

# Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 15, No. 19

© 1977 by Intercontinental Press

May 23, 1977

75¢

## No Home Port for Leaky Nuclear-Powered Ship



Continual rallies like this one have denied the 'Mutsu' landing rights at any port in Japan. See p. 592.

**A Well-Rehearsed Summit Conference**

**Debacle of Paisley's 'General Strike'**

**Battle Renewed Against the Concorde**

**The Debate at NOW's National Conference**

**Three Facets of 'Euro-Communism'**

**CIA Activity in Australia**

**Québec's Language Policy**

**Mounting Pressure in Brazil**

# Mexican Trotskyist Leader Assassinated

## A Well-Rehearsed Summit Conference

By Joseph Hansen

The two-day "Downing Street summit," which took place in London May 7-8, has been hailed in the American press as a historic event.

The gathering consisted of prime ministers James Callaghan (Britain), Pierre Elliott Trudeau (Canada), Giulio Andreotti (Italy), Takeo Fukuda (Japan); President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing (France); Chancellor Helmut Schmidt (West Germany); and—last but not least—Jimmy Carter of the United States.

The press quoted the participants as agreeing that a "new leader" of the NATO powers had appeared; namely, Carter.

Other than that, the commentators have been unable to point to much in the way of achievements. In fact they have felt compelled to say that the conference was marked more by style than substance.

A good example is the analysis by Hedrick Smith, which appeared in the May 15 issue of the *New York Times*. As he sees it, summit conferences follow a familiar pattern of four stages to which this one was no exception.

In the first stage, "the buildup," officials of the "White House and State, Defense or Treasury Department" consult with their "counterparts from other countries to patch together an agenda, work out the possibilities for agreement and isolate areas of potential dispute so that they can be avoided."

This was done in preparation for the Downing Street summit. The architect in charge was Henry Owen, "a craggy, white-haired, articulate New Yorker. . . ."

His background briefings in the high-ceilinged elegance of the State Department Building were the signal that the vital bargaining and briefings of the preliminary rounds were under way. For, well before President Carter sat down last weekend with the leaders of Britain, Canada, France, Germany, Italy and Japan, Mr. Owen and a handful of colleagues negotiated with their foreign counterparts the essence of what their chiefs of government would grandly announce to the world from the stage of the Banqueting House in Whitehall.

So effective was the publicity buildup that 1,400 journalists rushed to London, putting considerable strain on the duplicating equipment on which press handouts were run off.

"The second stage of such gatherings is the conference itself," Hedrick Smith notes. ". . . The stage had been carefully set, not only by Mr. Owen and his aides but at a private dress rehearsal for the conference held at Versailles a week ahead

of time, where the Europeans and Americans agreed not to disagree publicly on crucial economic issues when they met in London."

After the dress rehearsal, the participants concentrated on what they were most concerned about—polishing up their political images. This they worked at through "getting-to-know-you" horseplay:

The European leaders took full advantage of these getting-to-know-you aspects in London last week. And President Carter also proved adept at the art. So clever was he in fact in practicing the diplomacy of compromise and charisma that President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing of France praised him as a leader who "didn't try to force others to align their position with the United States." . . .

By the time the limousines were delivering the Western leaders to No. 10 Downing Street, they seemed less intent on deciding issues of substance than in taking the measure of the new American President or using the occasion to bolster their political standing at home.

"The third stage of summitry," according to Smith, "is the questioning period. It usually follows the conference's final communiqué. The thrust of this stage is to sift through the rhetoric and optimism of the conference to get at What Really Happened."

In London, true to form, almost at once economic analysts criticized the modesty of the accomplishments and recalled that the previous economic gatherings at Rambouillet in 1975 and Puerto Rico in 1976 had not sharply changed the world economy or brought under control the unemployment, inflation and trade deficits that bedevil the industrialized West.

The fourth and final phase of a summit conference, according to Smith, is its meaning after time has gone by:

This stage has not of course come for the London conference. The ultimate impact of the meeting will not be known for several months until the leaders' proclamations of interdependence and vows of good intentions are put to practical tests.

### Message From the Pentagon

The first practical test came soon; in fact on May 9, the day following the summit conference. The heads of the governments of Britain, France, the United States, and West Germany held a special meeting at 10 Downing Street that lasted two hours and forty minutes. The subject was military preparations.

A communiqué was issued, warning Moscow not to endanger the status quo in

Berlin. The May 10 *New York Times* reported:

The statement was not prompted by any crisis or urgent problems, however. Sources in several delegations said that the leaders had decided it was the right moment to send a stern but purposely unprovocative message to Moscow—not only about Berlin but also by implication about Africa and Asia—making it clear that they were in no mood to yield any ground in the face of Soviet truculence.

The saber-rattling statement doubtlessly constituted part of Carter's buildup for the resumption of SALT talks. It also dovetailed with Pentagon propaganda about a big new gap in the military capacities of the Soviet Union and the United States.

At a NATO conference held in London on May 10, Carter continued this bellicose line. Among the things he said in his address were the following:

Achieving our political goals depends on a credible defense and deterrent. The United States supports the existing strategy of flexible response and forward defense. We will continue to provide our share of the powerful forces adequate to fulfill this strategy. We will maintain an effective strategic deterrent, we will keep diverse and modern theater nuclear forces in Europe, and we will maintain and improve conventional forces based here.

The threat facing the alliance has grown steadily in recent years. The Soviet Union has achieved essential strategic nuclear equivalence. Its theater nuclear forces have been strengthened. The Warsaw Pact's conventional forces in Europe emphasize an offensive posture. These forces are much stronger than needed for any defense purpose. Since 1965, new ground and air weapons have been introduced in most major categories: self-propelled artillery, mobile tactical missiles, mobile air defense guns, armored personnel carriers, tactical aircraft, and tanks. The pace of the pact's buildup continues undiminished.

Carter pressed for the elimination of "waste and duplication." He agreed to promote "a genuinely two-way trans-Atlantic trade in defense equipment." All of this, particularly Carter's vow to maintain a nuclear stockpile in Europe, constitutes part of the justification for an astronomical war budget, while throwing the blame for it on the Soviet Union.

### Scintillating Showmanship

As an actor, Carter easily reached the level of Ronald Reagan, the Hollywood star who became governor of California. Of Carter's many triumphs, here is a typical one as described by Charles Mohr in a dispatch to the May 7 *New York Times* from Newcastle-Upon-Tyne:

"You were born a Georgian," the Lord Mayor of this industrial city told the President. "You have now become a Geordie."

"Haway the lads!" said Jimmy Carter, using the war chant of soccer fans in this northeast England city, whose residents call themselves Geordies. A crowd of about 10,000 gathered on a green between a neo-Gothic church and a starkly modern civic center let loose a roar of approval.

The *Times* of London put on a proper glow:

For the first time since President Kennedy died, the Western world can feel that it has a leader—and one who can both arouse the enthusiasm of peoples and inspire the confidence of statesmen.

Giscard d'Estaing was reported to have said that Carter struck him as a man of "great simplicity and modesty, low-keyed, who accepts the advice and even criticism of others."

In the May 14 *New York Times*, C. L. Sulzberger quoted one of the participants as saying:

Carter was impressed by Schmidt's guts. He was also impressed by Giscard's performance, the sheer intellectual quality. As for Carter himself, he came across pretty well among the seven. They could not help but be impressed by the fact that he and his Administration are going to be around four more years, maybe eight, when most of the rest are not.

The script was intended to make a great TV spectacle in the United States. For his first 100 days in office, Carter played the role of a man of the people, in 100 percent contrast to the slinking villain Nixon. Following this, a trip abroad would elevate Carter into a "world leader," and help assure a second term in office for him.

Did Carter make the grade in the record time of five days abroad (May 5-10)? It seems so. But then the show was well rehearsed. Everyone had to agree on that as the new trainer snapped his fingers and the performing seals went through their act. □

## \$118.5 Billion War Budget

A conference of senators and representatives agreed May 11 to recommend approval of a record \$118.5 billion in war appropriations for the year beginning October 1. The amount is more than \$11 billion higher than last year's figure, and if passed would represent the highest allocation for military spending in American history.

The \$118.5 billion recommendation was a compromise hammered out after a series of meetings between House and Senate caucuses.

Both the Senate and House had already voted to raise arms spending, but were in disagreement on the precise amount. The Senate favored \$1.8 billion more than the \$118.5 billion figure and the House wanted \$1.4 billion less.

Representatives objected to a figure higher than \$118.5 billion on the grounds that they might be unable to get it adopted by the House.

During the haggling, Senator Edmund Muskie suggested a few "savings," such as using more unspent appropriations from the previous year and assuming a lower inflation rate than that projected by the Pentagon. □

## In This Issue

Closing News Date: May 16, 1977

FEATURES	577	104 Journalists Imprisoned Around World
	578	Three Facets of "Euro-Communism" —by Ernest Mandel
IRELAND	564	The Debacle of Ian Paisley's "General Strike"—by Gerry Foley
	571	Special Court Gives Marie Murray Life Term
USA	566	Long Islanders Renew Battle Against Concorde—by Fred Murphy
	570	The Debate at NOW's National Conference—by Judy White
SPAIN	566	Cops Try to Crush Basque Demonstrations
MEXICO	567	Mexican Trotskyist Leader Assassinated on Campus—by Eugenia Aranda
BRAZIL	568	The Pressures for Liberalization
ARGENTINA	569	Case of Luisa Segura
	572	Rulers Discuss Need to Clean Up Junta's Image
IRAN	573	SAVAK Reveals "Secrets" of the Iranian Trotskyists—by Jamshid Yavari
CZECHOSLOVAKIA	573	Italian CP Offers Job to Hübl
CANADA	574	What Québec's Language Policy Really Says—by Dick Fidler
	575	Trudeau Threatens to Overturn Law
AUSTRALIA	576	Testimony at U.S. Trial Reveals CIA Activity—by Allen Myers
SRI LANKA	582	May Day Rallies Demand Release of All Political Prisoners
ITALY	583	Crisis of System and Workers Strategy to Meet It—Interview With Livio Maitan
JAPAN	592	Government Seeks Home Port for Nuclear Ship With Leaky Reactor—by Mutsugoro Kawasaki
NEWS ANALYSIS	562	A Well-Rehearsed Summit Conference
	563	\$118.5 Billion War Budget
SELECTIONS		
FROM THE LEFT	586	
AROUND THE WORLD	588	10,000 Students March in São Paulo
CAPITALISM		
FOULS THINGS UP	590	New Hampshire Protesters Win Release
DRAWINGS	568	Ernesto Geisel; 572, Jorge Videla; 579, Enrico Berlinguer—by Copain

Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Varick Street Station, New York, N.Y. 10014. Published in New York each Monday except the first in January and the third and fourth in August.

**Application to mail at second-class postage rates is pending at New York, N.Y.**

**Editor:** Joseph Hansen.

**Contributing Editors:** Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, Ernest Mandel, George Novack.

**Editorial Staff:** Michael Baumann, Gerry Foley, Ernest Harsch, Susan Wald, Steve Wattenmaker, Judy White.

**Business Manager:** Pat Galligan.

**Copy Editors:** Jon Britton, Fred Murphy, Sally Rhett.

**Technical Staff:** Paul Deveze, Ellen Fischer, Larry Ingram, Arthur Lobman, James M. Morgan. 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 stands on the program of the Fourth International.

**Paris Office:** Pierre Frank, 10 Impasse Guéméné, 75004, Paris, France.

**To Subscribe:** For one year send \$24 to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Varick Street Station, New York, N.Y. 10014. Write for rates on first class and airmail.

For airmail subscriptions in Europe: Write to Pathfinder Press, 47 The Cut, London SE1 8LL. In Australia: Write to Pathfinder Press, P.O. Box 151, Gebe 2037. In New Zealand: Write to Socialist Books, P.O. Box 1663, Wellington.

Subscription correspondence should be addressed to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Varick Street Station, New York, N.Y. 10014.

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.

Intercontinental Press is published by the 408 Printing and Publishing Corporation, 408 West Street, New York, N.Y. 10014. Offices at 408 West Street, New York, N.Y.

Copyright © 1977 by Intercontinental Press.



### The Debacle of Ian Paisley's 'General Strike'

By Gerry Foley

An attempt to carry out a Protestant general strike in Northern Ireland was abandoned on May 14 by its organizers, the ultrarightist United Unionist Action Council (UUAC).

For eleven days, relying on the muscle of the Protestant terrorist organizations, the UUAC had tried to force a shutdown of the economic life of the British enclave in Ireland.

Ostensibly the strike was called to press demands on the British government to restore a Protestant-dominated local parliament and open a war of extermination against the Irish nationalist organizations.

The ultrarightist Protestant groups proved unable to repeat their success of 1974, when they did paralyze Northern Ireland and won apparent concessions from the British government. The reasons for this failure were evident.

In 1974, at least a section of the British authorities condoned the strike. This time, the decisive sectors were firmly opposed to it. Once these sectors took a definite position, the bourgeois Unionists and the Protestant labor aristocracy, which continues to identify its interests with those of imperialist capital, fell into line. Once it was clear that the reactionary Protestant murder gangs could not count on the connivance of the British authorities, the Loyalists' attempts to achieve their objectives by intimidating the Protestant population backfired.

In his statement calling off the strike, the preacher-demagogue Ian Paisley indirectly acknowledged the power of the Protestant community's reaction against intimidation. He said: "Too many lives have been lost during the past seven years to put one more at risk."

During the abortive strike, Protestant rightist gangs reportedly killed at least three persons, all Protestants. In 1974 most of the victims were Catholics, including thirty-one persons in Dublin and County Monaghan in the formally independent part of the country, who were killed by bombs planted by the ultraright pro-imperialist forces.

It was already clear that this latest Loyalist strike attempt was collapsing on May 12, when the port of Larne was reopened. Shutting down this port had been the UUAC's major success.

Characteristically, a very small group of relatively highly paid workers was involved in the Larne shutdown. A May 12 Associated Press dispatch claimed that there were a total of 110 dock workers and

that the port was reopened when half of these, 55 men, returned to work. In its accounts, the *Irish Times* said that a total of thirty-four stevedores were involved, of whom a majority had voted to support the strike.

Decisive in the success or failure of the Loyalist attempt—the Irish, British, and American press repeatedly pointed out—were a few hundred electrical engineers at the Ballylumford power station across an inlet from the port of Larne. This installation, isolated on the Larne peninsula, can be reached only by ferry from the port. The entire area is deep in right-wing Unionist territory.

This time, unlike 1974, when power cuts assured the success of the Loyalist general strike against including Catholics in an extremely limited form of local government for Northern Ireland, the engineers resisted the appeals of the right-wing leaders.

The Ballylumford power workers voted 286 to 171 by secret ballot against participating in the strike. In order to maintain this position, they had to resist intimidation.

In a TV broadcast May 6, Paisley made clear what kind of pressures were being brought to bear. The May 7 *Irish Times* reported:

Mr. Paisley suggested in a BBC broadcast last night that the vote at the plant was not a proper one, even though it was taken in secret and supervised by the shop stewards. He said the people of nearby Larne had told him they were "very sore" with the power workers' decision. They called on the Ballylumford workers who supported the strike to come out and stand up for Ulster in this crisis hour.

The strike leaders made it clear that they intended to use the minority supporting them in the plant as a spearhead of an intimidation campaign.

The *Irish Times* noted that a crowd of up to 200 persons had gathered outside the Ballylumford station on the night of May 6. However, it pointed out that among those most opposed to the strike were the top engineers and that only a really massive movement or generalized terror could affect them.

The Loyalist enforcers made it clear that they were ready to use terror against the Protestant workers to achieve their objectives. In the first days of the strike, a gunman fired three shots into a school bus full of children in Bangor, County Down, a strongly Protestant area. A few days later, two Protestant bus drivers were injured in Protestant neighborhoods in Belfast. One

suffered face burns when his bus was hijacked and set afire. The other was seriously wounded by a rightist gunman.

On May 7, a number of Protestant terrorist groups made a joint statement saying:

We strongly advise the working people of Northern Ireland to keep off the streets, as we can no longer be responsible for their safety.

Among the organizations signing the statement were the Ulster Defence Association, the Ulster Volunteer Force, the Ulster Freedom Fighters, the Red Hand Commandos, the Down Orange Welfare, the Orange Volunteers, the Protestant Action Force, and the Ulster Special Constabulary Association.

On May 8, according to United Press International, the Ulster Freedom Fighters (UFF) said "it would coerce the Protestant community into backing the strike." The UFF is generally considered to be a title used by the Ulster Defence Association in specifically terrorist operations. The UDA itself is a large organization that functions relatively openly in the Protestant neighborhoods.

On May 10, Loyalist enforcers shot a Protestant bus driver in central Belfast.

The following day, bus drivers throughout Northern Ireland came out on strike. But they were not joining the Loyalist action. They were protesting against the enforcers.

The power workers also threatened to strike in protest against the intimidation to which they were being subjected by Loyalist fanatics and enforcers.

The attempt by the organizers of the failing strike to revive it by declaring war on the Protestant population brought the first split in the leadership of the UUAC. Ernest Baird said that he rejected violence and intimidation. Next to Paisley, Baird is the most prominent figure in the council, having in fact organized that body.

According to a May 11 dispatch from *New York Times* correspondent Joseph Collins, Paisley tried to blame the killings on "American secret agents" and a "dirty tricks department" used by British Secretary of State for Northern Ireland Roy Mason.

The politicians who represent the bourgeoisie more directly than the ultrarightists and their murder gangs used the reaction in the Protestant community to cut their fascist-like auxiliaries down to size.

Responding to the UFF threat, William Craig, the right-wing Unionist politician who, as Northern Ireland Home Minister in 1968, ordered the police attacks on Catholic civil-rights demonstrations, said:

How Loyalists can be so vicious against fellow-Loyalists is beyond my comprehension. They seem to delight in punishing fellow-Loyalists.

On May 4, James Molyneaux, leader of the Official Unionist parliamentary delegation at Westminster announced the end



of his party's coalition with the more violently reactionary Unionist groups. He claimed that the Loyalist strike was part of an attempt to set up an independent Protestant government in Northern Ireland. He said:

I would not like to be a member of such a provisional government because you would be quickly liquidated by these elements.

Molyneux said that he could not foresee a possibility of working with Paisley again in the future, because the preacher-demagogue had abandoned the democratic process. The "respectable" Unionist leader said:

I would feel anxious about sitting around a table with representatives of paramilitary groups, some of whose members have been convicted of murder.

Molyneux's statements were completely hypocritical. Paisley's links with Protestant murder gangs have been known since the Malvern Street murders in 1966. In fact, his special role has been to serve as the bridge between these groups and the parliamentary Unionists.

Paisley responded to such disavowals from "gentlemen" Unionists with equal hypocrisy but with the verbal violence favored by a long line of preacher-demagogues such as the celebrated "Roaring Hanna":

When I consider the drunkenness, lewdness, immorality and filthy language of many of those members [of parliament], I care absolutely nothing for their opinions. Ulster protestants are not interested in gaining the goodwill of such reprobates.

The loss of "gentlemanly" patronage, however, had some painful results for the Loyalist gangs. It exposed them to rough handling by the Royal Ulster Constabulary. One such incident occurred outside the UDA headquarters on Newtownards Road in Belfast, where the RUC chased away a group blocking the thoroughfare. This provoked the following angry but contradictory outburst by Andy Tyrrie, the leader of the UDA, which was reported in the May 7 *Irish Times*:

He yelled at a senior policeman, right in front of a startled RTE [Radio-Telefís Éireann] camera crew: "We're having no more of it. If you want to fight, we'll fight you. But we're not fighting the RUC. I'm telling you now, we're not fighting, so clear off the whole lot of you. Go away. If you want trouble, we'll give you it. We're not doing any more talking, because you stand and the IRA shoots you, murders you, murders UDR [Ulster Defence Regiment] men, and you can pour four thousand troops into East Belfast to beat the prods into the ground.

Tyrrie's statement hardly amounted to defiance of the RUC. Nonetheless, the UDA immediately repudiated it, saying that he had "fallen into a trap." The May 5 *Irish Times* noted:

When Paisley arrived soon afterwards at UDA HQ, he spoke to reporters outside, emphasising

that he had not been there when the trouble happened. "There'll be no strains in the strategy," he said. "Mr. Tyrrie has admitted he fell into Mr. Mason's trap, which he ought not to have done . . . he shouldn't allow himself to be put into a situation where Protestants are seen to be in confrontation with forces of the Crown."

In order to avoid such a "confrontation," Paisley said, there would be no further attempts to barricade roads. This sequence of events is familiar to anyone who has watched Protestant demonstrations "get out of hand."

There is a constant tendency for these fanatical mobs to come into conflict with Protestant police or British forces that have to keep the communal conflict within the framework of overall imperialist policy. On such occasions, apparently authoritative figures always appear to warn the crown not to fall into the "IRA's trap."

This is not to say that there is not a certain resentment between the rank-and-file goons and the Unionist "gentlemen." For one thing, the Protestant police and the British army have had to jail some Loyalist terrorists to preserve the pretense of a rule of law. Such resentment can take nasty forms, as Official Unionist Member of Parliament Harold McCusker was reminded on May 5, when he went to Armagh to testify on behalf of Loyalist vigilantes arrested for maintaining illegal roadblocks. The *Irish Times* reported:

As Mr. McCusker left the courthouse . . . the [Protestant] crowd, now alerted to his presence, attacked him with feet and fists. Despite a swift police escort, men continued to kick the MP and he received blows on the legs and in the groin.

