necessity for the Québec labor movement is a party of their own, independent of capital, the Québec labor movement continues to orient to the capitalist Parti Québécois. The Québec NDP has been effectively bypassed. Committed to maintenance of the unity of the fed-

eral state, the NDP has faint hope of becoming a force in Québec politics.

The NDP convention must pledge its support of Québec's democratic right to self-determination up to and including the right to national independence. The NDP must solidarize with the struggles of Québec workers, in particular against the Bourassa government's current campaign of repression. That campaign, spearheaded by the imprisonment of three of Québec's leading trade unionists, includes the notorious Bill 89, which

would empower the government to outlaw strikes in all sectors of the economy deemed to involve "essential services."

All conditions on the release of Pepin, Charbonneau and Laberge—conditions designed to humiliate, and further intimidate, the trade union movement—must be lifted. A cross-country campaign in solidarity with the Québec labor movement in its struggles against the government and corporation-inspired repression can aid in rolling back anti-labor legislation across Canada. □

When in Doubt, Lie

How the Healyites 'Answer' a Polemic on Economics

By Dick Roberts

In recent issues of the newspapers reflecting the views of the Socialist Labour League, the sectarian British group led by Gerry Healy, and the Workers League, the organization of Healy's U.S. supporters, considerable space has been devoted to answering a series of three articles I wrote in *Intercontinental Press* this past May. (See *IP*, May 7, p. 526; May 14, p. 568; May 21, p. 599.)

In those articles I urged the Healyites to abandon their purely factional use of economic theory and to stop lying about the tenets of Marxist economic theory. Unfortunately, the suggestion fell on deaf ears.

To answer me Peter Jeffries, the staff writer for the SLL's *Workers Press* who draws the assignment of wielding the factional club on economic matters, has presented, in a June series, yet another lie about the Socialist Workers party's views on economic theory. Jeffries's lie has been dutifully repeated by the Workers League—most notably by Tim Wohlforth in a recent series of articles and speeches published in the Workers League newspaper, the *Bulletin*.

According to Jeffries (*Workers Press*, June 8), "Roberts attempts constantly to deride and misrepresent the analysis of the monetary crisis which has been made by the Socialist Labour League. 'For Marxists,' he [Roberts]

tells us, 'the central contradiction of imperialism, monopoly capitalism in the 20th century, is the revolt of the forces of production against national boundaries.' . . .

"It is quite ludicrous of Roberts to 'counterpose' the monetary crisis to the 'real' capitalist crisis. . . .

"We [Healyites] are 'one-sided,' says Roberts, in pointing to the dollar crisis as the main component of the capitalist crisis."

Wohlforth puts it even more bluntly: "Along with Dick Roberts of the Socialist Workers Party, Spartacist [a sectarian U.S. opponent organization to the sectarian Workers League] is seeking to make a case that the Workers League and the International Committee have broken with Marx's assessment of the capitalist crisis in our insistence on the importance of the monetary crisis."

So, according to these twisters, Roberts attacked the Healyites for stressing the importance of the monetary crisis. Roberts believes the monetary crisis isn't the "real" crisis. Roberts, therefore, doesn't even recognize the contradiction between use values and exchange values.

This argument is of some value in padding newspaper articles. For if Roberts really doesn't understand the importance of the monetary crisis, Healyite authors can provide reams

of quotations from Marx to prove that Marx emphasized the contradictions of money, the contradiction between use value and exchange value (embodied in the commodity itself), and the contradiction between production and circulation. The readers of the Healyite press should be warned that they have only begun to see the lengthy quotations that can be culled from all of Marx's main economic works to prove these central points of his theory.

But this is not what is at issue: I made no such attack on the Healyites. On the contrary, I castigated them, mildly it seemed to me, for *not* recognizing the importance of the monetary crisis in postwar imperialist economics until the late 1960s, when the pound had already been badly shaken for years. I pointed out that Ernest Mandel, in *Marxist Economic Theory*, had long before this correctly pointed to the monetary crisis as the arena in which the contradictions of postwar imperialism would first manifest themselves.

Here are the relevant quotations from the first of my articles, in the May 7 issue of *Intercontinental Press*: "It is precisely because of the inevitability of crisis under capitalism that the state *must intervene more and more*. . . .

"The question remains as to the degree to which the capitalist state can moderate the fluctuations of the business cycle. *What are the contradictions of state intervention itself?* Mandel stressed that neocapitalist state intervention runs into an insuperable contradiction: the 'permanent tendency to currency inflation.' . . .