Despite such tensions, the Unionist "gentlemen" and goons are bound inseparably together and to their British overlords.

The fact that the British and the "gentlemen" decided to remind the goons of their place did not mean that they were throwing them to the hounds. Key Official Unionist politicians such as John Taylor, who succeeded Craig as Northern Ireland home minister, indicated that they did not expect the strike failure to end Paisley's career. And in the May 7 *Irish Times*, David McKittrick reported:

Harry West [leader of the largest Unionist faction] made it quite clear, right through the past week, that he agreed with the objectives of the strikers and rejected only their tactics. That was one of his reasons for launching his security initiative and going to see Roy Mason—to make it clear that the Unionist Party would not in any way regard the strike's failure as a defeat for its policies.

One thing the British authorities obviously hoped to gain by slapping down the Loyalists was to improve the image of the "security forces." In the Westminster parliament May 5, Roy Mason's deputy Don Concannon said that the RUC had given a "further demonstration, if that was needed, of their ability to act as an impartial and effective force."

The RUC had been discredited in the eyes of British and world opinion by its role in leading Protestant pogroms in 1969.

The English racist Enoch Powell, MP for the Protestant constituency of South County Down, said that the "events of the past three days were proving that the commitment of the overwhelming majority of the people of Northern Ireland was to constitutional action and the maintenance of the rule of law."

The Peace People, discredited as a pro-British operation, took advantage of the Loyalist strike to try to regain some humanitarian luster. Leaders of the organization announced that they were helping to deliver milk in Belfast neighborhoods.

The British authorities used the strike as an excuse to announce stepped up repression against the nationalist organizations. This was done in the guise of "reassuring" key sections of Protestant workers about "security" and thus keeping them from supporting the strike. The May 7 *Irish Times* reported:

There were some fears from SDLP [the Catholic bourgeois nationalist party] that Mr. Mason might have made a mistake in appearing to give the power workers some concessions on security—and in fact Mr. Paisley hailed what Mr. Mason told them as a victory for the Action Council.

Mr. Mason told the workers on Thursday that measures in hand included an increase in the strength of the RUC and the Ulster Defence Regiment's full-time section, a review of terrorist laws, and increase in "SAS-type activities" [e.g., use of secret commando units to assassinate republicans] and the formation of 10 RUC divisional mobile support units.

At the same time, the government tried to reassure Catholics that these measures were not concessions to the Loyalists but had been decided on previously. In fact, the role of the British government in the two Loyalist strikes shows plainly that the idea that London is vulnerable to Unionist pressure is a delusion.

A comparison of the 1974 and 1977 Loyalist strikes shows once again that Unionism is the creation of the British imperialists and remains dependent on them.

At the same time, however, the 1977 strike shows the many-sided and flexible means the British use to preserve their rule of Northern Ireland.

The defeat of the Loyalist strike will almost certainly be used to justify a new offensive against "the Catholic extremists."

To defend themselves against this, the oppressed Catholic community needs clearer political understanding and a more effective strategy than have been provided by any of the traditional organizations.

But the experience of this last Loyalist strike should have helped to weaken some particularly harmful illusions, such as the idea that Protestant workers can pursue their own class objectives while remaining Unionists. □

### Long Islanders Renew Battle Against the Concorde

By Fred Murphy

The Concorde, the ear-shattering supersonic jetliner that has been breaking windows and shaking homes in communities near the London, Paris, and Washington, D.C., airports for more than a year, may finally gain permission to do the same in areas near New York's Kennedy International Airport. That is, if Manhattan Federal Judge Milton Pollack's May 11 decision is allowed to stand.

Pollack ruled that the New York Port Authority cannot prevent the Concorde from using Kennedy. He said the Port Authority's ban on the plane was in "irreconcilable conflict" with a February 1976 decision by then-Secretary of Transportation William Coleman to allow sixteen months of test flights by the supersonic transport (SST) at Kennedy and at Dulles airport in Washington. Pollack's ruling clears the way for Concorde flights at Kennedy, which British and French airline officials say will begin by June 20.

The ruling against the ban was greeted with outrage in the communities near the airport, where opposition has been militant and vocal. "I'd like the judge to move here and see how he likes it," said one woman in Cedarhurst, Long Island.

Residents took little comfort in the fact that the "test flights" are only to last sixteen months. "By that time we will all be deaf or in mental institutions," said another woman.

The federal court ruling was the culmination of a multimillion-dollar lobbying, legal, and advertising effort by Air France and British Airways, the owners of the \$3 billion jet. The aid of numerous former U.S. government officials has been enlisted in this campaign. Among them are Charles Goodell, ex-U.S. senator from New York; Richard Aurelio, ex-deputy mayor of New York City; Eugene Rossides, ex-assistant secretary of the treasury; John Reilly, ex-federal trade commissioner; Donald Agger, ex-assistant secretary of transportation; William Reynolds, ex-Senate aide; and John A. Wells, a longtime adviser to Nelson Rockefeller.

In addition, the law firms of William P. Rogers, former secretary of state, and William D. Ruckelshaus, ex-administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, are handling legal matters in the case.

The Port Authority plans to appeal the ruling to a higher court, and will also ask that it not be enforced as long as this appeal is taking place. Governor Hugh Carey expressed the fear of New York officials: "I believe that the landing and takeoff of the Concorde at this time could

have grave consequences."

Meanwhile, British and French officials were pleased with Pollack's ruling. "My reaction . . . is one of great satisfaction and joy," said Marcel Cavaille, French state secretary for transportation. The *New York Times* featured a photo of Air France General Manager G. Antoine Giro, who "exulted over a glass of champagne."

A British government spokesman called the decision "very good news indeed, both commercially for us and from the point of view of relations with Washington."

The White House had no comment, but U.S. Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams was "relieved and satisfied."

French President Valéry Giscard d'Estaing expressed his attitude several days before the ruling in an interview with Tom Brokaw of NBC News:

*Brokaw:* Would you mind living near where the Concorde lands and takes off?

*Giscard:* You have Concorde several times a week landing in Washington. Did you ever hear any complaints about it?

*Brokaw:* There is a difference between Kennedy airport because there are more people [affected by planes] landing at Kennedy.

*Giscard:* Well, there is a difference. The Kennedy airport is on the sea, and the sea is crowded by fishes, not by people.

The residents of Howard Beach and the



Herblock/Washington Post

other victims of aircraft noise near Kennedy airport are getting ready to mount renewed protests.

When flights begin, "we'll be there on the runways en masse to greet them," says Bryan Levinson, a leader of the SST Concorde Alert Program. This group has organized traffic tie-ups at Kennedy in the past to protest the Concorde.

Carol Berman of the Emergency Coalition to Stop the SST, a Long Island group that has hesitated to participate in the airport protests, said she "would be very surprised" if the coalition did not vote to participate in future actions. "People are outraged," she said. "They know their way to the airport." □

### Spanish Cops Try to Crush Basque Demonstrations

Less than two weeks after unleashing its police against the May 1 rallies organized by the free trade unions, the Suárez government has tried to crush mobilizations in the Basque country demanding freedom for the nationalists jailed under Franco who still remain in prison.

On May 12, a general strike began throughout the Basque country to press demands for a complete amnesty. According to the May 13 *Washington Post*, Spanish officials admitted that at least 150,000 workers had downed tools.

The *Post* article reported what happened in San Sebastián on the first day of the strike:

Riot police firing rubber bullets and smoke bombs . . . dispersed Basque nationalist demonstrators demanding the release of all political prisoners. Sources said one man was killed by gunfire and another was seriously wounded.

An old-age pensioner was gunned down

by police in Rentería, a small town near San Sebastián.

On May 13, twenty-eight-year-old labor leader Juan Erice was killed in Pamplona. He was shot through the head by cops, according to Reuters, "after he fell to the ground while trying to run away from a police charge in a narrow street." Erice was described as a "leftist."

There are still thirty-three Basque nationalist prisoners serving long terms who have not benefited from the various amnesty decrees issued since Franco's death. Many other persons have also been arrested in banned demonstrations demanding a complete amnesty.

The Suárez government's murderous attacks on mass demonstrations of Basques demanding the release of Franco's victims show how reluctant and limited its "democratic" concessions have been. They show that the generalissimo's heirs are neither willing nor able to "democratize" a prison house of peoples. □



## Mexican Trotskyist Leader Assassinated on Campus

By Eugenia Aranda

[The following article is taken from the May 23 issue of *Perspectiva Mundial*. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

Alfonso Peralta Reyes, a thirty-eight-year-old member of the Political Bureau of the Mexican Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores [PRT—Revolutionary Workers party], was assassinated at 10:45 a.m. May 12 in Mexico City. He was a founding member of the Sindicato del Personal Académico de la Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México [SPAUNAM—Union of Academic Personnel of the Autonomous National University of Mexico], which has since become part of the Sindicato de Trabajadores de la UNAM [STUNAM—Union of Workers of the UNAM], and a member of its General Representative Council.

Alfonso Peralta gave classes on history at the Azcapotzalco branch of the College of Sciences and Humanities. He was gunned down as he came out of a classroom there along with several students and comrades.

According to a report in the Mexican daily *Excelsior* May 13, witnesses to the crime said the killers were lying in ambush, waiting for Peralta to come out into the hallway.

*Excelsior* also reported that "beside the body was found a leaflet entitled 'Madera.' Its text said, 'This is how political police who infiltrate the workers movement end up.'"

It is alleged the "Madera" is the organ of the "Liga Comunista 23 de Septiembre" [September 23 Communist League].

In a display advertisement published in the May 13 *Excelsior*, the PRT declared: "On that basis and on the basis of earlier death threats directed at Comrade Peralta by that newspaper, there is in fact adequate reason to believe that this organization was the perpetrator of the crime. Such actions, totally alien to the tradition of the revolutionary workers movement, provide an important service to the real enemies of the left—the bourgeoisie and its state."

The text continued: "That is why our party demands an immediate investigation of the murder, along with punishment for its perpetrators. Any delay in clearing up this murder by those in charge of carrying out the investigation will be the best proof that the murderers enjoy the complicity of this country's police apparatus."

In the same issue of *Excelsior* display advertisements appeared from STUNAM; from the Coordinator of the College of Sciences and Humanities, David Pantoja

Morán; from the workers, teachers, and students of the College of Sciences and Humanities at Azcapotzalco; from the administration and professors of the College of Sciences and Humanities; and from the Mexican Communist party. They all protested the murder and demanded punishment of the assassins.

The funeral, held May 13, was converted into a demonstration of more than 1,000 persons. They formed a cortege, marching from the College of Sciences and Humanities at Azcapotzalco to the mausoleum where Peralta was buried. Since the majority of the schools are out on vacation, the number of persons was significant.

The murder of Comrade Peralta took place in the context of growing political violence in Mexico—the government's offensive against the universities, especially the University of Oaxaca; the smashing of peasant struggles throughout the country by bringing in the army; and, most importantly, the government drive to break the workers movement by attacking trade unions that reject placing the burden of the crisis on the backs of the workers.

Within the workers movement, the university trade unions have been playing an increasingly important role. They have organized a series of mobilizations and struggles against President López Portillo's austerity plans. Currently, the focus of the working-class struggle in Mexico is among the trade unions of university personnel and the telephone workers.

However, for the government the university trade unions are a special case, a bigger problem, since their leadership does not belong to the ruling Partido Revolucionario Institucional [PRI—Institutional Revolutionary party] and it is not made up of bureaucrats linked in one way or another to the government.

The leadership of the SPAUNAM consisted of activists and sympathizers of various left organizations. The leadership of the STEUNAM [Sindicato de Trabajadores y Empleados de la UNAM—Union of Personnel of the UNAM] consisted of activists and sympathizers of the Communist party and other left groups.

Before the fusion of the two unions, the government tried to destroy SPAUNAM by means of the so-called teachers associations—organizations opposed to trade unions that challenged the union's representative character. The government tried to force SPAUNAM to go out on strike under unfavorable conditions so that it could be smashed. But this effort

did not get anywhere. Under such circumstances, of course, it would not be far-fetched to think that the government might resort to methods like intimidation and murder. The life of another Trotskyist, a member of STEUNAM's General Representative Council, had already been threatened. His home was raided by the police.

With regard to the assassination of Comrade Peralta, the Political Bureau of the PRT blames the "Liga Comunista 23 de Septiembre." However, it is worth recalling what Marlise Simons wrote in the June 6, 1976, issue of the *Washington Post*:

... political analysts and journalists are questioning the authenticity of the league as a leftist guerrilla group and are strongly suggesting that its numerous dramatic actions stem from the growing hysteria and militancy among Mexico's far right.

As early as 1973, during a conflict in Sinaloa, the "Liga Comunista 23 de Septiembre" killed a leader that opposed their political line. On repeated occasions since that date, it has beaten up, threatened, and harassed those it describes as "reformists."

The climate of increasing political violence in Mexico can also be seen among the ranks of the trade-union bureaucracy, where murder has been resorted to as a way of getting rid of problems. Although this is nothing new for the trade-union bureaucracy, it has been occurring on a bigger scale. For example, in March of this year Heriberto Kehoe Vincent, the general secretary of the Union of Oil Workers of the Mexican Republic—a union well known for its gangsterism—was killed.

In addition, López Portillo has taken a step that only adds ominous signs to the already tense situation—on March 18 the Mexican government reopened relations with the Spanish government for the first time in thirty-three years. Moreover, López Portillo had the nerve to name as ambassador former President Gustavo Díaz Ordaz, perpetrator of the massacre of students in Tlatelolco Plaza October 2, 1968. It appears that López Portillo considered this a "subtle" way of telling all Mexicans that, if he feels it necessary, he is willing to resort to the methods of his predecessor.

In this context, the killing of a leading Trotskyist is a warning to everyone in Mexico who is fighting to improve the situation of the working masses. Alfonso Peralta was a target of the Mexican government, a government that likes to pose as "progressive." □



## The Pressures for Liberalization in Brazil

[The following article appeared in the April 1977 issue of *Independência Operária*, a monthly socialist information bulletin published in Brazil. The translation and footnotes are by *Intercontinental Press*.]

\* \* \*

When Severo Gomes resigned,<sup>1</sup> many people thought the government had finally decided on an economic plan to deal with the crisis. With the departure of the bourgeois liberal from the cabinet, the government would immediately be putting into practice a well-defined—and right-wing—political plan. Finally, dismissing the minister who was playing off-key would put the governmental orchestra in perfect tune, and it could impose its wonder-working political and economic plans and solutions on the country.

While the entire press and innumerable rumors were predicting a rightward trend and fooling big sections of the population, the February issue of *Independência Operária* stated clearly that the bosses' government had been weakened and that the most probable outcome would be a relaxation of the dictatorship.

To think otherwise would be to totally ignore the direction and working of the contradictions engendered by the economic crisis and the class struggle. It would be the same as believing that when a boiler keeps getting hotter the operator would make the mistake of closing the valves and preventing any steam from escaping.

### The Real Situation

The present situation of near-equilibrium in the relationship of forces among the various bourgeois sectors and the slow revival of the mass movement give the government a strong tendency toward economic and political immobility. Finance capital, the strongest sector and the most arrogant creditor, has been working through the International Monetary Fund to force the government to adopt a series of classical methods for resolving the crisis: slow down production, eliminate the balance of payments deficit, and control inflation.

To apply these measures the government

must increase exports, cut public expenditures, restrict credit, hold down wages even more, and promote unemployment—in other words, create a recession.

But, as the saying goes, you can't make an omelet without breaking some eggs. When the government began to put these measures into practice, it aroused hostility



GEISEL: Dictator faces mounting pressure.

in almost all sections of the population, bourgeois and nonbourgeois alike. In other words, it made new enemies and further offended the old ones.

### The Collapse of the Simonetas

The *simoneta* episode (compulsory loans) illustrates the situation the government is in. As the banks were preparing to snap up the fat profits they would get from the deposits, Geisel was forced to retreat and to yield to pressures from the automotive industry, the oil and gasoline distributors, and almost all other sectors, including the workers.

The same thing is starting to happen with interest rates. Decontrolled by the government in order to force cutbacks in industrial production, the rates tripled, leaving the bankers wallowing in money. Then the outcry of the merchants, and of the small, the middle-sized, and some of the large industrialists, obliged the government to reconsider and to try to restore controls on interest rates.

What we see in the economic field is that

the government has been taking one step forward and one step backward—in military terms, marking time. In the political arena everything has been going the same way—the government doesn't have a political plan, or, if it has one, doesn't have the strength to apply it.

During the American elections we said that the policy of the Democrats was to support and encourage bourgeois-democratic governments, as opposed to the Republican policy of clear support to dictatorships—the results of which had been disastrous for imperialism.

One could quite correctly say that they are both imperialist governments. In fact, Carter and Ford are two sides of the same coin. What must be understood is that the imperialists don't have a single policy—they use various tactics according to the situation. Underlying the pressures on the Brazilian dictatorship are the contradictory economic interests of Yankee imperialism and its conflicts with other imperialist countries such as West Germany.

The truth is that the United States is now beginning to put economic pressure on the Brazilian government, and this pressure will likely be stepped up. More than half the Brazilian foreign debt is held by American banks. So the brawl has only just begun.

March marked a resumption of expressions of bourgeois sentiments for and against a relaxation of the dictatorship. But this time, the favorable opinions were well received, while the contrary ones were rejected—even by the former patrons of such views.

The statements by Einar Kok of the Brazilian Industrialists Association supporting democratic freedoms were praised by the general who heads the Second Army, Dilermando Monteiro. And when the banker Melo Flores (from his looks, not a very fragrant flower)<sup>2</sup> proposed a hardening of the regime, this position was disavowed by the Chase Manhattan Bank, of which he is a director, and by the Bankers Association.

In São Paulo the capitalist sectors that became active in February created the IDEM [Instituto Democrático—Democratic Institute]. In a number of other states (Pernambuco, Paraná, Bahia) the bourgeois sectors also began to make their views known, increasing the support for a relaxation of the dictatorship.

In general terms, the bourgeoisie breaks

1. Severo Gomes, minister of trade and industry, resigned his post on February 8, in protest of the government's failure to deal adequately, in his opinion, with the problems of inflation and a growing foreign debt. Gomes had close ties with São Paulo businessmen who have been pressing for liberalization moves by the military regime.

2. The Portuguese word for flower is *flor*.

down into three different camps. This is not to say that one or another sector as a whole has lined up behind one or another solution, since there are different opinions within a given sector.

One solution, the most right-wing, is supported by certain bankers, financiers, reactionary military figures, and sectors of the construction industry. They want to put an end to elections and maintain the state of emergency—an eternal dictatorship.

The second solution, which has the support of a large majority of the capitalists, is that of the center-right, or the liberals. With various nuances, they all want a liberalization—more power for parliament, several political parties, a freer press; opinions differ as regards direct elections, repeal of AI-5,<sup>3</sup> and so on.

A third group, which could be called the center-left, began to gain some momentum with the visit of Mário Soares to Brazil, and with the conflict with the United States. This is the Social Democratic sector; it defends democratic rights and has the support of petty-bourgeois layers, the middle class, intellectuals, and others.

The governors of the states of Rio Grande do Sul and Alagoas delivered proposals to Geisel suggesting, among other things, the legalization of the Socialist party. This shows the intention of some bourgeois sectors to let the Social Democrats have a run, which doesn't mean that they themselves are Social Democrats. Finally, Brazil wants more exports, and Europe, a good trading partner, is a Social Democrats' paradise.

In any case, what we see among the bourgeoisie is division, discontent, the effects of the economic crisis, and the pressures of imperialism. All these factors, combined with the revival of the mass movement, demonstrate without any doubt the tendency toward a relaxation. Such an opening would not mean the end of the dictatorship, but rather the beginning of its end, the door through which the mass movement will emerge to bring down this antiworker government.

### The Mass Movement

The most active sector continues to be the middle class, particularly the student movement. The reconstruction of the DCE at the PUC,<sup>4</sup> the struggle against excessive fees in the private schools in São Paulo

and Rio de Janeiro (which in São Paulo is leading to the reconstruction of the State Union of Students), the campaign of the bank workers for a 30 percent wage increase, the strikes by the medical students—all this shows that the revival of the mass movement, still centered in the middle class, is accelerating.

In the workers movement, the absence of leadership and the lack of clarity among the vanguard layers has kept the revival from being more rapid. But the strike at White Martins in Rio, the slowdown of the 5,000 miners in Santa Catarina, and the slowdown staged by the bus drivers in Bahia are examples of a combative mood on the part of the workers, of steadily growing boldness.

This shows how important it is to have

an audacious policy of mobilizing actions, which is the only way to broaden the scope of the inevitable liberalization. It is necessary to reinforce the class-struggle oppositions in the trade unions—to build them into mass movements, to ensure that they participate in all the struggles of the workers, for wages and all the other demands. It is necessary to rebuild the student organizations on the local, state, and national level, and to mobilize all sectors for their most strongly felt needs and for democratic rights. Only in this way can we widen the democratic opening and hasten the fall of the military dictatorship.

End the military dictatorship!

Democratic rights!