"Every effort to prolong the cycle through increased government expenditures will increase inflation. But the dollar is also the main currency in *international finance*. Thus, continued inflation threatens to wreck the international monetary system. Mandel pinpointed the economic arena in which the contradictions of neocapitalism would first manifest themselves: the international monetary system. . . .

"As late as 1964, the point was still missed by the SLL leadership. Peter Jeffries went so far as to suggest that war production might even be decreased in the United States." (Emphasis in the original.)

In the last of the three articles I observed that "some of the key contributions first presented by Ernest Mandel have been picked up by the Healyites. But they have done this without the slightest acknowledgment and under cover of systematic falsification of Mandel's views.

"The deep crisis of the monetary system compelled these indomitable opponents of pragmatism to finally notice that the inflation of the dollar is one of the consequences of deeplying contradictions in international finance."

So much for the lie that Roberts does not recognize the central importance of the monetary crisis.

Why, then, did I raise the question of the *centrality of production* in Marx's economic analysis? Why did I state in the third article of the series, "The source of capitalist crises is not to be found in money, credit, and gold *isolated* from production"? (Emphasis in the original.)

It is because of the peculiar notion still defended by Jeffries (but not so much by Wohlforth) that the "gold crisis" is "the dominant form taken" by the contradictions of the "social relations of production." For example, in March 1968, Jeffries declared that the cause of the monetary crisis was the fact that "America now holds only

around 10 billion [milliard] dollars of gold. . . . Yet the value of dollars now circulating in the rest of the capitalist world . . . now totals around 30 billion dollars."

In May 1973 I called to Jeffries's attention the fact that the volume of gold then held by the United States was about the same as it had been in 1968, but the outstanding volume of dollars had risen to \$80 thousand million. "Doesn't this indicate that there is more to the monetary crisis than the relationship between the U. S. gold in Fort Knox and the volume of dollars held abroad?" I asked Jeffries. The question still has not been answered.

In the final article of the series I quoted the following sentence from the *Bulletin*: "The most frantic gold rush in modern history—which last week drove the price of the precious metal up to \$95 per ounce—is a warning to the working class that the latest dollar devaluation is a direct prelude to the complete collapse of the world economic system." That had been published on March 5.

But in the first week of July 1973, gold had risen almost to \$130 an

ounce, over a third higher. The *Bulletin* dutifully noted on July 16: "Today's rise in the dollar's value on the exchanges is but a prelude to the collapse of the international monetary system."

Doesn't this indicate once again that there is more to the world economic crisis than the price of gold?

Perhaps the Healyites are banking on the notion that the monetary system will collapse one day and when it happens, the crash will have been predicted in the previous week's Healyite newspaper—since it has been predicted there virtually on a weekly basis for the past five years.

For us there is more to Marxist economics than this. The uncontrollable inflation of the dollar *does* threaten to wreck the monetary system, as we have explained. What is most pertinent to the masses of workers around the world, however, is that in order to stabilize the dollar, the world capitalist class will more and more resort to repressive measures, including the "export" of U. S. inflation to other countries.

In arming workers to combat this, Marxists should not lie to them. That is the method of the enemy. □

Antiwar Actions Planned in New Zealand

"Antiwar Mobilisation Committees in Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch have made plans for renewed activity," reported the July 13 issue of *Socialist Action*, fortnightly newspaper of the Socialist Action League, the New Zealand Trotskyist organization. The committees are seeking to coordinate their work on a national scale, involving as many cities as possible in a more effective campaign against New Zealand and U. S. interference in Southeast Asia.

A press release issued July 5 by the National Mobilisation Committee outlined its plans:

"Nation-wide antiwar pickets on July 27, along with a national speaking tour by a U. S. Vietnam veteran, Ron Eckrich, are some of the activities planned by a newly formed National Mobilisation Committee for Out of Southeast Asia Now.

"This new national committee has the support of the Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch Mobilisation

Committees, the antiwar coalitions which played leading roles in building the nation-wide mass demonstrations against the war in 1971-72.

"This stepping up of antiwar activities is the result of the fact that the Vietnam Peace Agreement has failed to end the war in Indochina. The United States is still bombing Cambodia; fighting continues throughout South Vietnam; hundreds of thousands of prisoners are still held in President Thieu's jails; and President Nixon has already threatened to reescalate the war in Vietnam if he does not get his way. One of the aims of this new National Mobilisation Committee will be to explain that the war in Indochina cannot be ended until all U. S. armed forces are completely out of S. E. Asia. The nation-wide speaking tour and the pickets planned for late July will be geared toward explaining this fact, as will all future projects undertaken by this new national body." □

Behind the Rise of the Teamsters Union

Teamster Power is the second of a projected series of three books on the rise of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters (IBT) written by a leader in the struggles that transformed the small, ineffective union into the most powerful labor organization in the United States.