A workers and peasants government! □

## Case of Luisa Segura Featured in Brochure

### Free Women Political Prisoners!

Luisa Segura, a member of the Argentine Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores (PST—Socialist Workers party), is one of four women political prisoners whose cases are featured in *Women in Prison*, a brochure issued by Amnesty International recently.

Segura, a student leader at the University of Tucumán, was arrested in November 1974 along with a number of other student leaders.

"Conditions at Villa Devoto prison where she is presently held," states the brochure, "have led to a steady deterioration in Luisa Segura's health; it was only after her case had received some publicity that she received medical attention."

Amnesty International, which has adopted Segura as one of its prisoners of conscience, reports that she "has been held without charge or trial for over two years under State of Siege legislation, which provides for an indefinite period of detention."

Segura's case is now under consideration by Argentina's Supreme Court of Justice. If the court decides favorably, she will be permitted the "option" of exile instead of remaining in jail.

The brochure also reviews the London-based organization's efforts on behalf of other women political prisoners.

"Two years ago," it reports, "during International Woman's Year, Amnesty International issued a list of 252 women imprisoned in 25 countries. The list was by no means exhaustive, since it included only those cases which had been taken up for adoption or investigation by AI—a mere fraction of the thousands of women imprisoned throughout the world on ac-

count of their religious or political beliefs, or their ethnic origin."

Since the publication of that list, the group has stepped up its efforts on behalf of women prisoners:

In addition to women who have been political activists, the organization has helped other prisoners of conscience who have concerned themselves directly with women's rights, either through political action, as in Spain, or through education and welfare programs designed to improve the status of women within their own society, as in Indonesia. A third category of women prisoners are those detained not as a result of their own activities, but because their husbands or close relatives are sought by the police. These prisoners are in some instances held hostages against the voluntary surrender of their male relatives. Finally, there are the rare cases of women who are restricted or detained because they are women. . . .

The other cases featured in the brochure are those of:

- Nasreen Mohamed Hussein, a Zanzibari woman forced to marry against her will.

- Oskana Popovych, a Ukrainian nationalist charged with "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda" and distributing samizdat.

- Ms Siti Suratih, wife of a leading member of the Indonesian Communist party but not herself a member of any political organization.

Amnesty International urges human-rights supporters to circulate the brochure and sign an attached petition for the release of prisoners of conscience.

Copies can be obtained from Amnesty International, International Secretariat, 53 Theobald's Road, London WC1X 8SP, England. □

3. AI-5—Institutional Act No. 5, a decree issued December 13, 1968, giving the government power to suspend Congress indefinitely, to remove members from it, and to suspend the political rights of any citizen.

4. DCE—Diretória Central dos Estudantes (Central Student Board of Directors); PUC—Pontifical Catholic University. See "Report on the Student Movement in Brazil," *Intercontinental Press*, February 16, 1976, p. 224.



# The Debate at NOW's National Conference

By Judy White

The fight to protect the gains won by American women during the last ten years has become the central concern of the most militant wing of the feminist movement in the United States.

The right to legal abortion is under attack by state governments across the country. Affirmative-action programs giving women preferential hiring and promotions to compensate for centuries of discrimination are being cut across as the economic crisis deepens. Government funding for child-care centers has been eliminated in many cases. The Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) to the U.S. Constitution has met with defeat after defeat in the state legislatures.

The need to wage a concerted national campaign to counter this capitalist offensive was raised forcefully at the recent national conference of the National Organization for Women (NOW), the largest and most influential organization in the American feminist movement.

The central resolution outlining this perspective, submitted to NOW's preconference discussion by more than eighty women, was entitled "Defending Women's Rights in the Second Decade." (The April 21-24 NOW conference marked the tenth anniversary of the organization.) It called on NOW to launch a drive, independent of the Democratic and Republican parties, to counter the right-wing attacks with a massive educational and action campaign.

The motivation accompanying the resolution pointed out:

The November 1975 defeat of state ERAs in New York and New Jersey signaled the beginning of a vicious attack on the gains won by women in the late '60s and '70s. . . .

Over the fall of 1976, the attacks against us have mushroomed: . . .

—the government proposed new guidelines exempting all but 6% of the businesses with government contracts from compliance with federal affirmative action guidelines.

—the December 7 Supreme Court ruling denying pregnancy benefits to General Electric workers threatens tens of thousands of women workers with loss of pay, seniority, or even their jobs in the coming years. Moreover, by making pregnancy a legitimate basis for discrimination, the court has reinforced a central pillar of job discrimination against women—the biological difference between the sexes.

—discriminatory layoffs on the basis of "last hired, first fired" have all but wiped out affirmative action gains. In New York City, for example, 1/3 of all women, 40% of all Black males, and over 50% of all Puerto Ricans were laid off during the '74-'75 cutbacks of city employees. The pattern in private industry is

similar. The results are unemployment rates for women and minorities substantially higher than for white males. In addition, since reaching a high point of 61% in 1971, average wages for women have now fallen to 57% of a white male's. Black women earn even less.

A complementary resolution, endorsed by the conference's Minority Women workshop, focused on a central aspect of the attacks on women's rights:

The racist and sexist character of the recent attacks reveal the government's attempt to destroy the women's movement by dividing us along race and income lines. President Carter's announcement March 16, that the Hyde Amendment will become national policy to eliminate Medicaid\* abortions, makes it clearer that the right of all women to safe, legal abortions is under attack.

The resolution noted that Black, Puerto Rican, Chicana, Asian, and Native American women had been targeted in this assault, that they were protesting it, that many of them looked to NOW for leadership, and that it was NOW's obligation to "chart a course of action now to reach out . . . to win these sisters" to the organization.

About 2,000 women attended the NOW conference where this perspective was raised. For the American women's movement, the size of the gathering was significant. Moreover, as Nancy Cole noted in an article in the April 29 issue of the revolutionary socialist weekly the *Militant*, "NOW is looked to for leadership by many more than its current 55,000 members."

Thus, the discussion and decisions made by NOW will have a big influence on the course of the fight to defend women's rights.

At the NOW conference, the organization's national leadership presented two resolutions outlining their central aim—to make NOW a "force" within the Democratic party. The one proposed setting up a National ERA Strike Force and the other a national Political Action Committee.

*Militant* reporter Cole described what these resolutions entailed:

The strike force, a small committee appointed by and headed by the NOW president, would be "charged with planning overall strategy" at all levels of the organization to win the ERA.

The Political Action Committee would collect

\*Medicaid is the system of federal funding that provides some relief for medical expenses of the poor and disabled.

contributions and deliver them to the candidates of NOW's choice.

"There is no way we're going to get the ERA without changing the composition of state legislatures," national board member Toni Caraballo said under discussion of the PAC proposal.

To avoid political debate during the conference, the NOW leadership structured the agenda so as to relegate discussion on activities to the last four hours of the conference. Moreover, they branded women who supported the Defending Women's Rights resolution as members or "dupes" of the Socialist Workers party—which was allegedly trying to "use" NOW to bring the SWP's "hidden agenda" before the public.

The leadership also attempted to undermine support for the Resolution on Women of the Oppressed Nationalities.

"The leading role played by Black, Chicana, and Puerto Rican women in bringing to the fore issues of concern to the most exploited women was attributed to a 'take-over' of the Minority Women workshop by 'militant' Black SWP members," Cole reported.

The action proposals in the Defending Women's Rights and Oppressed Nationalities resolutions were never allowed to come to the floor for a vote.

The NOW leadership was not satisfied to let things rest there. During the final hours of the conference, when only a few hundred participants remained, a redbaiting motion was placed on the floor charging the SWP with trying to "use" NOW and to "exploit the feminist movement." Before members of the SWP were permitted to answer the charges, the vote was called and the motion rammed through.

Mary-Alice Waters, a member of the SWP Political Committee, answered the charges in a statement issued in Detroit:

The SWP advocates activities such as rallies, picket lines, demonstrations, teach-ins, educational conferences, and other similar activities because we believe that all historical experience has confirmed that women can win their rights only by convincing larger and larger numbers of women and our allies to join in the struggle. . . .

An uncompromising fight for women's liberation has always been a touchstone of our [the SWP's] program and politics. We believe an independent mass feminist movement must be built. We believe that women must organize to fight for their needs and their demands. We state our goals and our strategy openly.

Waters made it clear that the SWP had fought for and would continue to fight for the adoption of the perspective outlined in



the Defending Women's Rights resolution. This is not the line of just the SWP, she pointed out. "It is the perspective that hundreds of women at the NOW conference were arguing for."

More than 100 NOW members expressed their opposition to the redbaiting motion at the close of the conference by drafting a petition stating:

We are opposed to the resolution against the SWP, which is also a resolution against NOW. NOW should be open to all women regardless of their political persuasions.

Others have also condemned the redbaiting motion, including the Newark and New York chapters of NOW and officers of the Seattle chapter.

The SWP also came under attack from Social Democrats for destroying the "unity" of the NOW conference by insisting on bringing the real issues to the surface.

Writing in the May 3-9 issue of the Social Democratic weekly *In These Times*, Judy MacLean explained that the Defending Women's Rights resolution—"circulated" by the SWP, as she put it—called for defending the rights of working-class women, especially women of the oppressed nationalities.

But, MacLean insisted, "NOW was already on record and active on all these issues." Thus, the SWP's participation in the fight to get these questions discussed and voted on the conference floor was "monopolizing" the discussion and "filibustering."

The *In These Times* article also tried to justify the redbaiting motion of the NOW leadership. It approvingly quoted NOW President Eleanor Smeal's statement that "No statement of this organization is being made against socialists," just against members of the SWP for raising certain ideas.

In an answer to the MacLean article published in the May 20 *Militant*, Nancy Cole pointed out:

Of course, that is exactly what red-baiting is. It never focuses on the ideas being put forward for discussion. The whole purpose is to divert attention away from objectively considering the correctness or incorrectness of concrete proposals. Even if the ideas sound correct, they must be rejected because those who are raising them may have ulterior motives for proposing them.

The sectarians of the Spartacist League attacked the SWP from another angle. An article on the NOW conference in the May 6 issue of *Workers Vanguard*, the weekly newspaper of the group, said:

The Socialist Workers Party's reformist day-dream of becoming the "best builders" of the bourgeois-liberal National Organization for Women (NOW) blew up in their faces at NOW's tenth national convention. . . .

SWP members were "shattered and reduced to tears," according to the article, "by the vicious redbaiting they got at the conference."

The Spartacist League was "not surprised" at the redbaiting, of course, since



Nancy Cole/Militant

Rhonda Rutherford, an initiator of the Defending Women's Rights resolution, speaks at a caucus meeting of more than 200 supporters of the resolution.

they "know full well that feminism is a bourgeois ideology, necessarily hostile to communism."

The Spartacist League does not explain why the gains won by "bourgeois" supporters of feminism have become a focal point of the capitalist class's assault on the American masses. Nor does it explain the apparent contradiction between the polls that show a *majority* of the population favoring the Equal Rights Amendment and their contention that the fight around such issues is a "bourgeois" concern.

In their sectarian purity, they ignore the difference between the racist, reformist leadership of NOW and the thousands of radicalizing women that have joined the organization in hope that it will provide orientation for their struggles. These women will not follow the Spartacist League's cry that they wait for the proletarian revolution to bring them their liberation.

And far from being "shattered and reduced to tears" by the experience of the NOW conference, women in the SWP shared the assessment presented by Rhonda Rutherford, coauthor of the Defending Women's Rights resolution, to the final caucus meeting of the resolution's supporters:

"For the first time in NOW's history, we have had a discussion of strategy—how we are going to move forward to combat the attacks on our rights, how we are going to bring thousands of Black and Latina women into NOW, and how we are going to get back out into the streets again. This discussion is an important victory for all NOW members.

"Through this discussion we have explained the dangers of the opposite strategy—the perspective put forward by NOW's leadership. We have to bring this debate back to our local chapters.

"This discussion has just begun, and we are going to win." □

## Special Court Gives Marie Murray Life Term

A special court set up to hear political cases sentenced Marie Murray to life imprisonment in Dublin May 3. The May 4 *Irish Times* reported that Murray was found not guilty of capital murder, however, a charge that mandates the death penalty.

Marie Murray and her husband Noel were accused of killing an off-duty policeman during a 1975 bank robbery. They were condemned to death after their first trial in June 1976, but the Irish Supreme Court set aside the execution orders late last year. Noel Murray's sentence was commuted to life at hard labor and Marie was ordered retried.

Their original death sentences were widely understood to be an effort by the government in Dublin to reintroduce the death penalty for political "crimes." The

press portrayed the two as "anarchists," even though it was clear that they did not belong to any organizations.

The two-year campaign to save the Murrays from the gallows won impressive international support. More than 15,000 persons signed petitions for the Murrays in West Germany. French journalists, writers, lawyers, and trade unionists sent protests and sponsored a delegation to observe their trial.

Last November Bernadette Devlin McAliskey toured the United States, making appeals for the Murrays at meetings across the country. In most cities her appeals received extensive media coverage, and prominent civil-libertarians and Irish-American groups began taking up the campaign to save the Murrays' lives. □

### Rulers Discuss Need to Clean Up Junta's Image

[The following article appeared in the April 1 issue of *Adelante*, a bulletin of news and analysis published in Buenos Aires. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

\* \* \*

What exactly is the political situation at the close of one year of military rule?

The summer, which many people hastily predicted would be very calm, was filled with events that make it possible to see just how far the government has been able to go in overcoming the political crisis that led to the March 24, 1976, military coup.

- The pace of inflation far exceeded the ceilings [Finance Minister José] Martínez de Hoz promised the armed forces, and it became an unfortunate new factor for the masses and for the plan to reactivate the economy. The grain crop could be marketed abroad only at prices that amounted to "dumping."

- The Light and Power Workers Union launched an extraordinary strike that involved broad layers throughout the country. The government could do nothing to halt the work stoppages and widespread cutoffs of power. The strike was defeated only after a month of attrition actively promoted by the trade-union bureaucracy.

- As a consequence of the severity of the economic crisis and the extraordinary resistance by the workers, two divergent fronts emerged among the national bourgeoisie.

On the one hand, differences about economic policy grew sharper. The critics were headed by one sector of the oligarchy (Aguardo, CARBAP<sup>1</sup>), which accuses Martínez de Hoz of wanting to pass on to it part of the burden of the crisis—through territorial taxes, meat and milk prices, the future of the CAP<sup>2</sup>—and by industrialists who see no prospect of reactivating their sectors in the short run and who thus are demanding special measures, particularly greater increases in wages and public spending.

On the other hand, differences of a political nature became more acute. A broad group of publications has begun to urge steps leading toward a political liberalization, saying that is the only way to avoid a popular outburst.

1. Jorge Aguado is president of CARBAP (Asociaciones Rurales de Buenos Aires y La Pampa—Rural Associations of Buenos Aires and La Pampa).

2. Corporación Argentina de Productores de Carne (Argentine Meat Producers Corporation).

This simple but persuasive list makes it possible to see how far the military government is from having resolved the political crisis bequeathed by the Peronist government.

To be sure, the coup last year enabled the bourgeoisie to shift the burden of the crisis onto the backs of the laboring population. But it is equally true that this assertion of bourgeois order against the workers has not broken the workers' resistance. On the contrary, this resistance is taking on more far-reaching forms.

Although the coup also politically united the capitalists—who made dramatic profits through speculation—it is a fact that the economic crisis continues unabated and is once again creating divisions within the bourgeois camp. The comings and goings of Martínez de Hoz, his constant reports to the military, and the "truce" and revocation of the "truce"<sup>3</sup> are all symptoms of the sharp clashes of interests that are appearing in the ranks of the bourgeoisie.

The combination of economic crisis and workers' resistance has aggravated old political differences between the wing of the military that favors a line based on repression and the wing that stresses the need to begin a process of "liberalization."

The clearest sign of this developing political crisis was the question of the "fourth man," a phrase that came to summarize [Admiral Emilio] Massera's position—to weaken [President Jorge] Videla by removing him as commander-in-chief of the army.

Added to this political picture is President Carter's position on "human rights" in Argentina. As we explain in another article in this issue, Carter's policy must be viewed in the light of the political crisis of American imperialism—starting with the defeat in Vietnam, then Watergate, the speedup in the development of a revolutionary crisis in several European countries, and the prospects for a step-up in the class struggle in the United States as a result of the poor economic prospects.

Carter's position can be summed up as a warning directed at the "hard-line" wing, inasmuch as the international situation of imperialism is not compatible with propping up a second Pinochet, especially when the first one is already walking the tightrope.

The most likely prospect is that the government will be forced to begin to study

3. On March 8, Martínez de Hoz announced a 120-day voluntary freeze on prices but within less than two weeks the bourgeois press was carrying frequent reports of rising prices.—IP



VIDELA

a policy of "liberalization," although the fact of the matter is that it has no such policy.

It should be pointed out that the struggles that have taken place throughout the year have changed many of the elements the military government was relying on. The trade-union law is stymied along with the so-called trade-union normalization, owing to the fact that the government is afraid to leave the unions in the hands of puppets who are incapable of controlling rank-and-file resistance. Moreover, the "rebuilding" of a trade-union bureaucracy is a key piece in the "reordaining" of the Peronists. But resistance by the workers, which has tied the military's hands, is a decisive factor forcing consideration of a "political liberalization."

Does this mean that the government has definitely abandoned resorting to a show of force against the workers?

Not at all.

Because of the existing tendency toward an open crisis in the government, it is obvious that putting a "liberalization" plan into action is very tricky. Its viability will likely involve an effort to first liquidate all important resistance. The striking magnitude of the state's illegal terrorist activity tells us something about the resistance the reactionaries will put up against implementation of any "political plan." A display of this resistance was shown in the total absence of proposals in Videla's March 31 speech.

What we face is a discussion in the ranks of the exploiters about the need to introduce modifications in the conduct of



the military dictatorship, a discussion whose main concern is how to control the workers' struggle. The outcome of this discussion—which promises to be vicious—will probably be a proposal for a liberalization plan.

Should the workers intervene in this situation? Of course. If we do not take advantage of the governmental crisis, the crisis will be resolved—as always—to our disadvantage.

How should we intervene?

The main problem is that the working class lacks the means to make its voice heard and thus to reach the great mass of working people with its own position. The decisive debacle of Peronism has ended up making clear the unavoidable need of the workers to build a party of their own class to fill the vacuum created by their total lack of political representation.

On the basis of this strategic perspective, we call for the formation of a united

front of all organizations of the working class and of all activists. This will enable us to form united committees where we work and study, committees that can organize the struggle to get the prisoners out of the jails and launch an energetic campaign to oppose the growing terror, win full respect for democratic rights, regain control over the trade unions as independent organizations that defend the gains and wages of the working class, and put an end to the military dictatorship. □

## Special Feature in Tehran Press

# SAVAK Reveals 'Secrets' of the Iranian Trotskyists

By Jamshid Yavari

In a departure from their customary silence on the dissident movement abroad, all major Iranian newspapers carried a series of articles on this forbidden topic in five installments printed at the end of January.

The series was presented as informative articles intended to familiarize readers with the "subversive" activities of various groups and organizations active abroad or involved in the underground movement inside Iran.

The articles were said to have been written on the basis of interviews with a "Dr. Malek Zadeh Milani," who was alleged to be a former member of a Maoist group now cooperating with the government.

They deal with the pro-Moscow Tudeh party, the pro-Peking split-off known as the Revolutionary Organization of the Tudeh party, two other Maoist groups, the Iranian National Front (a bourgeois-liberal organization), and the Iranian Trotskyists.

The articles were later reprinted in a pamphlet under the title, *Secrets of the Iranian Student Movement Abroad*. The pamphlet has been mailed extensively to Iranians living in foreign countries.

In reality, the articles are a clumsy tissue of lies and distortions intended to discredit all individuals and organizations opposed to the shah's dictatorial rule.

SAVAK, whose poison-pen specialists no doubt helped prepare the material, is clearly trying to sow seeds of confusion as more and more Iranians abroad join the ranks of the opposition. This effort is part of an international campaign the government has launched to counter the rise of the fight against the shah's repression.

Some of the falsifications are instructive, giving a glimpse of the attractive features of the opposition that the political police are most anxious to conceal.

In the section devoted to the Iranian Trotskyists, for example, the articles say: The Trotskyists, "who follow the ideas of Leon Trotsky (Lenin's former collaborator and a staunch opponent of Stalin), believe that a socialist revolution can take place only in societies where the means of production have developed sufficiently (such as in West Germany and Britain). With such a thesis, the Trotskyists reject all Communist revolutions of the world, including the Russian revolution of 1917."

Strangely enough, the SAVAK theoreticians do not explain how Iranian revolutionists could be attracted to ideas that are good only for revolutions in Britain and West Germany. As for the Trotskyists' alleged "rejection" of the Russian revolution of 1917 and all other "Communist revolutions," the SAVAK propagandists are merely resorting to the technique of the "big lie" so as to avoid publicizing the real program of the Trotskyist movement in this regard.

SAVAK also tries to stir up a witch-hunt against Iranians active in the Committee for Artistic and Intellectual Freedom in Iran (CAIFI), a group based in the United States, by implying that CAIFI is a Trotskyist organization. In 1975, the articles say, "[the Trotskyists] established a committee under the name 'Committee for Artistic and Intellectual Freedom in Iran,' and in this manner expanded their activities."

SAVAK makes a point of the fact that Iranian Trotskyists abroad have published "the Persian translation of the *Communist Manifesto* as a Trotskyist publication."

Then, perhaps losing the thread of its argument, the Iranian government that was itself brought to power by the CIA tries to insinuate that all these activities are supported by foreign governments. "The financial sources that can support the heavy expenses of the Trotskyists'

activities remain unknown, as yet," the series reports.

On the whole, the articles give the clear impression that the shah and his political police are worried about the growing influence of Trotskyism among Iranians.

The reasons for their concern are not difficult to determine. The Iranian Trotskyists offer a program for unity in action in defense of the political prisoners. They have been in the forefront of Iranian groups fighting against the use of slander and violence to resolve political differences. They have put their ideas into action, and all of this with much success.

SAVAK in effect acknowledges this when it writes: "It is interesting to note that the propaganda activities of this group in the United States are of a considerable size." □

## Italian CP Offers Job to Hübl

Milan Hübl, a signer of the Charter 77 human rights manifesto, has been offered a position at the Antonio Gramsci Institute, the research center sponsored by the Italian Communist party.

Following the 1968 Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, Dr. Hübl, who was appointed by Alexander Dubcek to head the Communist party college, was imprisoned for five years on charges of subversion. When his name appeared as a signer of Charter 77 earlier this year he was reportedly warned that he might be jailed again.

Although Hübl earlier this year refused an offer by the authorities to go into exile in Austria, he told Czech government officials that he intends to accept the Italian invitation unless he can find work in Prague and his children are allowed to enter college. □



## What Québec's Language Policy Really Says

By Dick Fidler

[The following two articles are taken from the April 25 issue of *Labor Challenge*, a revolutionary-socialist fortnightly published in Toronto, Ontario.]

\* \* \*

"Ethno-centric at best, racist at worst." "Brutal, coercive." Myths and misapprehensions." "Deeply sleazy in its piously stated dishonesty."

Those are just a few of the epithets the English-Canadian press has applied to the Québec government's white paper on language policy.

The white paper is none of these things, as a reading of it shows. It describes in sober, even moving terms the threat facing the national language, culture, and way of life of the Québécois, and offers some modest proposals designed to alleviate the problem.

A central concept—and one that has drawn the most violent attacks from English-Canadian critics—is summed up in the following simple assertions:

"The Québec we want to build will be essentially French. The fact that the majority of its population is French will at last be clearly visible: in work, in communications, in the landscape. . . . The use of French will not be generalized simply to disguise the predominance of foreign powers over the francophones; its use will accompany, symbolize, and favor the reconquest by the francophone majority of Québec of the control it should have over the levers of the economy. . . .

"For the first time in Québec, a law will proclaim that every Québécois has the right to work and be educated in French, to be informed and serviced in French, to express himself in French in any deliberative assembly, to demand that the public administration, health and social services, professional bodies, employees associations, and the various companies communicate with him in French." (All quotations are translated from the original French text.)

That this proposal can be described as "revolutionary," as it was in the English-Canadian media, is a devastating indictment of the way in which the present status of the French language in Québec discriminates against the rights of the French-speaking majority.

The white paper's essential concern is to promote the use of French in Québec, where more than 80 percent of the population has French as its mother tongue.

English-Canadian critics have fastened on the white paper's rejection of "bilingualism."

"There will no longer be any question of a bilingual Québec," the document states. French is to have priority.

Undemocratic? A violation of the rights of Québec's English-speaking population? Not at all.

The English language is not under attack in North America. But the French language is threatened—including Québec, the homeland of five million francophones. And with it is threatened "not simply a mode of expression, but a social milieu, a way of life," the white paper points out. It cites many recent studies like the federal Laurendeau-Dunton commission (the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism) and Québec's Gendron commission, which documented this threat very graphically.

There is one overriding reason for this state of affairs. "English is the language of business," the white paper states. As a

result, "the higher one rises in the corporate hierarchy, the more one must use English."

Thus, while francophones are under strong pressure to learn English, the anglophones need not and tend not to learn French.

Immigrants naturally prefer to learn English, and are drawn toward integration into the English minority.

"Only when French has truly become the language of work and business will most immigrants understand that it is in their interest to solidarize with the francophone community," the white paper says.

Government-inspired "bilingualism" policies run counter to this goal, it points out. In a society like Québec's, "bilingualism" necessarily means promoting the language of the minority, English, to the detriment of French.

The fundamental error in preceding language legislation like Bill 22 was that it tried to reconcile "two conflicting objec-

### Unions Endorse Basic Aims of Policy

Québec's union federations, representing more than 700,000 organized workers, have expressed support for the government's proposed language policy.

Fernand Daoust, general secretary of the Québec Federation of Labor (FTQ), said that in promising to end the "institutionalized bilingualism" of Québec society, the white paper prepares the way for the working milieu to become authentically French. This goal will be achieved when the Québécois take control of the Québec economy, he said.

Daoust said the FTQ was particularly pleased with the proposal to include union representatives on the committees to oversee the establishment of a "French milieu" in companies with more than 100 employees.

Daoust said he did not think the projected Charter of the French Language would arouse much dissent among the FTQ's non-francophones, who compose about 20 percent of the federation's membership.

Norbert Rodrigue, president of the Confederation of National Trade Unions (CSN), said that radical mea-

asures are urgently needed to win respect for the rights of francophone Québécois in their work and their life styles.

Rodrigue said he hoped the general thrust of the white paper will not be weakened by the detailed provisions of the forthcoming legislation.

Noting that the CSN is strongly opposed to any idea that the English language has "acquired rights," Rodrigue said the white paper seemed somewhat ambiguous on this question.

He added that the CSN regretted that the government had not decided to establish a single public French-language school system at the post-elementary level.

Yvon Charbonneau, president of the Québec Teachers Federation (CEQ) also called for a single, integrated, French-language school system, and criticized the white paper for not proposing that all francophones and immigrants already in English schools be enrolled in French schools.

However, he said the basic principles outlined in the white paper reflect the overall orientation adopted by the general council of the CEQ.

tives: Frenchifying Québec, and institutionalizing bilingualism."

What is needed, the white paper argues, is legislation that will create a social milieu in which every resident of Québec is required to understand and use French.

"In stating that in a society like Québec everyone must understand the French language, the government does not intend to prevent anyone from learning or speaking other languages as well. It simply wants to ensure that there is an underlying common means of expression. . . ."

The white paper outlines the key provisions of the legislation that will follow, in such areas as public administration, business and the workplace, and education. Notwithstanding the blast of criticism in English Canada, the proposed measures indicate that the PQ government is bending over backwards to accommodate the English minority, giving them "rights" that don't exist for francophones in the other nine provinces.

French will become increasingly the sole language of public administration. However, laws will be translated into English, transcripts of legal proceedings will be available in English, some services such as health care will be available in other languages, and citizens will be able to communicate with government offices in other languages.

Proposals to create a French environment in business and industry remain very vague. The white paper says that companies with fifty employees or more will have to qualify for a "certificate of francization" by 1983. The certificate would indicate that a satisfactory "French milieu" exists in the firm. But proposed exceptions are numerous ("we will have to take account . . . of relations that the firm may have abroad, as well as the particular cases where corporations whose activity extends outside Québec have their headquarters in Québec").

One of the most conspicuous concessions to anglophone claims that they have special rights is in the white paper's proposal on education policy. For years nationalists and labor organizations have pointed out that the only democratic solution to the schools question lies in establishing a single secular French-language school system. But the PQ's white paper retains the English school system, although it restricts access to such schools to children with at least one parent who was educated in an English school. (Other exceptions are provided for, too.)

This proposal has been widely criticized in Québec.

The underlying premise of the white paper is that by legislating the compulsory use of French in business, education, and government services, the Québécois can win effective control of the key levers of their society.

It is true that greater use of French in

corporate operations can increase the number of francophones in administrative and even management posts. But as long as the major corporations that dominate Québec's economic life continue to be owned by non-Québécois, the latter will have the real decision-making power. Francophones will be little more than branch-plant managers. English will continue to be the language of big business.

That may meet the limited objectives of the Parti Québécois leaders, but it won't satisfy the aspirations of the Québécois workers who elected them to government. Québec's economy will still be distorted by imperialism. And the French language and culture will continue to be threatened by economic pressures.

But the attack on the white paper by the big-business politicians and media in

English Canada is directed not at these limitations but at the reforms being proposed. Above all, the anglophone chauvinists challenge the very right of the Québec government to make any moves to redress the colossal injustices of two hundred years of national oppression.

Why are Québécois in their vast majority sympathetic to the goals of the white paper? Is it because they are "racists," "backward," gullible, as the English-Canadian press would have us believe?

On the contrary. It is because the white paper, despite its limitations, speaks to some of the most deeply felt conditions of oppression experienced by the Québécois.

It takes a lot of gall—and more than a pinch of real "ethnocentrism," real racism—to portray the victims of that oppression as the criminals. □

## Trudeau Threatens to Overturn Law

The federalist assault on Québec's right to self-determination, far from awaiting the promised referendum on independence, is already taking shape in the reaction to the Québec government's white paper on language policy.

The white paper, issued by Cultural Development Minister Camille Laurin on April 1, is the forerunner of a bill that will constitute the first major legislated reform of the new Parti Québécois government.

Prime Minister Trudeau told a news conference April 5 that the federal government might disallow the Québec language law. He refused to discount reports that Ottawa is considering the possibility of challenging the legislation in the courts as unconstitutional, and threatened "that even if there is nothing unconstitutional in the law, the federal government will fight the proposals because of the type of society they espouse," the *Toronto Star* reported.

"Let them live in fear and trembling of my power," Trudeau mocked the Québécois.

Syndicated Ottawa columnist Richard Gwyn reported April 7 that the Liberal cabinet already has debated the possibility of "passing legislation to give Ottawa responsibility, cultural and educational, for all minorities in Canada."

Ottawa, of course, has never evinced much interest in protecting threatened national minorities; the plight of the French-Canadians outside Québec, or of the Native peoples, is proof of that. The real purpose of such legislation would be to protect the existing privileged status of the English language in Québec.

The Conservative government in Ontario has also announced it is preparing a possible court challenge to the Québec legislation. Government officials in other provinces, including Saskatchewan's NDP Premier Allan Blakeney, have expressed opposition to the Parti Québécois government's moves to protect the French lan-

guage.

The draft language legislation and the Charter of the French Language that is to accompany it have not yet been introduced, let alone discussed, amended, adopted, or implemented. But the current campaign in English Canada against the white paper is designed to mobilize chauvinist opinion in opposition not just to specific features of the bill, but to the very right of Québec to enact such legislation.

The capitalist politicians, newspaper editors, and businessmen hope to use the weight of English-Canadian chauvinist opinion to terrorize the Québécois and to force major concessions from the Parti Québécois government.

Their ultimate goal is to instil such fear in the Québécois of possible repercussions—including a flight of capital, economic depression, even armed intervention—that they will reject not only these modest proposals to defend the French language, but independence itself.

In Québec, the white paper's proposals to promote the use of French have the sympathy of virtually all francophones, as even English-Canadian reporters have had to acknowledge. (The handful of critics, like *Le Devoir* editor Claude Ryan, have been widely condemned.)

Many leaders of the non-English immigrant communities initially expressed acceptance of the policy outlined in the white paper (which was published in Italian, Greek, and English as well as French). However, under the pressure of the anglophone chauvinists' campaign, some immigrant leaders have subsequently retreated.

To the best of our knowledge, not one English-language newspaper outside Québec has seen fit even to publish the text of the white paper, although they have not hesitated to attack it in the wildest terms, often grossly misrepresenting the contents. □



## Testimony at U.S. Trial Reveals CIA Activity in Australia

By Allen Myers

[The following article appeared in the May 5 issue of *Direct Action*, a revolutionary-socialist weekly published in Sydney, Australia.]

\* \* \*

Testimony by an alleged spy during his trial in the US has lifted a corner on the activities of the CIA in Australia. Testifying in Los Angeles on April 26 and 27, Christopher Boyce said he had turned secret material over to the Soviet Union as the result of a series of events that began with his disillusionment over CIA operations in Australia.

According to Boyce, who was once employed by TRW Systems Inc—a company involved in the CIA's use of photographic surveillance satellites—the CIA had “infiltrated” Australian trade unions and “suppressed their strikes,” especially those involving airports and railways.

Boyce also said that while working as a code clerk on a CIA project he learned of “day-to-day deceptions in our transmissions to the Australians.” One interpretation of this remark is that it refers to the US base at Pine Gap, which receives broadcasts from spy satellites. The CIA is supposed to share with Australian spy agencies all information received at Pine Gap; failure to do so could have been the “deception.”

### A Role in Kerr's Coup?

Objections by government lawyers prevented Boyce from providing any real detail about what he knew of CIA operations in Australia. But some of what he said points to activities of an extremely sinister nature.

Boyce testified that in early 1975 he frequently talked with a childhood friend, Andrew Lee, who later blackmailed him into spying for the Soviet Union. According to Boyce, they discussed their dissatisfaction with such things as Watergate, US involvement in Vietnam, the CIA's activities in overthrowing the Allende Government in Chile, and allegations of CIA participation in the assassination of President Kennedy. After one such discussion, Boyce testified, he told Lee: “If you think that's bad, you should see what the CIA is doing in Australia.”

In the April 29 *Financial Review*, Robert Haupt, the paper's Washington correspondent, commented on the possible significance of Boyce's remark:

“The context he gives to it—Watergate,

Vietnam, Kennedy and Allende—firmly suggests that he was referring to nothing less than an operation against the Australian Government.”

The *Financial Review* first raised the question of possible CIA involvement in the November 11, 1975, coup more than a year ago, shortly after the subject was

### Demands for Inquiry

The Australian Labor Party of Victoria called April 29 for a Senate Foreign Affairs Committee investigation into CIA activities in Australia. The call was issued by the party's branch administrative committee.

Bob Hawke, president of the ALP and the Australian Council of Trade Unions, has also demanded an inquiry. “The Government should put it squarely to the Americans what has been the degree of CIA involvement in Australia in the past, and what it is now,” he said. Hawke asked unions with evidence of CIA meddling in their affairs to make it available to the ACTU.

Officials of the Australian Railways Union, the Waterside Workers Federation, and the Seamen's Union held talks in Melbourne April 28 and agreed that they wanted a Federal government investigation of CIA activities.

considered by the New York weekly *Village Voice*.

### CIA's Version

Haupt's article also quotes the unofficial CIA explanation of Boyce's testimony. The CIA's version is that Boyce was a willing spy and that the story of CIA deception was a cover provided by the Soviet KGB with the intention of disrupting relations between the CIA and Asio and other Australian spy agencies. Interestingly, this explanation lays much emphasis on an alleged Soviet plot to use the Labor Government to “isolate” Asio from other capitalist political police. “Asio ran through a lot of headaches—the Attorney-General was Murphy, as I recall,” the CIA mouthpiece told Haupt. “You exposed a great deal of your service.”

That is an obvious reference to Lionel Murphy's March 1973 raid on Asio's Melbourne headquarters in an effort—

unsuccessful—to assert ministerial control over the agency.

The CIA is also known to have been upset by Whitlam's charges, in early 1975, that the CIA had contributed funds to the coalition parties and his exposure of the fact that Richard Stallings, a CIA agent, had rented Doug Anthony's house in Canberra.<sup>1</sup> The day before Kerr's coup,<sup>2</sup> the Asio Director General received from an Asio officer in Washington the CIA's complaints about Whitlam's remarks. These complaints were sent on a “service to service” basis, that is, they were not to be shown to the Government.

This November 10, 1975, message was later leaked and was published for the first time in full in the April 29 *Financial Review*. It makes clear that the CIA was deeply concerned about Whitlam's statements:

“CIA can not see how this dialogue with continued reference to CIA can do other than blow the lid off those installations in Australia where the persons concerned have been working and which are vital to both of our services and countries, particularly the installation at Alice Springs.”

And the CIA's message concluded:

“... CIA feel that everything possible has been done on a diplomatic basis and now on an intelligence liaison link they feel that if this problem can not be solved they do not see how our mutually beneficial relationships are going to continue.

“The CIA feels grave concern as to where this type of public discussion may lead.

“The DG [Director General] should be assured that CIA does not lightly adopt this attitude.”

The Australian ruling class had sufficient reasons, from the standpoint of its own interests, for wanting to throw out the Labor Government. Those reasons can be seen quite clearly in the offensive against the living standards of the workers that

1. J. Douglas Anthony is leader of the New Country party and holds the posts of deputy prime minister and minister of national resources and overseas trade in the Fraser government.—IP

2. On November 11, 1975, Governor General Sir John Kerr, representative of the queen of England, dismissed the Whitlam Labor party government from office. Liberal party leader Malcolm Fraser was then named prime minister pending new elections, which were held December 13, 1975, and resulted in a victory for the Liberal party-New Country party coalition.—IP



Fraser has conducted since the moment he took office.

But that fact in itself says nothing about the *method* which Australia's real rulers might have chosen to get rid of the Whitlam Government. It is not at all inconceivable, for example, that the CIA's assistance might have been enlisted to present Kerr with a picture of a "threat to security" justifying the extreme measure of sacking the elected Government.

### Influencing Unions

It took only a few days for part of Christopher Boyce's testimony to be confirmed by an independent source. On April 29, R. Cowles, secretary of the Transport Workers Union in Perth, said he had been approached by a CIA agent in 1974 over the Ermolenko affair.

Georgi Ermolenko was a Russian violinist who asked for political asylum while on a concert tour of Australia. But after being interviewed by Soviet diplomats, Ermolenko said he had changed his mind and wanted to return home. For a time, the TWU maintained a ban which prevented him from departing. When the TWU ban was lifted, the Federated Clerks Union refused to process Ermolenko's ticket. He was eventually flown to Singapore by the RAAF.

Cowles told reporters that while the TWU ban was still in effect, he had been approached by a CIA agent named McLean who asked him to see that the ban was continued as an "embarrassment to the Russians." Cowles also said that he knows of at least three CIA agents active in Perth. (The State organiser of the FCU said on April 29 that during the affair he was threatened by an official from the Soviet embassy in an effort to get the FCU's ban dropped.)

There is, quite obviously, a great deal more information about CIA activities in Australia that may yet become public. But it is already quite clear that Australian spy agencies such as Asio habitually work hand-in-glove with that notorious gang of assassins. This is only natural: Both the CIA and Asio exist to defend the same rotten system by whatever rotten means are necessary.

The issue posed by the recent revelations is not—as Gough Whitlam tried to make it in his parliamentary comments on the Boyce trial—whether or not Australian "defence secrets" had reached the Soviet Union through Boyce's activities. The real issue for working people in this country is the necessity of getting rid of all the capitalist political police operating here—CIA and Asio alike.

The CIA agents in Australia are not spies in the usual sense of the word. They are here with the knowledge and permission of the Australian Government. The work of subverting organisations of the working class and preparing future wars is

a collaborative effort of US and Australian spy agencies.

The secrecy that is so important to these agencies is directed first of all against the working classes in both countries. They don't want us to know what they're up to because what they're up to is contrary to our interests. They work for the same people that Fraser and Carter work for.

In 1971, the Federal ALP conference came within one vote of making abolition of Asio part of the party's program. Ironically, Lionel Murphy was one of the main opponents of the motion at the

conference, which eventually came out in favor of "ministerial control" over Asio.

Surely it is past time now for the ALP to recognise the foolishness of its 1971 decision and to come out squarely against all political police. The entire Labor movement, including the unions, should raise the demand now that the names of all CIA agents in Australia be published and that these agents be sent packing. The US bases, from which they operate, should be closed. And at the same time, we should get rid of their Australian counterparts.

*CIA out! Abolish Asio!* □

## Indonesia, Uruguay Worst Offenders

### 104 Journalists Imprisoned Around World

The names of 104 journalists known as of March 15 to be imprisoned, restricted, or detained worldwide for political reasons have been published by Amnesty International.

The list, released April 27, is an updated version of one distributed by the organization a year earlier. Though far from comprehensive, it indicates an increase of more than 50 percent in the number of journalists who have been persecuted. Some of those named have "disappeared" or been tortured since their arrests, and others are being held without charge or trial, Amnesty International said.

Of the twenty-five countries listed as holding journalists prisoner, the Indonesian regime of General Suharto is cited as the worst offender. Many of the journalists have been jailed since the Indonesian army took power in 1965. Uruguay nearly matches Indonesia's grim record.

A number of Black journalists imprisoned in South Africa for reporting on the Soweto rebellion are also included on the list. Among those detained at that time were internationally recognized photographers like Peter Magubane and Willie Nkosi, whose pictures of the rebellion were published throughout the world.

Five correspondents from *The World*, South Africa's leading Black newspaper, and reporters from the *Rand Daily Mail*, East London *Daily Dispatch*, and other newspapers were held without trial from early September to late December. The following were listed as still imprisoned by the Pretoria regime as of March 15, 1977:

**Anthony Holiday.** Journalist for the *Cape Times*. He was detained without charge from July through November 1976. He has since been charged, convicted, and sentenced to six years imprisonment under the Terrorism Act.

**Michael Mzeleni.** Photographer for *Drum* magazine. He was detained without charge in Johannesburg in February 1977.

**Thenjiwe Mtintso.** Detained incommunicado for five months in 1976. After she was released in December 1976 she was "banned" under conditions that subject her to partial house arrest and prohibit her from earning her living as a journalist.