The first book in the series, *Teamster Rebellion*, was published last year (Monad Press, 192 pp., \$2.25, £.95). It described the famous 1934 Minneapolis Teamster strike led by Local 574, the decisive battle in a struggle that changed the city from a "scabs' paradise" into a union town.

Under the leadership of Trotskyist militants, Local 574 grew during 1933-34 from a membership of less than 100 to several thousand. Even more important than its quantitative growth was its transformation into an instrument of class struggle, an example that inspired workers not only in Minneapolis but across the country.

In *Teamster Power*, Farrell Dobbs now describes how the revitalized Local 574 worked a similar transformation on the IBT through the drive to organize long-distance drivers in an eleven-state area.

Dobbs was not only a leader of Local 574 and the interstate organizing campaign. He was also one of the Trotskyist militants who provided the understanding and strategy that made it possible for the Teamsters to win victories. This makes his account a textbook on the role of the revolutionary party in the unions.

Before the eleven-state organizing campaign could be launched, Local 574 had found itself forced to fight for its existence against an attack by Daniel Tobin, the president of the IBT. A thoroughly conservative and class-collaborationist bureaucrat, Tobin was alarmed by the militancy of Local 574 and by its revolutionary leadership. In mid-1935, he expelled Local 574 and attempted to set up a fake "Local 500" to replace it.

The consequent struggle lasted a

year. Throughout, the leaders of Local 574 insisted that the union continue to act as a local of the IBT, refusing to be drawn into the trap of trying to "go it alone." Local 574 continued to aid the organizing attempts of other IBT locals and American Federation of Labor (AFL)

Teamster Power by Farrell Dobbs.
New York: Monad Press, 1973.
255 pp. \$2.95, £1.25. Exclusive distributor: Pathfinder Press, Inc., New York.

unions, winning the respect and support of workers throughout the area. At the same time, it reacted swiftly to all raiding attempts by "Local 500," calling strikes when necessary to prevent back-room deals between the bosses and Tobin's representatives.

Tobin was eventually forced to call off his attempt to destroy Local 574, proposing a face-saving compromise in the form of a merger between it and his fake local under a new name, Local 544. Recognizing that the aim of the struggle was not revenge against Tobin but rather the creation of conditions favorable to a militant organizing drive, the Trotskyist leaders of 574 recommended acceptance of the compromise.

They did so even though they would be outnumbered four to three by Tobin's representatives on the new executive board. This situation obviously involved risks, but Dobbs and his fellow revolutionists in the Teamsters were confident that the new executive would either be forced to adapt themselves to the class-struggle program favored by the membership or be bypassed by the ranks—a calculation that proved correct.

The new Local 544 was soon able to begin preparations for the over-the-road organizing campaign. Through the *Northwest Organizer*, the paper of the Minneapolis Teamsters Joint Council, the campaign was pop-

ularized and contact was established with other union militants throughout the region.

Dobbs was the central strategist of the campaign. Once again, the leaders of Local 544 had to contend with Tobin's obstruction. But by concentrating their fire on the bosses, they forced the bureaucrat into a position of having to choose—in full view of the ranks — between the bosses and the workers. In the end Tobin was forced to give his formal approval to the organizing drive. This in turn made it easier to secure the cooperation of Teamster officials throughout the eleven-state area.

The over-the-road campaign was to produce results that were unprecedented in U.S. history. By October of 1939, the Teamsters had won a regional contract providing substantial improvements in wages and working conditions for nearly 200,000 drivers employed by 2,500 companies.

Moreover, the example of the eleven-state campaign inspired teamster organizers and drivers in other areas. By the end of 1939 the IBT, which had only 80,000 members in 1933, had grown to a membership of 500,000.

Dobbs's highly readable account of the growth of the Teamsters Union is an invaluable contribution to the history of the U.S. labor movement. Readers of *Teamster Rebellion* and *Teamster Power* will be eagerly awaiting the third book in this series.

— Allen Myers

Employment Trends

There has been a noticeable decrease in the number of persons applying for jobs with the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency since that organization was implicated in the Watergate scandal, according to a July 3 United Press International report.

Top CIA officials have admitted aiding burglars who broke into the office of Daniel Ellsberg's psychiatrist.

A CIA spokesman told UPI's reporter that there had been a "clearly discernible" decline in the number of job applications. "He said, however, that it was too early to tell whether it reflected a disenchantment on the part of young Americans with government intelligence operations . . . or simply reflected changing employment conditions in some parts of the country."

Or perhaps many potential agents are still working for Nixon's campaign office.