**David Rabkin.** Sub-editor of the Cape *Argus*. He was arrested in July 1976 and convicted in September of violating the Terrorism and Internal Security Acts. He was sentenced to ten years imprisonment.

**Nat Serache.** Reporter for the *Rand Daily Mail* and correspondent for the BBC. He was held from September 1976 to February 1977, released on bail, and detained again on March 20.

**Joe Thlooe.** President of the Union of Black Journalists and a reporter for *Drum* magazine. He was detained without charge or trial from September 1976 to December 1976. He was detained again and has been held incommunicado since March 1, 1977.

Other countries included on the Amnesty International list were: Argentina, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Chile, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, German Democratic Republic, Haiti, Kenya, Malawi, the Philippines, Singapore, Soviet Union, Spain, South Korea, Syria, Taiwan, Tanzania, Thailand, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. □

### Less Risky Not to Breathe?

The following was reported by Prensá Latina in the May 8 issue of the Cuban newspaper *Granma*:

More than 150,000 children die every year in Mexico as a result of air pollution, according to Ramón Mestre, president of the Mexican Academy of Ecological Law. Every year, some 1.8 million tons of pollutants in the air of Mexico City cause these deaths and make more than 80,000 adults sick.

# Three Facets of 'Euro-Communism'

By Ernest Mandel

[The following article appeared in the April 28 issue of *Inprecor*, a fortnightly news bulletin published by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.]

\* \* \*

## I. 'Euro-Communism' and the Imperialist Bourgeoisie

So-called Euro-Communism primarily represents a codification of the rightward evolution of the Western European Communist parties since the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, an evolution which has led them—with the exception of the periods between September 1939 and spring 1941 and the period during the Korean War—to close class collaboration with their own bourgeoisies.

From this standpoint, the latest congress of the French Communist party (PCF), like the abandonment of the dictatorship of the proletariat by the Italian, Spanish, British, Swedish, and Belgian Communist parties, may be regarded as the counterpart to the Görlitz Congress of the German Social Democracy. After a long period during which reformist day to day practice came into sharper and sharper contradiction with formal (literary) programmatic orthodoxy (the Erfurt Program for the Social Democracy in the past, the so-called "principles of Marxism-Leninism" for the Stalinist Communist parties today), the program was finally adjusted to the daily practice. Revisionism has thus been officially codified in theory.

Does this mean that the official codification of the neo-reformist practice of the Western European CPs will not alter their practice very much? It is true that these parties have already been practicing class collaboration for decades. At the end of the second world war, through their participation in governments, their disarming of the partisans, and their active aid in the reconstruction of the bourgeois state and bourgeois repressive apparatus (even under conditions of colonial war) and in the reconstruction of the capitalist economy, they literally saved the capitalist system in France and Italy, just as the central European Social Democracy had done after the first world war. This counterrevolutionary role of the CP leaderships had already been prefigured in republican Spain in 1936-38. At that time everything was still being done in the name of "defense of the Soviet Union." Today they are openly renouncing the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state. But does this change anything in practice?

To answer this question correctly, it must be understood that the reformist degeneration of the mass organizations of

the working class constitutes a *process*, and not an event. In the process, day to day practice, official theory (as the basis on which cadres are educated), the manner in which members are recruited, the objective role of the class struggle, the very comprehension of the leadership, cadres, and militants of the party come into play as interlocking factors which cannot be considered as independent elements nor as forming a homogeneous whole.

After the turn toward the popular front during the 1930s and 1940s, the average militant of a Western European Communist party joined this party in spite of its reformist practice because he or she identified with the October Revolution and with the Soviet Union as the incarnation of the revolution. This is less and less true today. In the past, the cadres of these parties were prepared for tactical zigzags in Comintern policy (the tactics changed every three or four years). The present cadres of the Communist parties of Western Europe, with a few rare exceptions, have been engaged in purely reformist tactics for twenty or twenty-five years now. *In this context*, the codification of neo-reformism marks a new significant stage in the rightist evolution of these parties.

The imperialist bourgeoisie is quite conscious of these changes. It is not enchanted by the prospect of "Euro-Communist" participation in governments, at least so long as it is not facing an explosive revolutionary crisis. The bourgeoisie is still suspicious of these Communist parties to a qualitatively higher degree than it is of the Social Democracy. But it understands that something has changed. One of the leading ideologues of the cold war, George Kennan, expressed this clearly in a television interview whose text was published in the January 20, 1977, issue of the *New York Review of Books*: "Today, when questions are being raised on the subject of the Italian and French Communist parties, we are not dealing with the same parties we had to deal with in 1947."

For several years we have used the concept of the *gradual Social Democratization* of the Communist parties of West Europe. Recent developments fully confirm this diagnosis. Nevertheless, as we have said, what is involved is a process. Even if the Communist parties of Western Europe now no longer support merely bourgeois parliamentary democracy,\* but also the

\* After the disturbances in Bologna in February and March, Bufalini, one of the leaders of the Italian Communist party, stated from the podium of a meeting of the CP Central Committee (March 14): "contrary to the 1950s and 1960s . . .

bourgeois police, in the image of the classical Social Democracy, they still maintain specific links to the Soviet Union and the "socialist camp." In spite of all the mounting criticisms of the domestic policy of the Soviet bureaucracy, their relationship to this bureaucracy is still different from that of the Social Democratic parties. Their relations with international imperialism (American, European, and Japanese) are in no way identical to the relations the Social Democracy maintains with imperialism.

On the other hand, both the Soviet bureaucracy on the one hand and international capital on the other continue to act differently toward the Communist parties and Social Democratic parties.

The so far uncrossed limits of the process of gradual Social Democratization of the West European CPs is accounted for primarily by the political and material self-interest of the enormous bureaucratic apparatuses of these parties. The existence of this bureaucracy is based on its own particular identity, and this identity is still closely linked to "special relations" with the "socialist camp."

Should the process of Social Democratization continue to the bitter end, then the basis of the separate existence of these CPs from the Social Democracy would disappear. Most of the CP leaderships today do not (yet) want to take this risk, nor are they able to. Many other factors—such as tradition, continued material links, advantages the CP maintains against the SP through clinging to its historical identity among the combative sections of the working class, the danger that many members and sympathizers would allow their organizational links to the CP to evaporate—also come into play in accounting for the limits to the process of Social Democratization which have existed up to now.

From the historical standpoint, however, "Euro-Communism" is not simply a confirmation of the (further) rightward turn of most of the Western European CPs. It also represents a right turn under particular conditions, which are new for them. First, it is occurring during a period of rising and sometimes stormy upsurge of mass struggles in southern Europe, which has bordered on prerevolutionary and revolutionary situations. Under *these* conditions the shift to full adherence to bourgeois parliamentary democracy and class collaboration, even with big capital (as in Italy), marks a sharper and more open turn to class betrayal than in the past. The events in Italy during recent weeks constitute a clear sign of this. Just like the Social Democracy after 1914, the "Euro-

today the police are called upon to defend the democratic order against . . . the enemies of the democratic system." You would think you were listening to a Hilferding or Severing at the height of the Weimar Republic.



Communists" are compelled to sacrifice not only the revolutionary class struggle but also the day-to-day interests of the wage earners on the altar of class reconciliation with the bourgeoisie ("in order to avoid a test of strength at any price").

It is indispensable to destroy the state apparatus and repressive apparatus of the bourgeoisie if one is to prevent these apparatuses from being used to protect private property, even against the democratically expressed will of the majority of the population, including with the bloodiest violence if need be. That is a lesson they did not draw from the Chilean experience. On the contrary, the old "wisdom" of the Social Democracy was affirmed: avoid a comprehensive test of strength with the bourgeoisie. And when the exacerbation of class contradictions and the polarization of political forces in the context of a prerevolutionary or revolutionary situation leads to such a test of strength, then the political conclusions drawn from this "wisdom" is simple: curb the workers mobilization, even if this divides the toilers and demobilizes entire layers of the proletariat. The successful application of such a line can lead only to the victory of the counterrevolution.

On the other hand, the *determining* motive in the right turn of the "Euro-Communists" is no longer unconditional adaptation to the exigencies of Soviet diplomacy, that is, to the interests of the Soviet bureaucracy, as was the case in 1935 or after Nazi imperialism's attack on the Soviet Union. This time the decisive factor is the attempt to break out of domestic political ghettos, to break down parliamentary isolation, to seek a link with the Social Democracy and the "liberal" petty bourgeoisie. The turn of "Euro-Communism" is thus in no way the response to a command from Moscow issued at more or less the same time in various countries. The turn was made years apart in countries like Italy, Sweden, France, Spain, and Britain, which clearly shows that national and not international processes have been decisive.

Of course, in and of itself the right turn of the Western Communist parties does not disturb the Kremlin. It falls within the policy of "peaceful coexistence" and "détente," that is, the freezing of the European spheres of influence of world capital and the Soviet bureaucracy as they were established at Yalta and Potsdam. Nevertheless, this turn is regarded uneasily, if not with overt hostility, by the Soviet bureaucracy and its satellite bureaucracies in East Europe. There are various reasons for this, none of which have anything to do with the "faith" of Brezhnev and his friends in the "dictatorship of the proletariat."

One of these reasons is that the implementation of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie by the "Euro-Communists" not in order to cover for some diplomatic

maneuver by the Kremlin but instead ever more exclusively for reasons of electoral and parliamentary opportunism—that is, growing integration into bourgeois society and the bourgeois state apparatus—raises the danger that in the event of a conflict between the Soviet Union and the West European imperialists the "Euro-Communists" might stand on the side of their own bourgeoisies against the Soviet Union.



BERLINGUER: Italian Stalinist hack takes naturally to latest 'Euro-Communist' style.

Up to now, one can only hypothesize about whether this would happen. Developments have not yet gone far enough for this question to be answered yes or no. But the loss of any real political instruments in West European internal politics would be a serious setback for Moscow. That such a danger exists, at least potentially, now appears clear to the Kremlin.

Trotsky foresaw this back in 1938, although he was wrong about the timing of developments. In an article entitled "Munich, the Last Warning," he wrote the following commentary on the development of the West European CPs, which should serve as the basic point of departure for an understanding of "Euro-Communism":

"As regards the ex-Comintern, its social base, properly speaking, is of a twofold nature. On the one hand, it lives on the subsidies of the Kremlin, submits to the latter's commands, and, in this respect, every ex-Communist bureaucrat is the younger brother and subordinate of the Soviet bureaucrat. On the other hand, the various machines of the ex-Comintern feed from the same sources as the Social Democracy, that is the superprofits of imperialism. The growth of the Communist Parties in recent years, their infiltra-

tion into the ranks of the petty bourgeoisie, their installation in the state machinery, the trade unions, parliaments, municipalities, etc., have strengthened in the extreme their dependence on national imperialism at the expense of their traditional dependence on the Kremlin.

"Ten years ago it was predicted that the theory of socialism in one country must inevitably lead to the growth of nationalist tendencies in the sections of the Comintern. . . . Today we can predict with assurance the inception of a new stage. The growth of imperialist antagonisms, the obvious proximity of the war danger, and the equally obvious isolation of the USSR must unavoidably strengthen the *centrifugal nationalist tendencies* within the Comintern. Each one of its sections will begin to evolve a patriotic policy on its own account. Stalin has reconciled the Communist parties of the imperialist democracies with their national bourgeoisies. This stage has now been passed. The Bonapartist procurer has played his role. Henceforth, the Communo-chauvinists will have to worry about their own hides, whose interests by no means always coincide with the 'defense of the USSR.'" (*Writings of Leon Trotsky, 1938-39*, Pathfinder Press, New York, pp. 70-71.)

## II. 'Euro-Communism' and the Soviet Bureaucracy

But much more important than this uneasiness on the part of the Soviet bureaucracy about the future relations of the "Euro-Communists" with the Soviet Union and the "socialist camp" is the fear and hostility of the Kremlin in regard to the timid criticisms the "Euro-Communists" have made of the worst excesses of bureaucratic repression: condemnation of the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968; condemnation of the internment of political dissidents in "psychiatric clinics" in the USSR; condemnation of attacks on democratic freedoms and civil rights; support of Charter 77 in Czechoslovakia; gentle protest against the repression of strikes in Poland; gentle condemnation of the expulsion of Wolf Biermann from East Germany and the lifting of his citizenship.

We are dealing here with a phenomenon that revolutionary Marxists have increasingly stressed in their analysis of the crisis of Stalinism since 1948—one which other tendencies critical of the Soviet leadership have not understood (or not fully understood): the fact that the Soviet bureaucracy has not cut the umbilical cord to the international workers movement and therefore to the international working class. Consequently, everything that happens in the Communist parties outside the Soviet Union (or the "People's Democracies") has repercussions on internal relations in the Soviet Union and these People's Democracies. Under certain conditions these effects can be damaging, and even downright threatening, to the stabili-

ty of the rule of the Soviet bureaucracy.

In Eastern Europe and the USSR the statements of the "Euro-Communists" in favor of political pluralism and democratic freedoms are avidly received, *not* because they recognize capitalism and the bourgeois state, but because these statements are seen as an alternative to the present form of political rule in *East Europe and the USSR* (that is, alternative models of the workers state). Therein lies the great objective explosive potential of "Euro-Communism" from the standpoint of the Kremlin.

When Jimmy Carter calls for civil rights in the USSR or when Solzhenitsyn drags the October revolution through the mud it is only the internal policy of the Soviet bureaucracy which benefits. Such actions allow the bureaucracy to continue to paralyze its own working class with the alternative: either the massive unemployment of the capitalist system or bureaucratic monopoly of power. But when Berlinguer, Carrillo, and Marchais timidly plead for "political pluralism in the building of socialism," then things change to the displeasure of the Kremlin. Either the Kremlin has to explain that the largest Communist parties in the capitalist world have crossed over to the camp of imperialism, or it must recognize that there are alternatives to the Stalinist and post-Stalinist model of power from the standpoint of the working class. Either option would undermine the Kremlin's political authority and clearly broaden the maneuvering room of opposition in the USSR and the "People's Democracies." From this standpoint it may be asserted that "Euro-Communism" has opened a deep breach in the international Stalinist apparatus and has deepened the crisis of this apparatus, particularly in its relations with the masses in the USSR and the "People's Democracies." It therefore accelerates development toward the political revolution.

Isn't there a contradiction, then, in asserting that "Euro-Communism" represents primarily a right-wing turn, that is, an adaptation to the West European Social Democracy, to the petty bourgeoisie, and in part to big capital? To resolve the apparent contradiction it is enough to formulate the question differently: *Why* are the West European CPs now criticizing internal policy and repression under the rule of the Soviet bureaucracy in growing (although still completely insufficient) measure? Is it mainly a matter of seeking to please the West European bourgeoisie, of breaking into bourgeois "salon society"? This would be a simplistic interpretation.

As we have already shown, the main reason for all the tactical turns of the "Euro-Communists" during past years has related to electoral policy: it is a matter of overcoming a specific obstacle to reaching voters (and trade-union sympathizers to some extent). From this standpoint, the

"Euro-Communists'" criticism of the repressive policies of the Soviet bureaucracy can in no way be aimed at winning bourgeois or "upper middle class" votes. The opportunist electoralist policy is aimed at the working class and the decisive middle layers. It is also among these circles that the strongest CPs (especially the Italian, French, and Spanish) can have the greatest success with their "Euro-Communism." In other words: the growing criticism of the Soviet bureaucracy is a concession primarily to the West European working class itself and not to the West European bourgeoisies.

One may try to undermine this analysis by stressing the reformist and Social Democratic influence within the working class, that is, the predominance of the influence of bourgeois or petty-bourgeois ideology within the class. There is undoubtedly a kernel of truth in this contention, but only a kernel. It is a fact that in Italy it is the Communist party and not the Social Democracy that has held hegemony over the working class and the workers movement for years. And it is difficult to claim that the combative working class in Spain during past years has been developing under reformist hegemony.

On the contrary, insofar as there is an upswing of workers struggles in southern Europe, and to some extent in other European countries, this upsurge is accompanied by the growth of anticapitalist and not class collaborationist trends among broad layers of workers. Under these conditions, the "Euro-Communists'" criticism of the Kremlin is in large part not a concession to bourgeois ideology and influence within the working class, but a *concession to the antibureaucratic component of the average consciousness of the combative layers of workers*, which is now undoubtedly much stronger than it was in the past.

It follows that we must regard *this* aspect of "Euro-Communism" positively and not negatively. It would be paradoxical to say the least if revolutionary Marxists, who for years have denounced the crimes of the Soviet bureaucracy against its own working class and against those of Eastern Europe, should suddenly become uncertain when a small echo of this criticism is heard from the leaders of many official CPs in the West. What we condemn about the "Euro-Communists" *on this point* is not alleged "capitulation to imperialism," but rather inconsistency and lack of courage in carrying their own thought through to the end. An "objective" critique of Stalinism in the style of Elleinstein, which seeks to explain everything by "historical conditions"; a vague call for a "political pluralism" which does not clearly demand the right to form various different Soviet parties as the working people of the Soviet Union and

the "People's Democracies" desire, including opposition parties and an opposition press; a fleeting reference to "socialist democracy" without clearly and openly calling for a democratic regime of workers councils, that is, for free and democratically elected councils as the political backbone of workers self-administration—all these things make the current "Euro-Communist" criticism of the political relations which prevail in the East incoherent and scarcely credible. Only a Marxist explanation of the nature of the Soviet bureaucracy as a privileged social layer; only an explanation of Stalinism as based on the material interests of this bureaucracy; only an understanding of the interaction of this political problem with the problem of any society midway between capitalism and socialism, with its specific relations of production and its own contradictions and dynamic, can clarify the structural and superstructural reality of Soviet society and scientifically define the perspectives of the struggle to break the bureaucracy's monopoly of power, the struggle for workers power and the political revolution.

All this is lacking in "Euro-Communism." We therefore criticize the "Euro-Communist" theses on Soviet society. But the dialogue with their cadres and members on this question is qualitatively easier today than it was in the past. This is progress and not retrogression.

Die-hard sectarians who would seek to deny this pretend that "Euro-Communism" represents either a cynical Kremlin trick aimed at facilitating the "international détente" or else an outright abandoning of "defense of the Soviet Union." The first argument is ridiculous. Does anyone believe in all seriousness that the Kremlin ordered Carrillo, Marchais, and Berlinguer to criticize the Kremlin? The second argument leads to dangerous conclusions, for in reality neither in Czechoslovakia nor in Poland, not to mention the USSR itself, is there a conflict today between imperialism and Soviet society that poses the restoration of capitalism as an immediate possibility. Instead there are conflicts between the Soviet bureaucracy and layers (or the majority) of the oppressed, muzzled, and atomized working people which in no way involve an attempt to restore private property (only the most hopeless idiots fall for the crude slanders spread by the bureaucracy on this subject). And in a conflict between the working class and the bureaucracy we stand 100% on the side of the workers, whatever their ideological level may be (and if it is low and confused, this is a result of the bureaucratic dictatorship and will be able to be raised only in the process of overthrowing this dictatorship). Those who equate a conflict between the bureaucracy and the toiling population with a conflict between Soviet society and



international capital are capitulating to Stalinism.

### III. 'Euro-Communism' and the West European Working Class

The fact that the programmatic and political right turn of the "Euro-Communists" chronologically coincides with an upsurge of mass struggles and a sharpening of the social crisis, at least in the countries of southern Europe which have strong "Euro-Communist" parties, permits us to account for the contradiction between the fact that the "Euro-Communists" are compelled to make concessions simultaneously to reformist petty-bourgeois pressure from the right and antibureaucratic pressure from the left. An understanding of this special aspect of "Euro-Communism" enables an understanding of its internal contradictions, especially the contradiction in its dynamic, much more completely than if it is examined solely in terms of its relationship to the Soviet bureaucracy.

Classical Stalinism was an internally sealed system expressing a particular social logic (although a logic which led to totalitarian madness). It may be summarized this way: The Soviet Union was the homeland of the toiling people of the entire world and the capital of world revolution. All interests were represented by the "Leninist Central Committee of the CPSU," with the omniscient general secretary at its head. Any criticism of the Central Committee or the general secretary was thus automatically an expression of the political pressure (or influence) of enemy social classes and in the final analysis an expression of betrayal of the working class. Whoever did not stand behind Stalin unconditionally was "objectively" against socialism and for imperialism.

At least since the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, if not since the rehabilitation of Tito or even since Moscow's break with Tito, this closed system has been springing more and more leaks. With the "Euro-Communists," there is scarcely anything left to salvage. Today it is openly or implicitly accepted that one can remain "in the camp of the international workers movement" while also making merciless criticisms of the policy of the Soviet leadership on many questions. At the same time, it is being openly or implicitly acknowledged that Soviet society, far from being a "workers' paradise," has many features that no "Euro-Communist" party would introduce in the event of the overthrow of capitalism in their own countries. In place of a series of solidified dogmas, today we increasingly find critical questions and timid demands for open discussion (in which we must take as active a part as possible; we have worked far longer on these questions and have reached much more serious Marxist con-

clusions than any other current of the international workers movement).

But there is no Chinese wall between the alleged infallibility of the "great Stalin" and the alleged infallibility of the "little" Stalins on the national, regional, and local levels. If the leadership of the CPSU can make a mistake, so can the leadership of the Italian, French, or Spanish Communist parties. The demand for critical reflection on the current policy of the Soviet bureaucracy (beginning with critical reflection on the history of Soviet society) inevitably leads to the demand for critical reflection on the current policy of the "Euro-Communists" themselves (beginning with the understanding they have of their own history).

In other words, the dynamic of "Euro-Communism" undoubtedly widens the field for workers democracy, for free internal and public discussion in the West European workers movement, in the West European Communist parties, and in the mass organizations controlled or influenced by them, particularly the unions. You cannot eternally recognize "pluralism" in the state and society (including in a future workers state) and simultaneously cling to the dogma of the "monolithic" party, and still less the "monolithic" trade union.

But the greater space for workers democracy objectively opened up by "Euro-Communism" clashes with the objective and especially the subjective consequences of the right turn of the "Euro-Communists." You cannot preach "tolerance" and "democracy" and simultaneously expect that an austerity policy (in Italy), or pressure politics (Spain) can be forced down the throats of combative workers with impunity. "Euro-Communism" thus inevitably leads, at least in the phase of rising mass struggles, to growing differentiation within the CP-led trade unions, growing differentiation within the mass Communist parties themselves (above all among the youth and working-class members), a growing shaking of bureaucratic control over significant sections of vanguard workers, and growing demands for the right of tendencies in CPs, trade unions, and mass organizations. The difference may be easily seen by comparing the results of Berlinguer's course during 1974-77 with those of Togliatti's policy in the big factories of northern Italy from 1943 to 1947.

Apart from the revolt of the working-class and trade-union rank and file against the course followed by Berlinguer (see the appeal supported by the delegates of more than 600 factory councils published in the last issue of *Inprecor*, No. 4, new series, 14 April 1977), the Central Committee of the CP itself has divided into three tendencies: a "right wing" around Amendola, a "center" around Berlinguer, and a "hard-line" wing around Cossutta and the old Stalinist Luigi Longo. A similar phenomenon has arisen in the

Spanish CP, where a "left wing" around Camacho opposed a "right wing" which favored the dissolution of the Workers Commissions, while the "center," around Santiago Carrillo, after negotiating with the right, finally lined up with Camacho on this question.

We have no illusion in the possibility of a "self-reform" of the Stalinist bureaucracy, whether in the USSR or in the "Euro-Communist" mass parties of the imperialist countries. These parties cannot be transformed into revolutionary or centrist parties "under the pressure of the masses." But we are fully convinced that the slackening of bureaucratic control which is being touched off by the dynamic of "Euro-Communism" will introduce a new and higher stage in the crisis of these parties. How will this crisis evolve? What portion of the militant Communist workers and youth will be able to break from the bureaucratic apparatus? To what extent will the growing oppositions in these parties set some limits to the leadership's ability to maneuver? These are questions which will be answered only by the relationship of forces. And in the final analysis the activity of the masses and the role played by revolutionary Marxists both in the mass struggles and in programmatic and political debate will be of decisive importance in determining this relationship of forces.

The big trump card the "Euro-Communists" have been able to play up to now in countries like Italy, France, and Spain has been the fact that in the eyes of the masses they seem to present a *credible comprehensive political strategy*. The reformist content of this strategy is less noticed (and taken less seriously: the anticommunist campaigns of the big bourgeoisie play an important role in concealing this aspect from the eyes of the broad masses). What has attracted the workers, and still attracts them in part, is the fact that for the first time since 1968 they see a possible way out of a political stalemate which has lasted for years and which the masses instinctively or semi-consciously identify with the deepening social crisis of late capitalism. "The unions of the left will win more and more votes. After two or three attempts they will win majorities in parliament. Then when it comes to a test of strength, they will have a better starting point." This is how the broad masses understand "Euro-Communism"; it is also how the German toilers understood Kautsky's "attrition strategy," and Ebert-Scheidemann's "long-term tactics" (the historical precursors of the strategy of "Euro-Communism").

But the sharper the economic difficulties of the era of late capitalism become, the stronger the employers' attacks on the positions the working class has already won, and the more the social crisis and class conflicts sharpen objectively, the faster this strategy will approach its

moment of truth. Collaboration with the bourgeoisie, not to mention a "historic compromise," is no longer possible on the basis of new reforms. It requires new sacrifices, which are imposed on the working class in order to raise the rate of profit. No matter how positive and credible the broad masses may find the "left alternative," they are increasingly less prepared to accept sacrifices in their living standards and democratic freedoms in order to bring it about. They will inevitably collide with the CP apparatus on this point. And this collision will entail a severe crisis for "Euro-Communism," precisely as a consequence of its ideological-political dynamic.

A negative outcome of this crisis—that is, a defeat of the workers in a class struggle against the employers and the

bourgeois state as a consequence of the diversion of their struggles by the CP bureaucracy and the lack of a political alternative—would entail a shift in the relationship of forces to the advantage of big capital, which could have weighty consequences. A victory of the working class in this crisis (which is unthinkable without the qualitative strengthening of a new revolutionary leadership) would require the involvement of broad layers of workers in anticapitalist practice, self-organization, and a political strike *against* the will of the "Euro-Communists." This would open the way to socialist revolution in Western Europe. One way or the other, the "Euro-Communist" strategy is bankrupt.

Many sincere Communist workers, youth, and intellectuals who have been

encouraged in their critical attitude toward Stalinism by "Euro-Communism" will in the future fight in the front ranks of the battle for the interests of their class, for the socialist revolution. A firm and principled policy of unity in action for immediate and transitional demands corresponding to the burning needs of the masses, combined with a patient and pedagogical explanation of the essence of Stalinism, our program of socialist councils, and our alternative strategy are the most important weapons in opening the road for them to come into our ranks. "Euro-Communism" is nothing but a transit station, without a timetable. For real communists there is no other way than Leninism, the way of the Fourth International.

April 15, 1977

## Sri Lanka—May Day Rallies Demand Release of All Political Prisoners

At a May Day rally in Price Park in Colombo, participants passed resolutions calling for greater democratic and trade-union rights.

Called the United Red May Day rally, it was cosponsored by the Ceylon Mercantile Union (CMU), the Mahajana Eksath Peramuna (MEP—People's United Front), and the Sri Lanka Vimukthi Balavegaya (SLVB).

The featured speakers were SLVB General Secretary Prins Gunasekera, Dinesh Gunawardena of the MEP, and CMU General Secretary Bala Tampoe. Tampoe is also a leader of the Revolutionary Marxist party, Sri Lanka section of the Fourth International.

The resolutions adopted at the rally demanded the repeal of the draconian Criminal Justice Commission Act and the Emergency Regulations, a revision of the Trade Union Act to allow public employees to engage in trade-union activities, and the release of all political prisoners.

In particular, attention was brought to the plight of the 2,000 members and supporters of the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (JVP—People's Liberation Front), who are still in prison. The JVP led an uprising against the regime of Sirimavo Bandaranaike in April 1971, in which thousands of youths were killed by government forces. Although the JVP was banned at the time, the lifting of the state of emergency in February of this year allowed it to resume legal activities.

S. Amerasinghe, a JVP representative, also addressed the United Red May Day rally. According to the May 2 *Ceylon Daily News*, Amerasinghe "said the workers should organise themselves to usher in a workers' government shortly. No socialist government could be established by pact other than by a revolutionary process.



TAMPOE: Speaks at Colombo May Day rally.

There was the possibility of a repetition of the 1971 events."

The JVP held a May Day rally of its own at Dematagoda Park in Colombo. The speakers included Acting Secretary Upatissa Gamanayake and K.A. Chandrapala, who was recently elected president of the Students Council at the Peradeniya Campus of the University of Sri Lanka.

Gamanayake attacked the two main capitalist parties in Sri Lanka, Bandaranaike's Sri Lanka Freedom party (SLFP) and the opposition United National party

(UNP). He also blasted certain "senile leftists" for splitting the working class, an apparent reference to the ex-Trotskyist Lanka Sama Samaja party (LSSP)\* and the pro-Moscow Communist party. He announced that the JVP would run a few candidates in the forthcoming elections and would begin to establish its own trade-union base from within the LSSP- and CP-controlled unions.

The *Ceylon Daily News* reported, "He said that the JVP—the party of the proletariat—had to depend on the proletariat for support and hoped that the proletariat would support them in their struggle to build up a genuine communist party."

In addition, Gamanayake "called for the repeal of the Criminal Justice Commissions Act, the release of political prisoners, the repeal of the Public Security Act and an end to police terrorism.

"Mr. Gamanayake said that the JVP would launch a vigorous islandwide campaign to achieve these objectives and intended to call a general strike in support of their call."

Other May Day rallies were held by the United Left Front—an electoral bloc of the LSSP, CP, and People's Democratic party—and by the SLFP and the UNP. □

\*The LSSP (Ceylon Equal Society party) was expelled from the Fourth International in 1964 for accepting posts in Bandaranaike's capitalist government. Its leaders were dropped from her cabinet in 1975.

### Electric Chair Outmoded

The Oklahoma legislature voted May 9 to provide for the execution of prisoners by injection of lethal drugs instead of by the electric chair.



## Italy—Crisis of System and Workers Strategy to Meet It

An Interview With Livio Maitan

*Q. Laying out a revolutionary strategy today requires recognizing that the reformists are still dominant, for the most part, and that up until now, forces to the left of the PCI have polarized around centrist formations. How do Italian revolutionary Marxists, in an organization that remains extremely weak, envision solving this problem?*

A. It is clear to us that the workers movement in Italy will face new crucial tests before there is a radical change in the relationship of forces within it. This is why the problem of what attitude to take toward the masses who are under the reformists' influence, and toward the traditional political and trade-union organizations, remains decisive. This question cannot be avoided by adventures, or by deluded attempts to bypass it; nor can it be solved by adaptation and tail-ending. The *problématique* of the united front and the workers government imposes stern demands on us.

I do not believe that the fundamental criteria are any different in Italy than in France or Spain. The idea that the problem can be reduced to exposing the bureaucratic leaderships and putting them on the spot is sectarian, and at best propagandistic. Such was not Lenin and Trotsky's conception, even though it is not altogether absent from the documents of the Third International, and especially from the actual practice of the period. I am convinced, likewise, that it is an error to subordinate the need for the united front, which has an objective basis insofar as it presupposes a real convergence of interests, to the relationship of forces between bureaucrats and revolutionists.

On the Italian far left, the idea of the united front has always met with very strong resistance, in fact with strong opposition. This is the result both of theoretical errors and sectarian fears. Some reject the possibility of a united front because they consider the PCI a bourgeois party; others fear that a united front would be a popular front, involving an alliance with bourgeois forces. I do not think we will be able to overcome this resistance if we limit ourselves to simply calling for a united front rather mechanically, as the Trotskyist organizations often did before 1968. The problem, rather, is *how* to take concrete steps, even modest ones, in every given situation.

To take an extreme example: The problem of the united front cannot be formulated and advanced in the same way both when the workers movement is coming under sharp economic and political attacks from the class enemy, and when there is a prerevolutionary or revolutionary situation. Basically, the need is the same: It is essential to bring about the greatest possible unity of the working class, and draw other exploited layers around the working class, because unity is one of the prerequisites for victory. Still, in the first instance, even the bureaucrats can have an objective interest in seeing the battle won, and convergence can occur more easily. In the second case, the problem does not take the same form, because the bureaucracies have no interest in promoting the anticapitalist dynamic of the mass movement, and, in fact, do their utmost to block it and derail it. In the first case, there are much better chances than in the second of achieving a united front in the full sense, that is, with agreements at the level of the national leaderships, not just the lower levels or certain sectors. Trotsky wrote about applying the united front policy in 1917 at the time of Kornilov's counterrevolutionary attempt; he didn't mention it in connection with the weeks in October. To give

a more recent example: Would a proposal to the SP leadership to form a united front have had much credibility in July and August of 1975, at a time when Soares was the main instrument of the "democratic counterrevolution"?

To sum up, in a situation where the working class is under attack by the class enemy, when its gains are threatened, and so on, you have to rely on the united front in the strict sense, formulating it this way: Working-class unity can and must be achieved, including by agreements at the top. In prerevolutionary or revolutionary situations, on the other hand, it has to be understood that unity is attainable chiefly around specific objectives, around transitional demands, and that the preferred organizational framework for the recomposition [restructuring] of the working class can and must be organs of revolutionary democracy, the embryos of dual power.

In Italy at the present time, even without a change in the overall relationship of forces, it is possible to force the reformist leaderships into united-front actions, into de facto united fronts. The precondition for this, however, is a convergence of the entire far left or the great majority of it, around goals corresponding, of course, to the needs and aspirations of the masses. If this takes place, it becomes very difficult for the bureaucrats to oppose united actions, at least without paying a high price for it politically. In this sense, unity of the far left and unity of the workers movement are not counterposed, as is feared by some and claimed by others, but are complementary. The Italian experience has shown, moreover, as for example in the day-to-day activity in the student movement, that a conception of unity that excludes the reformists from the start has a boomerang effect, and that, in the last analysis, it jeopardizes unity of the far left itself.

*Q. How have you presented the need for a workers government? How was it presented after June 20 and after the Andreotti government was formed?*

A. The slogan of a workers government was raised based on our analysis that it was necessary to fight for an overall political alternative, especially once an economic crisis had broken out. We emphasized the class content of this formula, which rules out all participation by bourgeois parties and all forms of class collaboration, and therefore also rules out the specific form of class collaboration represented by the historic compromise. How to assess the "government of the left" formula put forward by Proletarian Democracy, of course, depended on how this was interpreted. In some cases the PdUP, and even AO and LC left the door open to possibly including bourgeois parties other than the DC in the government of the left, notably La Malfa's PRI [Partito Repubblicano Italiano—Italian Republican party]. This is an unacceptable position.

Just as in France, the question arises of whether we should merely talk about a workers government in general, or whether we should put forward this formula in a concrete form. There is much to be discussed on this point. But I think that, from the standpoint of the criteria, the question is fairly simple. When the situation requires us to raise the slogan chiefly in a propagandistic way, it is better to use the most general formula, expressing the class nature of the government that must be established and the basic lines of its program. When it becomes necessary to move into the area of agitation, and a workers government is considered objectively attainable in the short run, it is absolutely necessary

to be precise about the political forces that are to make it up. This is why it was correct for years in Italy to use the formula of a "workers government," and then, beginning in mid-1975, to fight for a government of the PCI and PSI. In the present conjuncture, the problem will have to be reexamined very concretely. But, in general, it is necessary to combat the tendency to drop all governmental slogans. The consequence of this would be failure to offer a general political perspective for the struggle against the Andreotti government.

*Q. Is it correct to see the united front in connection with a struggle to oust the Andreotti government, which, in fact, is supported by the PCI and the PSI?*

A. We cannot in any way give an endorsement to a government which is not only bourgeois but which has launched the sharpest offensive against the working class in fifteen years. It is necessary to prepare the way for a mass mobilization strong enough to get rid of this government and at the same time prevent it from being replaced by one with the same outlook, or one even more conservative. However, it is necessary to take note of the fact you called attention to, that the PCI and PSI do not want to topple this government. This does create problems for us in our relations with the masses influenced by these parties. Those who say that a unity accord presupposes agreement on the need to get rid of Andreotti, in my opinion, are taking an ultimatic position. It would be even worse to make this a precondition for any agreement in elections for shop delegates, as the LC comrades tried to do. We have to say: Let us fight the measures taken by Andreotti. These measures are, in fact, arousing strong reactions among the masses, including those sectors that look to the PCI and the PSI. If unity can be achieved on this basis, and a strong enough movement can be built, the Andreotti government will very probably fall.

*Q. Before June 20, the far left debated the problem of what attitude to take toward a government of the workers parties. What is your opinion of this?*

A. If the workers parties had won a majority in the elections, and formed a government, this would have deepened the crisis of leadership of the bourgeoisie and the structural instability of the system. From this standpoint, it was necessary to campaign for the central slogan of a "government of the PCI and PSI." Still, the formation of such a government could obviously not be confused with the proletariat taking power. In no case should revolutionists identify with a government of the reformist parties, or reduce their role to that of a pressure group. They should always act from the standpoint of the interests of the working class, the need to build and strengthen the mass movement, and to organize it on the basis of revolutionary democracy. It goes without saying that this need not exclude either giving critical support to measures directed against capitalist interests, or defending a government of the reformist parties against all reactionary attacks.

### **The 35-Hour Week and the Sliding Scale**

*Q. During the recent struggles around renewing the contracts, revolutionary Marxists raised the slogans of a thirty-five-hour week and a 50,000-lire [US\$56.55] across-the-board salary increase. Only Lotta Continua shared this perspective. Moreover, in recent months, even within Lotta Continua, opposition has been raised to such an axis, which, according to the critics, represents an economist deformation, and arouses no response among the masses.*

A. In the first place, the demand for a thirty-five-hour week was more important, in our view, than the demand for 50,000 lire, which, however, it was correct to raise, since in this fight wage demands could not be ignored. I do not agree that the demand for

a thirty-five-hour week did not have mass support. Through deceptive manipulations, the bureaucrats might at most be able to show that the majority of workers were not in favor of it. But in those cases where the vanguard fought around this question, the results were very positive. This was the case in a large number of plant assemblies and mass demonstrations in Turin, Milan, and Naples in November and December 1975. As additional proof, at the meetings where the new contracts were presented for a vote, a substantially greater number voted to reject them than in the past.

However, we cannot be satisfied just with this type of empirical evidence. In the context of the economic crisis, the problem of the employment rate is crucial. We are confronted with fake solutions put forward by the reformists—investment in the South, first of all, and then so-called control over investment (amounting, at best, to the right of information). The only alternative that can be offered to such deceptions is cutting the workweek with no cut in pay. The demand for thirty-five hours was no more than the concrete expression of this perspective. In the given situation, this slogan had a transitional dynamic, for putting it into practice would mean calling into question all of the economic decisions made by the bourgeoisie on a national level, and would disrupt the normal functioning of the system, sharpening the crisis still further. When you don't lose sight of the fact that this demand was raised in the context of a struggle that had mobilized large sections of the working class, and whose political implications were recognized by everyone, it is simply stupid to speak of economism.

*Q. So in the debate within the LC, you would line up with those who supported the demand for thirty-five hours . . .*

A. Not necessarily. I have two criticisms to make of LC. The first is that the campaign for a thirty-five-hour week was not consistently carried out, to say nothing of the fact that it was started only very belatedly. Secondly, the demand for the thirty-five-hour week was sometimes raised as a transitional goal, but at the same time presented as a type of foretaste of communism and associated with a maximalist approach. So it is understandable that negative reactions are now developing within the organization.

For us, the fight to reduce the workweek, or for a sliding scale of hours, remains central, and must be concretized in the demand for a thirty-five-hour week, or something similar. Some would prefer to put the emphasis on the fight against rationalization of the work force. It would be foolish to minimize this problem. However, in the concrete, what the bosses want to accomplish by means of these rationalizations is to maintain the present level of productivity, or even raise it, while reducing the work force. Thus, the question of jobs arises from this angle as well. It is both possible and necessary, for example, to wage a many-sided struggle, including a fight against overtime, layoffs, speedups, arbitrary transfers, and so on. But if we stay only within those boundaries, we will be locked into a purely defensive struggle, which could even have a suggestion of Luddism\* about it. The fight will have credibility, and will have an impact only insofar as the goal of defending jobs and fighting superexploitation is pursued by struggling for the reduction of the workweek—which the introduction of new techniques could, in principle, help to bring about—and for workers control over speedups, layoffs, working conditions, and so on.

*Q. So you think that the battles over the coming months should be waged with this type of perspective?*

A. Yes, but with one specification. In a more strictly conjunctu-

\*Reference to outlook of the Luddites, an early nineteenth century movement of English workers who destroyed machines that were taking away jobs.—IP



ral sense, it is necessary to emphasize the need for an uncompromising defense of the sliding scale. The sliding scale has become the target of a furious campaign by the government and the bosses; therefore, first priority must be given to answering these attacks.

*Q. You talked about the failure of the far left to project a political and organizational alternative to the reformist parties. However, we cannot ignore the extreme weakness of the revolutionary Marxists, and thus our own responsibilities. How could we envisage a change in this situation? There has been a lot of talk about unity of the far left, and the electoral bloc, in which revolutionary Marxists in Italy participated, appeared to pave the way for it. But now it seems that the process of unification is at an impasse, and that a crisis has broken out in the far left, taking various forms.*

*A. Let's be frank about this: Not only has no revolutionary party developed; there is not even an organization that could offer a sound framework in which to build such a party. The largest centrist organizations cannot do it, and this is even more true of the orthodox Maoist fauna. But it is also true of us.*

*Q. We are faced with the need for a self-criticism . . .*

*A. We have made a self-criticism on several occasions, and the question is on the agenda for our organization's next congress.*

Briefly, the most serious responsibility we have to accept is the fact that we were not quick enough to understand the implications of the change in the situation that began to take form in 1966 or 1967. More specifically, we did not grasp in time that relatively large forces now existed outside the traditional organizations, in particular outside the PCI, and that it was possible and necessary to take independent initiatives, in order to mobilize and polarize these forces, as well as to promote a critical ferment among those who stayed within the orbit of the traditional parties. Others entered this field before we did, with much greater audacity, and have reaped the benefits. Subsequently, after abandoning our entryist orientation, we wasted more precious time before formulating a new strategy for building the revolutionary party. And we were late in establishing the central axis around which to rebuild our organization. Even after this was done and our priorities were established, these priorities were only very partially adhered to in practice. The organization's activity was strongly marked by sectorialism, localism, and empiricism. I am leaving aside here other weaknesses of a more strictly organizational nature, such as the methods of the leadership, etc.

#### **Building the Revolutionary Party and Unity of the Far Left**

*Q. What was the perspective for building the revolutionary party that you adopted after the turn in 1968 and 1969? There seems to be a lack of clarity in the matter. On the other hand, the Italian comrades sometimes appear to have had sectarian reflexes toward the centrist organizations, broadly condemning them all and tending to lump some of them together with the reformists.*

*A. In fact, there were some sectarian attitudes, which went hand in hand with a failure to understand the dynamic and potential of some organizations. It is only in the last two years that we have adjusted our focus, adopting more precisely calculated and more flexible tactics.*

Beginning with the 1970 and 1971 national congresses, we worked out a strategy for building the revolutionary party as the outcome of a three-part "movement": gathering together the vanguard groups around coherent platforms based on a common experience in struggle; attracting the worker and student vanguards around this pole; and developing the antibureaucratic and antireformist consciousness of those working-class sectors that are under the influence of the traditional parties. It was only in 1973 that we made work in the working class a systematic

priority and gave it a central role. Unfortunately, even after this, this priority was not at all rigorously adhered to, even in some major cities.

Our attitude toward the problem of unity of the far left flows from the perspective we have worked out, and from the fact that, despite everything, thousands, even tens of thousands of cadres and militants have acquired very substantial political experience, and are raising a series of vital theoretical and strategic problems. The great debate over electoral unity in April and May 1976 was indicative of this. The June 20 defeat touched off a very deep crisis, whose outcome is still completely undetermined. We consider it important to maintain at least a minimum framework of unity, and remain favorable to a discussion of the political and theoretical problems that face us, as well as to unity in action, with a view to determining to what extent organizational fusion would be possible. Unfortunately, the most recent developments are not encouraging. LC seems to be returning to a largely spontanist outlook, marked by sectarianism toward the PCI, and even the unions. The fusion of the PdUP and AO is continually being put in question, and if it does take place, it will be on the basis of the greatest centrist confusion.

*Q. Whatever happened to the Democrazia Proletaria collectives?*

*A. No one has drawn a balance sheet of them as yet, and it is difficult to get the whole picture. At any rate, it is clear that the same name is used to refer to very different things, from plant collectives similar to the "Coordinamenti" of the vanguard workers, to collectives which are a fairly open type of cultural association. In some cases, in Padua, for example, the collectives are a kind of gathering place for the far left. They have gotten out of the control of groups like the PdUP and AO, which wanted to turn them into an instrument for achieving a unification between their own organizations. We think that some of these experiences have been positive, and our comrades have taken part in them.*

*Q. From some of the assessments made in this interview, we could draw fairly pessimistic conclusions about the current situation in Italy . . .*

*A. Briefly, the situation is still open-ended, the working class still has a considerable capacity for struggle, and the vanguard is still willing to fight. But we are at a very tricky stage, where even in the short run a turn for the worse could begin. A victory for the bosses and the government in the battle which is looming over austerity could mean a retreat by the working class for the first time in ten years. This could be followed by weariness and demoralization. The bourgeoisie would have a chance to attempt a "democratic counterrevolution." There is no need for me to point out the consequences this would have for the workers movement throughout capitalist Europe.*

If we understand this danger, we have to draw the conclusion that it is imperative to involve ourselves more deeply in the struggle, and in our effort at a critical appraisal. After all, even in the event that the current struggles end in failure, it will be important to have acquired enough experiences and strength to insure a stronger starting position in the next wave. It will be important to have correctly drawn the extraordinary lessons of the past decade. If these conditions are met, we can at least prevent the difficult process of building the revolutionary party from being pushed way back, and, on the theoretical level, we will be able to prevent a revival of the kind of revisionist and confused conceptions that were rampant during the prolonged period of economic boom and relative stagnation of working-class struggles. It is possible that this will not seem very significant to those who have a rather catastrophist obsession with immediate results. But the opposite is true, if we keep in mind the historic dimensions of the battles that are unfolding.

December 7, 1976

# Selections From the Left

## Socialist Action

*Published twice monthly in Wellington, New Zealand.*

A Royal Commission on Contraception, Sterilisation and Abortion set up by New Zealand's Labour government in 1975 has submitted a report that is "a major assault on women's rights," reports Kay McVey in the May 6 issue.

"It advocates a tightening up on women's already heavily restricted right to control their own reproductive life," McVey points out.

The report recommends the establishment of a number of bureaucratic steps "which any woman seeking to end an unwanted pregnancy would find almost impossible to overcome." Among them are finding a doctor willing to offer advice, specialists, and "counselors." If she manages all that, then her case goes before a panel of two doctors, along with a nonvoting social worker, who have the final say.

The only other grounds for getting an abortion would be in cases of "substantial risk" of fetal deformity, when pregnancy is the result of incest, or when the pregnant woman is "severely subnormal."

McVey notes that "the Commission's repressive proposals fly in the face of recent public opinion polls, which all show a trend towards increasing majority support for liberalised abortion laws."

## klasse-kampen

*"Class Struggle," published fortnightly in Copenhagen by the Revolutionary Socialist League, Danish section of the Fourth International.*

The April 28 issue reports the formation of a group to defend the rights of foreign workers. The name of the organization is La Emigrantoj En Batalo (LEEB), Esperanto for Emigrant Workers in Struggle.

"LEEB was formed in February this year by fifty foreign workers who knew each other beforehand. The organization is open to all. Its aim is to fight for full equality for foreign workers and to combat all forms of racism, discrimination, and double exploitation. It is thus a broad group and not a party or an initial nucleus of a party.

"In the short time the organization has been operating, work has been carried out by various project groups. . . . One such group plans to form an Emigrants Educational Association. Another group has organized a festival, which is to be held on the 24th of this month. A third group has

been studying the legal rights, or rather lack of legal rights, of immigrant workers. . . ."

In a press release announcing the festival, the LEEB explained: "Who is a 'guest worker' [the official euphemism for immigrant workers in Germany and Scandinavia]? Piratical exploitation of labor is not a new invention. For hundreds of years Irish workers have had to emigrate to eat. Hitler's Germany exploited several million 'foreign workers,' and today there are more than twenty million immigrant workers in West Europe. All economic studies show that capitalists make special profits by using foreign labor power to a certain extent. Immigrant workers are the weakest section of the working class—forced to leave their countries, exposed to the arbitrariness of imperialism, deprived of all civil rights, treated by the authorities as human merchandise."

One of the leaders of LEEB told *Klasse-kampen*:

"We are a specially oppressed group and so we have to organize independently.

"But we are and want to be considered part of the Danish working class. We are not a foreign organization. We are a Danish organization that is organizing a minority with special problems."

## Pro mole

*Paper of the Revolutionary Marxist Group, sympathizing organization of the Fourth International. Published twice monthly in Toronto.*

In the April 8 issue, the "Debate on the Left" column takes up the Maoists' position on the national-liberation struggle of the Québécois people.

"Pledged to preserving a workers' unity that doesn't exist, the political forces of Maoism in Canada actively oppose the path of independence for Quebec. Two organizations, In Struggle (En Lutte) and the Canadian Communist League (Marxist-Leninist), both with a sizeable presence in Quebec, are the main opponents there, in the workers' movement, of the independence struggle—a struggle that they claim can only aid US imperialism.

"In the words of In Struggle, ' . . . the Party will continue to recognize in practice the right of Quebec to separate, and if the people want it that way, the Party will respect this choice . . . But for now, we put the unity of the Canadian proletariat above all.' But, where is this cherished unity that the Maoists refer to?

"Rarely has there been any convergence in the struggles of the working classes of English Canada and Quebec. For the past

decade Québécois workers have waged the most advanced economic and political struggles in North America with scarcely any support coming from the Canadian labour movement.

"Hardly a word of opposition to the repression meted out during the War Measures in 1970 [when Québec was put under emergency rule and hundreds of "security risks" were rounded up], the jailing of the Common Front union leaders in 1972, and the violent crushing of the United Aircraft strike was forthcoming.

"Mobilizations last year against wage controls on March 22 and October 14 were the first instances of common political struggle joined by the two working classes, and even by the left in each nation. A promising beginning it was, but the unity achieved remains tenuous and mainly confined to the trade union level.

"CCL (M-L) views the current Montreal flour mill strike as an example of how 'workers from English-Canada and from Quebec are breaking down the divisions maintained by the bourgeoisie and its state to weaken the proletariat.'

"But the same union that organized support for the strike in Canada, the Ontario council of Canadian Food and Allied Workers, recently urged the CLC to 'launch an aggressive campaign to promote Canadian unity to offset the separatist movement in Quebec.' The Canadian director of the union said, 'We cannot sit back and say "Quebec alone will decide the future of Canada".'

"This the Maoists downplay, continuing to talk about 'unity in action' on the economic front. . . ."

"Building unity between the two working classes is a vital need. The Québécois' struggle could be crushed without it. But that unity can only be based on a recognition of Quebec's historic oppression. The chauvinism of Canadian labour, harbouring the illusion that workers have some stake in maintaining 'national unity' . . . presents the main stumbling block.

"To calls for 'national unity' from the NDP [New Democratic party, a party based on the unions that has its strength essentially in English-speaking Canada], CLC, and federal government, socialists must pose solidarity with the aspirations of the Québécois, beginning with a defense of their right to independence, the most elementary democratic right of a nation."

## Bardona Socialista

*"Socialist Flag," the weekly newspaper of the Revolutionary Workers party. Published in Mexico City.*

The April 20 issue contains a statement from the Political Bureau of the Revolu-



tionary Workers party (PRT) on the question of Mexican political prisoners.

The PRT hails as a victory the decision of the Mexican attorney general's office to drop the cases of more than 400 persons indicted for political reasons. The decision "is a great triumph of the campaign for amnesty that the revolutionary and democratic movement has been conducting since last year," the statement says.

However, the PRT points out, only about 200 prisoners have really been released. The other cases dropped were of individuals free on bail or whose cases were still in the courts. Moreover, "there are still scores of compañeros imprisoned in the Federal District, such as compañera Francisca Calvo Zapata; in Monterrey, such as compañero Sánchez Hiraes; and in Chiapas, Guerrero, and other states. The fundamental job to be done now is to continue the movement to free them. . . ."

## rouge

"Red," revolutionary communist daily, published in Paris.

The April 30 issue has an article by J. Krasny on a new flowering of high-school student opposition papers.

"A page divided down the middle. Two windows drawn side by side. Through the first we can see a scene that includes a classroom and a trash area, where there is a television set, a guillotine, advertisements for Pax detergent, and a picture of the woman symbolizing the republic. Turning his back to this scene of daily brainwashing, a youth leans out the window, trying to look into the one alongside it. There, the décor is completely different—a shining sun, small friendly clouds, birds in flight.

"This allegory on the cover of the *Stove Pipe*, the paper of the students at the Troyes technical high school, admirably sums up the mood that has inspired the striking growth of high-school opposition papers this year.

"In the pages of these bulletins, usually mimeographed with varying degrees of skill and sometimes laboriously handwritten and duplicated on an alcohol machine, in these newspapers sold by hand by a team of activists or school papers taken over and run by the students themselves, we see a real outcry against the boredom and imprisonment of the high schools.

"The few issues . . . we describe in the accompanying article give only a partial picture. These are by no means papers that have just been thrown together. The issues that I have seen are not only lively in their writing and general tone but also well edited. There are cartoons, articles on male chauvinism and sexism, music departments that deal especially with folk music, poems, debates on drugs."

The accompanying article lists high-

school student papers in many towns and cities in France. The first was *Le Petit Pavé Lycéen* ("The Little High-School Student Paving Stone"), named apparently in reminiscence of the clashes between students and police in 1968. It is published in Barrincou "in a makeshift school about four kilometers from the center of the city. The school consists of about twenty prefabricated huts in the open country and has no cultural life. Average sales of the paper are about 400.

"In issue No. 5, there is a special feature on the life of workers." This issue carried interviews with workers in nearby plants. "The PPL has upset people so much that private-school students have launched a rival publication, with the aid of the local merchants. It is devoted to skiing, fishing, and nightlife."

Other papers listed include *Big Bad Wolf* in Bordeaux, *Guillotine Blade* in Maisons-Alfort, *Apple Core*, published by the Lycée Mallarmé in Paris. One of the newest was the *Catapult*, published in Champigny-sur-Marne. Its first issue featured articles on Breton music and women's history.

Krasny notes that one of these papers, *The Underground Rainbow* in Caen, has proposed a conference of the high-school alternative press.

## QUÉ HACER?

"What Is To Be Done?" Organ of the Socialist Workers Organization, a sympathizing organization of the Fourth International. Published monthly in San José, Costa Rica.

The May issue contains an article on working conditions in the city of Guanacaste.

Because many workers in the city are not unionized, the article notes, the bosses get away with paying starvation wages; not paying for overtime worked; not providing fringe benefits, holidays, a weekly day off, vacations, or bonuses.

Unemployment means low wages, the article says. "Most big landowners pay twenty-seven colones [US\$3.13] a day with no fixed number of hours stipulated. The hotel industry pays starvation wages of 350 colones [US\$41] a month for long hours of backbreaking work, which damages the health of the workers."

Workers in Guanacaste are also subject to severe repression of their trade-union rights. "At Empresa Ganadera Industrial (GISA) more than thirty workers have been fired simply because they were organizing to ask for a wage increase. At the IRA Lumber Co. (a capitalist firm that is deforesting Guanacaste with the authorization and help of the Oduber government), workers have been told they will be fired if they organize a union.

"In its sugarcane production operation,

Condesa is replacing the workforce every forty-five days to avoid having to pay workers the most minimal fringe benefits. The Pelón de la Bajura plantation is constantly threatening to fire workers if they mobilize to ask for a wage increase."

Workers in some industries in Guanacaste are beginning to protest this situation, the article continues. The key to begin turning it around is to "organize trade unions independent of the influence of the bosses and the capitalist government. . . ."

"We must join together to solve our problems through an organized, ongoing fight against our class enemy. . . ."

## CLAVE

"Key," fortnightly newspaper published in defense of the interests of the working class. Printed in Mexico City.

The Autonomous University of Nayarit is under attack by the López Portillo government, the April 23-May 7 issue reports.

At Nayarit, a fake professors union was formed, which "has not been recognized by the [democratically chosen] university authorities, but which was recognized by the state conciliation board."

This "union" has carried out several gangster attacks on the campus and was shown to be unrepresentative in a referendum conducted at the end of 1976. "But the 'union' decided not to abide by the decisions of that referendum," the article notes. "It used gangs of thugs protected by the state police to take over university facilities, beating up and even shooting several students."

Then, the "union" formed a fake, unrepresentative governing board, which received full support from Nayarit Governor Flores Curiel. The federal government also recognized this governing board.

"The insistence by Flores Curiel and the federal government on imposing authorities that do not represent the sentiment of the majority of the university population is reminiscent of the Oaxaca case," *Clave* says.

Despite the fact that such a policy brought down the provincial government in Oaxaca, the article notes, "The Mexican government's offensive against the gains of the students, professors, and university workers, has not stopped."

On the contrary, the Nayarit events show that "the government is carrying out a nationwide offensive, which must be responded to quickly."

"A united front is needed to promote mobilizations demanding that the autonomy of Nayarit University be respected and that no state and federal authorities interfere in the affairs of the Nayarit University community. If the government does not stop and the movement gets broader, it could become another Oaxaca."

# AROUND THE WORLD



## 10,000 Students March in São Paulo

Student protests have suddenly erupted in Brazil, seriously challenging the military dictatorship headed by retired Gen. Ernesto Geisel. Correspondent Bruce Handler reports in the May 7 *Washington Post* that student demonstrations have recently taken place in Rio de Janeiro, Porto Alegre, Belo Horizonte, Recife, Campinas, and Ribeirão Preto.

The biggest protest took place May 6 in São Paulo, where about 10,000 students marched through the downtown area carrying banners reading: "Democratic Freedoms," "amnesty," and "Free Our Prisoners." Leaders of the protest read an "open letter to the people" that called for free elections and "an end to torture, arrests, and political persecution." It also criticized "economic exploitation" and "the high cost of living."

The São Paulo demonstration was called in response to the arrest of four students and four workers who were detained for allegedly belonging to a left-wing group, the Workers League. Handler reported that the police used tear gas, but there was no serious violence and no one was arrested.

### Kissinger and the Kurds

In his April 24 column, Jack Anderson revealed some of the details behind Washington's cynical sell-out of the Kurdish struggle for independence from Iraq.

In May 1972 former President Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger met with the shah of Iran in Tehran. At the shah's "insistent request," Anderson said, the two American leaders agreed to arm the Kurds to fight against the Iraqis, with whom the shah was feuding.

During the months that followed, the CIA smuggled some \$16 million worth of Soviet and Chinese-produced weapons to the Kurds, which allowed them to hold off the Iraqi army. On February 22, 1975, Kissinger sent a secret message to Kurdish leader Gen. Mustafa Barzani, which Anderson quoted in his column:

"My dear General," Kissinger's message began, "I want you to know of our admiration for you and your people and for the valiant effort you are making. . . . I am convinced that secrecy has been of paramount importance in maintaining our ability to do what we have done; it is only for this reason—plus our concern for your personal safety—that I hesitate to suggest a personal meeting here with you."

Within weeks of Kissinger's message,

however, the shah reached an agreement with the Iraqi regime. One of the terms was shutting off American and Iranian backing to the Kurdish struggle. CIA support disappeared overnight, Anderson reported, and even Barzani's appeals to Washington for humanitarian aid for the tens of thousands of Kurdish refugees fell on deaf ears.

Anderson also reported that in January 1976 the State Department allowed an official Iraqi delegation to visit Kurdish refugees in the United States for the ostensible purpose of persuading them to return home. Their identities are now known to the Iraqi regime, and many fear for the safety of relatives in Iraq.

### Corporations Leave Québec

A government report issued April 27 in Ottawa claimed an increased number of business headquarters are moving out of Québec following the Parti Québécois' victory in last November's provincial elections.

The report, issued by the Department of Corporate Affairs, stated that ninety-one companies moved their head offices out of Québec between last November and the end of February. In the previous ten months fifty-seven such shifts were reported.

The federal report coincided with the introduction of a bill in the Québec assembly that would prohibit English-language employers from discriminating against French-speaking workers.

### California Cops Back Down on Their Swindle Story About the PLO

The California Highway Patrol grabbed headlines last February by reporting it had uncovered a ring of Arab students engaged in bilking insurance companies to the tune of \$5 million. Police said the money was being secretly channeled to the Palestine Liberation Organization overseas.

While the witch-hunt is still being pursued—several students have already been arrested—California police were forced to admit that the "PLO link" hasn't materialized. Lieut. Glenn Sewell, who is supervising the investigation for the highway patrol, said, "We haven't been able to confirm that money is leaving the country."

James Ahern, director of the insurance

industry's antifraud organization, admitted they have "no evidence that money from Arab insurance claimants is going to the P.L.O." But, he added, "it certainly is a possibility."

### India Abandons Forced Birth Control

Prime Minister Morarji Desai told a meeting of Indian Health officials that the government would seek to control the country's birth rate without forced sterilization, according to a report in the May 8 *New York Times*.

Mandatory sterilization was adopted as government policy during former Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's two years of emergency rule. As administered by her son, Sanjay, the policy was bitterly opposed and contributed to the former prime minister's recent election defeat.

Desai told the two-day health conference in New Delhi that the problem of population growth was "serious" and should be tackled "in a manner acceptable and suitable" to the people. Desai announced that a "family welfare program" would replace the old Congress party's "family planning program."

India's new health minister, Raj Narain, said the government would retain the birth-control goals and methods of the Gandhi government, less the coercion. The present birth rate of 34.5 per thousand persons would be brought down to 30 in two years and to 25 by 1984, he said.

"In trying to achieve these targets," he said, "there should be no compulsion, no coercion, no pressure of any kind and all methods should be promoted with equal vigor. Sterilization alone is not family welfare."

An official source in the health ministry said that as a result of deemphasizing sterilization, the number of sterilization operations have already dropped dramatically. Against more than a million such operations in January of this year, they numbered only a few thousand in March.

### Spain Bars 67 Parties From Elections

According to a May 6 Reuters dispatch, 67 political parties will be excluded from Spain's general elections June 15. The Interior Ministry has registered 156 parties for the ballot, but refused to certify the others.

Among the parties that have not yet been legalized by the Spanish government



are the Liga Comunista and the Liga Comunista Revolucionaria (Communist League and Revolutionary Communist League), the two sympathizing organizations of the Fourth International in Spain.

### Paul Goma Released in Romania

Writer Paul Goma was one of 19,000 prisoners released by the Romanian government May 9 under the conditions of a sweeping amnesty. The announcement was timed to coincide with Romania's celebration of the 100th anniversary of its independence. The government also said an additional 9,500 persons would not be brought to trial or would not have to serve their sentences.

Goma and other dissidents were arrested this April for signing a human rights appeal addressed to the upcoming Belgrade conference to review the Helsinki accords.

### Chilean Secret Police Request Funds to 'Neutralize Junta Opponents

A September 1975 memorandum to Chilean dictator Augusto Pinochet from the head of the country's secret police—the Dirección de Inteligencia Nacional (DINA)—requested a supplementary budget allotment of \$600,000 for the final three months of that year.

The memo gave four reasons why DINA needed the extra money:

1. To increase DINA personnel stationed in diplomatic missions in Peru, Brazil, Argentina, Venezuela, Costa Rica, Belgium, and Italy.
2. To pay "additional expenses" involved in the "neutralization" of the Chilean junta's main opponents abroad, "especially in Mexico, Argentina, Costa Rica, the United States, France, and Italy."

3. To pay expenses related to "operations in Peru—aid to our supporters in the Peruvian navy and press. . . ."

4. To continue financing counterinsurgency training in Brazil for DINA officers.

A commentary on this memorandum issued by the Phoenix Committee for Human Rights in Latin America noted the "success DINA has had" in the job of "neutralizing" junta opponents abroad. The committee listed the murder of Chilean General Carlos Prats in Argentina, Socialist party leader Orlando Letelier in Washington, and the attempted murder of Christian Democratic leader Bernardo Leighton in Rome.

Chilean authorities claim the memo is a forgery.

However, syndicated columnist Jack Anderson reported in the May 3 issue of the *Washington Post* that "A DINA defector now in asylum in the Italian embassy in Santiago . . . has confirmed the authenticity of the memo."

Anderson added, "We have also had

access to other DINA documents, which the Chilean government has acknowledged are authentic. These resemble the disputed document in every detail."



Herblock/Washington Post

### CIA Sued for Tampering With Mail

A trial charging the Central Intelligence Agency with illegally opening the mail of American citizens opened May 9 in Brooklyn, New York. From 1953 to 1973, CIA agents are said to have opened more than 200,000 pieces of mail as part of its domestic surveillance program.

Seeking between \$20,000 and \$50,000 in damages from the government for invasion of privacy are Norman Birnbaum, an Amherst college professor; Leonard Avery, a Minneapolis advertising executive; and Mary MacMillen, a writer from Massachusetts. All three charged that letters they had sent to the Soviet Union were intercepted and read by the CIA.

At a Senate committee hearing in 1975, CIA Director Richard Helms testified that the agency had known the mail intercepts were illegal. Therefore, the only real issue in the present lawsuit is whether the government should be forced to pay damages.

Burt Neuborne, an attorney representing MacMillen and Avery, told the court that his clients were pressing the case "to let every C.I.A. and F.B.I. agent know that when they violate your rights, they are valuable rights and the court will give substantial money damages."

On the other hand, a lawyer representing the government told the jury: "If you feel there are not damages, there should be no award. And if you feel some damages should be assessed as a token so that the

law should not be violated—\$5 to \$10—that would not be to say that's what you think the rights are worth."

### Fulsome Praise Department

*Rodong Sinmun* (organ of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers party) carried an editorial April 4 headed "The Great National Honour and Revolutionary Pride of Our People Who Have Their Great Leader in the Person of Respected and Beloved Comrade Kim Il Sung."

The editors contend that national honor and pride are lofty goals that can be realized only through the person of a "great leader":

"Only when they attend a great leader can the people of each country . . . explore the road of the revolution with flying colours. . . ."

"It was an ardent wish of our people . . . to have a great leader who would lead the struggle along a correct road and save the nation from misery.

"This age-old desire and ardent craving of our people came true only when the great leader Comrade Kim Il Sung, the peerless patriot and national hero, stood in the van of the Korean revolution shouldering upon himself the destiny of the country and the nation. . . ."

"The august name of the respected and beloved leader peerless in the thousands of years long history of our people is a symbol of the glory of the age and the nation, all our victories and greatness. . . ."

"The historic agrarian reform for liquidating the thousands of years long feudal fetters was carried out in only 20 days or so . . . and the historic task of industrialisation which took others hundreds of years was brilliantly fulfilled in a brief period, 14 years. All these legend-like miracles are historic events which are possible only in heroic Korea under the guidance of the great leader of the revolution." (Quoted from a translation in the April 13 issue of *People's Korea*.)

### Freudian 'Slip of the Tongue'?

Jack Anderson reported in his May 13 syndicated column that Rep. John Ashbrook of Ohio recently referred to the late Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. as a "nigger." Ashbrook made the remark, Anderson says, at a Washington dinner meeting called to discuss the current investigations into the assassinations of John F. Kennedy and Dr. King.

When former chief counsel to the House assassinations committee, Richard Sprague, mentioned the slain civil-rights leader, witnesses heard Ashbrook complain that time and money "should not be wasted investigating the murder of some nigger." The congressman denied making the remark, but Sprague and others at the dinner confirmed the quote as accurate.

# Capitalism Fouls Things Up



## New Hampshire Protesters Win Release

In what was widely recognized as a considerable victory for their cause, the last 541 antinuclear protesters detained in five New Hampshire National Guard armories gained their release on May 13. They were among the 1,414 persons arrested May 1-2 on trespassing charges following the occupation of an atomic power plant construction site in Seabrook, New Hampshire.

The releases were arranged in negotiations between state authorities and representatives of the Clamshell Alliance, which organized the occupation. The demonstrators pleaded not guilty in a lower court, were found guilty in mass trials, and then released without bail. All now have the automatic right to appeal their convictions in higher courts, a process that is expected to take months.

New Hampshire Attorney General David Souter, calling the occupation "one of the most well-planned acts of criminal activity" in American history, had tried to justify continued detention on the grounds that the activists were planning to immediately reoccupy the building site. The charge was denied as "absurd" by a representative of the demonstrators, and the editors of the *New York Times* felt compelled to say that the action of the authorities "smacks mightily of preventive detention."

The conditions under which the protesters were held had been challenged in federal court by the American Civil Liberties Union as "cruel and unusual punishment." Few blankets or showers were available; lights were left on all night; persons were crowded together with virtually no privacy; conditions were unsanitary; and illness had begun to spread.

Clamshell activist Rennie Cushing told the judge after his trial, "On behalf of my fellow defendants, I would like to say that our acceptance of this agreement in no way condones the incarceration perpetrated on us by the state. It's a raw deal."

New Hampshire officials also came under increasing fire for the \$50,000 a day the continued detention was costing the state. Governor Meldrim Thomson launched a nationwide appeal for funds May 6, calling for contributions from "corporations, labor unions, and rank-and-file citizens." His call cited a letter sup-

posedly received from a nuclear worker in Hanford, Washington, who said, "You in New Hampshire are doing this job for us. If they are not stopped there, they will be out here next."

Thomson has been unavailable to the news media since making his appeal. His office says it has no report on how the fund-raising effort is doing.

The jailed protesters were determined, however, not to let their campaign against the dangers of nuclear power become lost in the legal defense arising from Gov. Thomson's repressive actions.

The "Dover Armory 265" issued a ten-page statement on May 7, saying the danger of radiation lasts "for thousands and thousands of years," citing the "enormous costs" of nuclear plants, and warning that a "police state" could arise out of the stringent security measures that surround the nuclear industry.

They said they were being held because "we believe that what happens in New Hampshire has enormous bearing on what will happen to nuclear power all over our nation and all over the world."

Protests such as those at Seabrook, along with legal challenges based on safety and environmental issues, have considerably slowed American nuclear development. But recent government actions show that the antinuclear movement still has a big job ahead of it.

On May 6 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's atomic safety and licensing board gave the go-ahead for construction of a 5,100 megawatt reactor complex at Hartsville, Tennessee. This will be the world's biggest atomic plant, more than twice the size of the Seabrook project. On May 12, the House Committee on Science and Technology voted 38-0 to continue full funding for the \$2.2 billion breeder reactor at Clinch River, Tennessee. The Carter administration had proposed canceling it as a concession to the antinuclear movement.

### Barry Commoner Speaks Out Against Carter's Nuclear Plans

Although many prominent American environmentalists and ecology organizations have so far been taken in by what they see as the "conservationism" in

Jimmy Carter's proposed energy program, ecologist Barry Commoner of Washington University has not.

Speaking before the energy task force of the National League of Cities, Commoner focused his fire on Carter's proposal to step up reliance on nuclear power: "By implementing the plan, we would have made an unwitting choice—which may already be anticipated in the thinking of its authors—to pursue the nuclear route," including the breeder reactor which produces more fuel than it consumes, he said. "If we go the nuclear route, we will have our country powered by huge nuclear plants protected like military installations."

Commoner is the author of several widely read books on the environment. His most recent is *The Poverty of Power*, in which he advocates the development of solar power as a renewable, environmentally sound alternative. He said that "despite claims to the contrary," Carter's plan "does very little" toward development of solar energy.

Commoner also criticized Carter's efforts to streamline the licensing process for nuclear plants: "If you cut down on hearings, you will cut down on environmental and safety standards."

"What is called for is a new beginning—not a modification of Carter's plan," Commoner said.

### Toxic Chemicals Invade Louisville Sewer System

Thirty-one workers at Louisville, Kentucky's sewage treatment plant began complaining in late March of skin rashes, nausea, and loss of memory. The source of their symptoms was soon found to be at least six tons of highly toxic chemicals that had entered the city's sewer system.

Before this discovery, eight million gallons of contaminated water had been dumped into the Ohio River, and six million gallons of poisoned sludge were accumulated at the plant. To halt further contamination, the city began dumping its untreated sewage into the river. By May 11, more than four billion gallons had been dumped. The plant was not expected to reopen until at least May 18.

The chemicals responsible are known as HCP and OCTA. HCP is used as raw material in the manufacture of Kepone,



Tris, and several other substances listed as carcinogenic by federal agencies. OCTA is a by-product in the preparation of HCP.

Twenty-six blocks of sewer line in Louisville were affected by the chemicals. Engineers devised an elaborate plan for flushing them out, using massive quantities of rubbing alcohol and activated charcoal. Fire trucks and carbon dioxide were to be held in readiness in case the volatile alcohol caught fire.

According to the April 25 *Washington Post*, "Nobody knows whether this strategy will be successful. Arguing against it is the fact that the sewer line, about 70 years old, has a layer of sludge that ranges from eight to 17 inches thick, and HCP, a heavy substance, tends to collect in low spots."

Seventy-five thousand 55-gallon drums will be required for transporting the contaminated sludge to landfills or to a special incinerator.

The whole operation is expected to cost \$8.6 million.

No culprit had been identified at last report, although FBI and state investigations were leading in the direction of Kentucky Liquid Recycling, Inc., which operates a plant on the Ohio River just across from Louisville. A large quantity of HCP was discovered there and traced to the chemical's only U.S. manufacturer, Velsicol Chemical Corporation.

Velsicol has been implicated in a number of other recent industrial poisoning cases, including widespread nerve damage among workers at its Phosvel pesticide plant in Bayport, Texas (see "The Phosvel Zombies," *Intercontinental Press*, December 20, 1976, p. 1831).

### Protests Continue at Tokyo Airport

Four thousand persons gathered at the new Tokyo International Airport on May 8 to protest an action taken by police two days earlier.

On May 6, working under the cover of darkness, 2,100 cops moved in to topple the two steel towers that have blocked runways at the field for the past five years. The towers had been erected by farmers in the area and their allies. They were a national symbol of opposition to the environmental destruction and land seizures the government has carried out to build the airport.

The demonstrators on May 8 were attacked by 4,000 riot police firing tear gas and water cannon directly into the rally. A young worker was severely wounded and is in a coma from which he may not recover, his skull smashed by a gas shell fired from a distance of four meters. Thirty-three protesters were arrested and 296 were injured.

Antiairport activist Issaku Tomura condemned the police violence. "Even if the steel towers have been knocked down, there is still a movement opposed to the transport of fuel," he said. "The movement

will grow as a result of these outrageous actions." Tomura was referring to a railway union boycott on the shipping of jet fuel to the airport (see *Intercontinental Press*, April 25, p. 460).

### No Bargain

We reported May 9 (p. 526) on the environmental damage that could result if Jimmy Carter's plans to increase U.S. coal consumption by 65 percent are carried out. More evidence of this recently became available in a study by the Energy



Engelhardt/St. Louis Post-Dispatch

"I needed the (burp) energy, boy."

Research and Development Administration.

The ERDA's figures show that coal conversion would result in a 30 percent increase in nitrogen oxides, even if "clean air" laws are strictly enforced. An 18 percent rise in this pollutant would still occur if the best pollution control equipment available were required. Nitrogen oxide is the chief component of the photochemical smog which plagues all urban areas.

Sulfur dioxide, another pollutant in coal smoke, would increase by 10 percent under strict clean-air enforcement, and 60 percent based on current poor compliance levels.

The ERDA study was made available to the news media May 3 by Senator Gary Hart. "The American people are being required to make a Faustian bargain by trading off public health for a solution to the energy problem," Hart said.

### Carter, Trudeau Face Gas Pipeline Dilemma

The richest reserve of natural gas yet discovered in North America, more than 20 trillion cubic feet—enough to provide 5 percent of U.S. consumption for twenty-

five years—lies beneath Prudhoe Bay on the northern coast of Alaska. Now that Jimmy Carter has proposed lifting controls on natural gas prices, various pipeline companies and other developers are anxious to begin exploiting this newly profitable energy resource.

But development of the Alaska gas field is being held up for U.S. and Canadian government decisions on how the gas should be transported south.

Three alternatives have been proposed. Two involve pipelines across Canada, through either the Yukon or the Mackenzie Valley. The third would be an Alaska pipeline followed by shipment of liquefied gas by tanker to a port north of San Francisco.

The U.S. Federal Power Commission rejected the sea route May 2 as more environmentally damaging than either of the two Canadian pipelines, but failed to determine which of these it preferred. President Carter must now make a final decision to propose to Congress by December 1.

Meanwhile, a commission appointed by the Canadian government to study the pipeline routes brought in its report May 9. It recommended a ban on any gas line across the northern Yukon, and urged that no line be built through the Mackenzie Valley for at least ten years.

Commission head Judge Thomas Berger said a Yukon line would cause "irreparable environmental losses of national and international importance." He also insisted that the Mackenzie route be delayed until land claims of the native Indian, Inuit, and Métis peoples in the area are settled, and they "become better equipped to cope with the massive social and environmental changes that would follow the projects" (*New York Times*, May 10).

Beside its effects on the lives of the native peoples, a Mackenzie Valley pipeline would also result in the disappearance of one of the last great caribou herds in North America, Berger said.

Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau has promised a decision on the pipeline routes by September 1. He said recently that "Canadians want to be as helpful to Americans as we can." But the depth of opposition Trudeau faces was indicated when the entire first printing of 16,000 copies of the Berger report was sold out in one day.

Carter can expect similar opposition if he decides to support a trans-Alaska route followed by shipment of liquefied natural gas (LNG) to California. Aside from the ecological drawbacks of constructing another pipeline across Alaska, LNG is very dangerous to handle. A large-scale spill, if ignited, can lead to an immense fireball several miles in extent. An explosion in an LNG storage tank on Staten Island, New York, in 1973 killed forty workers. And that tank had been empty for a year.

# Japanese Government Seeks Home Port for Nuclear Ship With Leaky Reactor

By Mutsugoro Kawasaki

TOKYO—The Japanese government has a 8,200-ton problem: the *Mutsu*, a nuclear-powered ship with a leaking reactor. This floating white elephant has lain idle at its berth near Mutsu City since completion in 1972, owing to the protests of local fishermen and residents. It cannot be repaired there, and each suggestion of a new "home port" in which to repair it provokes powerful opposition in and around the city thus threatened.

The *Mutsu* was an important prestige project for the Japanese government, which hoped that it would be the first of a fleet of such merchant ships. These hopes received a severe blow during the ship's first test at sea. The reactor had been operating for only three days when a radiation leak was detected—at only 1 percent of maximum power—800 kilometers from Mutsu City.

Protests by the local Aomori Prefectural Fishermen's Cooperative Association (APFCA) and other groups had already delayed this test for more than two years. They feared that radioactive discharges from the ship would damage the successful scallop fisheries in the coastal waters. Eventually a 100 million yen (US\$370,000) compensation fund was promised by the government, and local officials capitulated and gave their consent.

On August 25, 1974, the *Mutsu* prepared to sail. But the APFCA was adamant, and mobilized some 250 fishing boats to completely surround the vessel and prevent its departure. This tactic was defeated only when a typhoon sprang up, forcing the small boats to run for shelter and allowing the *Mutsu* to slip out to sea under naval escort.

When news of the reactor leak reached Mutsu City, it sparked a fresh wave of demonstrations. The APFCA completely blockaded the entrance to the port to prevent the ship's return. The government had to send Zenko Suzuki, a top leader of the ruling Liberal-Democratic party (LDP), to negotiate a compromise. The *Mutsu* drifted at sea for forty-three days until an agreement was reached among the local mayor, the prefectural governor, and the APFCA.

The agreement, signed in October 1974, stipulated that the government would pay 1.4 billion yen (US\$5.2 million) in compensation to the fishermen for allowing the ship to return to port, but that no attempt would be made to repair it there. Further, all shore-based nuclear services would be dismantled and the ship would be moved from Mutsu City within two and a half years (that is, by April 1977).

So began the search for a new home port

in which to repair this floating monument to the irrationality of Japanese capitalism. Many sites were suggested, but whenever an official proposal was made, an opposition movement sprang up among residents of the threatened port. This even happened on the small, sparsely populated islands of Tanegashima and Tsushima.

The *Mutsu* problem is by no means unique in the history of Japanese industrial development. The success of Japan's industrial complex has been based not only on borrowed technology and wages that are low in comparison to other imperialist powers, but also on wholesale devastation of the environment. This is an especially sharp contradiction in Japan, which has a high population density and depends heavily on fishing as the major source of food. Many industrial developments during the last twenty years have been imposed over opposition from local residents. Some have been delayed for longer than the testing of the *Mutsu*.

Soon after taking office last December, Prime Minister Takeo Fukuda promised to push through two projects that have long been stalled: the new Tokyo International Airport and the repair and testing of the *Mutsu*.

As all other proposals have met very stiff resistance, the best possibility the government now has is Sasebo, in Nagasaki Prefecture. This is an important shipbuilding center, where the effects of the world recession in that industry have been acutely felt. Furthermore, the port has been working below capacity since the U.S. Navy stopped using it at the end of the Vietnam War.

On the other hand, Nagasaki Prefecture is Japan's second largest marine produce area, and nearly all the fishing is done relatively near the coast by small, family-owned boats. Thus there are a large number of local fishermen throughout the area who are extremely hostile to the prospect of a ship with a leaking reactor sailing into Sasebo harbor. They remember how fish catches were substantially depleted after the U.S. nuclear submarine *Swordfish* leaked radioactive waste into the bay in 1969.

The Nagasaki Prefectural Fishermen's Cooperative Association (NPFCA), representing the owners of some 1,400 boats, is the major opposition group. The Socialist party, supported by the Sohyo trade-union federation, has taken up the issue in connection with this year's Spring Labor Offensive.\* In addition, environmental

groups, organizations of victims of the Nagasaki bombing, and student groups have all participated in a series of marches and rallies, some of which have involved more than 10,000 persons.

The movement has been divided, however, along the traditional lines of local politics. The fishermen and labor unions organize separate demonstrations, and left-wing groups have not been allowed to sell their publications or distribute leaflets at rallies called by the NPFCA. The LDP-affiliated leadership of the fishermen's association has adopted this policy because they fear that the fishermen are becoming alienated from the ruling party and are ready to listen to radical currents in the labor movement.

In areas such as Nagasaki, the LDP draws its electoral support from petty-bourgeois layers such as small businessmen, farmers, and fishermen, and usually seeks to set them against the labor unions. Thus Mayor Ichizo Tsuji and Prefectural Governor Kanichi Kubo find themselves in a difficult position. Both were elected on the LDP ticket, and they can see their support dwindling as they attempt to find a compromise which will allow the *Mutsu* to enter Sasebo.

Last December Governor Kubo set up a special commission to investigate the safety problems involved in repairing the ship. The only firm conclusion in the report was that repairs could be safely carried out only if the nuclear fuel were removed before the vessel was brought to Sasebo. Despite this, Mayor Tsuji pushed a proposal through a council meeting on March 30 that the *Mutsu*, complete with fuel, be allowed to use the port. (The regular council meeting on the previous day had been canceled due to the presence of about 500 protesters.) The council's decision provoked a large strike of Sohyo unions in Nagasaki on April 3. The NPFCA has promised to blockade the port with their 1,400 boats to keep the ship out, and the Nagasaki Joint Action Committee has vowed "an all-out struggle until the *Mutsu* is scrapped."

The April deadline has passed, but the *Mutsu* has not moved. The Aomori fishermen are renewing their campaign, demanding further compensation from the government. Attention is now on the Nagasaki Prefectural Assembly, due to discuss the issue soon. Whatever their decision, the stage is set for a confrontation, and the government is not the favorite to win.

May 2, 1977

kai (General Council of Trade Unions of Japan), the largest union federation in Japan, led by the Socialist party. It has become traditional each spring for Sohyo and other major unions to stage mass rallies, strikes, and other actions to press their demands. The wage settlements won then generally set the pattern for the rest of industry.

\*Sohyo is short for Nihon Rodo Kumiai Sohyogi-