

# Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 15, No. 32

© 1977 by Intercontinental Press

September 5, 1977

75¢

## Questions Left Unanswered in Teng, Vance Secret Talks



Gamma/Liaison

TENG: Rehabilitated "capitalist roader" hits it off with Vance at sumptuous Peking banquet.

**Parading the British Crown  
in Northern Ireland**

**American Rightwingers Condemn  
'Giveaway' of Panama Canal**

**Why Albanian CP Discovered  
'Differences' With Peking**

**Enrique Broquen Released  
in Argentina**

**50,000 in Australia Protest  
Uranium Mining**

**Free the Student Demonstrators  
Behind Bars in Brazil!**

— Statement by Panamanian Trotskyists —

**'Not a Single U.S. Soldier, Not a Single U.S. Base on Our Soil!'**

## Questions Left Unanswered in Teng, Vance Secret Talks

By Joseph Hansen

What did the Carter administration gain in the secret talks between Secretary of State Cyrus R. Vance and Deputy Premier Teng Hsiao-p'ing?

After being briefed by Vance, Carter said August 27 that the talks "were highly successful." He went so far as to say, "I believe this is a major step forward in our ultimate goal of normalizing relations with the People's Republic of China."

As for Teng and Communist Party Chairman Hua Kuo-feng, Carter revealed that they had sent him word that the discussions were "very fruitful from their point of view."

However, up to now neither side has listed anything concrete as having resulted from the talks. Thus—unless a secret understanding was reached—Vance's four-day stay in Peking (August 22-25) ended with nothing more achieved than passing the time of day at a round of sumptuous banquets.

Correspondents, hard-pressed for news, were reduced to such meager bits as reporting how Teng, during the banquet he staged, smoked and chewed on a cigar, aiming at a porcelain spittoon when necessary.

At a news conference held June 30, Carter indicated that he expected to gain something more from Vance's trip to Peking than later proved to be the case. He implied that in order to reach agreement with the Hua government he was prepared to break formal diplomatic and military ties with the regime established by Chiang Kai-shek on Taiwan.

When he was asked whether there could be full relations with China while continuing the U.S. defense commitment to Taiwan, he replied:

This is a difficult question to answer now. My hope is that we could work out an agreement with the People's Republic of China, having full

diplomatic relations with them and still make sure that the peaceful life of the Taiwanese, the Republic of China, is maintained.

That is our hope and that is our goal.

To establish "normalization" of relations, Peking has demanded that Washington meet three conditions:

1. End recognition of Chiang's Republic of China.
2. End the 1954 Mutual Security Treaty with the Chiang regime.
3. Withdraw American military bases and troops from Taiwan. (The Defense Department reported August 15 that U.S. military personnel in Taiwan is now down to 1,165.)

On the surface, meeting the three conditions would seem to offer no great difficulties to the Carter administration. Yet it has led to a division of opinion in imperialist circles that could hurt Carter on the domestic political scene.

In fact some of the commentators have expressed the opinion that the main objective of Vance's trip was to indicate the domestic political problem facing the White House and to hint that China's new leaders could help out by making a commitment, however diplomatically voiced, not to attack Taiwan.

Against this, Peking points out that relations with Taiwan are not Washington's business, since Taiwan is only a province. Thus the U.S. position amounts to intervening in China's internal affairs.

The opposition to conceding to Peking's three conditions emanates from such reactionary figures as Ronald Reagan, with Senator Goldwater tagging along. They point to such difficulties as the 1954 Mutual Security Treaty, which provides, "This Treaty shall remain in force indefinitely. Either Party may terminate it one year after notice has been given to the other Party."

If Carter were to give one year's notice, the antediluvians would do their utmost to convert the issue into a hot one. Thus White House circles have talked of allowing the treaty to "lapse." But there is no way to do this because the treaty remains in force "indefinitely."

Underlying this legalistic dilemma are more substantial considerations. The August 29 issue of *Time* magazine alluded to them as follows:

Taiwan is today a mini-industrial power. Although the island's population—16.6 million—is only one-fiftieth of mainland China's, its trade

with the U.S. is 14 times greater than that of its huge neighbor—nearly \$5 billion last year. Taiwan's robust growth rate—more than 10% in most of the years since the 1960s—has boosted its G.N.P. to just over \$17 billion. During the worldwide recession of 1974-75, inflation whirled up to a 40% annual rate for a while, but the regime has since brought that down to less than 3%.

Taiwan has taken care to maintain relations with its trading partners who have cut off formal ties through the establishment of quasi-official trade and cultural offices. By far the most important of these "private" relationships is with Japan, whose so-called Interchange Association with Taiwan is staffed by Foreign Office officials on "temporary leave." Japan does more business with Taiwan today than before it broke with Taipei and established relations with Peking in 1972.

Then why all the jitters over a possible break with the U.S.? Some experts maintain that the abrogation of the American defense commitment to Taiwan would result in a scenario in which an emboldened Peking would attempt to frighten foreign companies and investors away from the island by threatening economic reprisals or military action. "If some people are scared off," says one top government official, "the economic consequences for us could be disastrous."

These objections, centered on safeguarding investments in Taiwan, are associated with a view that puts priority on use of the club in foreign policy. If relations with China were normalized, they argue, wouldn't this completely demoralize the dictatorial South Korean regime as well as similar "friends of America" throughout the world?

There is a grain of truth in this contention. To continue to maintain recognition of the Chiang regime in Taiwan is tantamount to declaring that Carter intends to continue an openly counterrevolutionary course toward China, for it means upholding the Chiang regime's objective of returning to the mainland and smashing the Chinese revolution. That would really inspire the Parks, the Marcos's, the Pinochets, and the Vorsters.

The imperialist circle that favors immediate "normalization" of relations with China takes into account a much broader relationship of forces than those centering on Taiwan. They worry in particular over the possibility that if things are permitted to drift any longer, Peking may decide to break the triangular setup that permits the U.S. to play the two big workers states against each other, and seek a détente with the Brezhnev regime. From the viewpoint of American imperialism, this would constitute a major disaster.

In a well-publicized speech given in Boston on August 15, Senator Edward M. Kennedy, one of the leaders of this current, argued that China's "unremitting opposition to Soviet power" cannot be taken for granted indefinitely. He held that "Chinese frustration with the United States over Taiwan might eventually overcome" the late Mao Tsetung's "strong anti-Soviet legacy and lead over time to a limited detente between China and the U.S.S.R."

### NEXT WEEK . . .

"Revolution in Zimbabwe"—a series by *Intercontinental Press* correspondent Jim Atkinson, recently returned from Zimbabwe.

Part I, "The British Conquest and African Resistance," begins next week. Don't miss it. Reserve your copy now.

One of the effects of normalizing relations with China by ending "our military presence there, and our formal diplomatic relations with the island," would be to "create at least some incentive" for the Soviet Union to "improve relations with the United States."

Kennedy added:

Recent historical experience indicates that our relationships have risen and fallen together—1972 and 1973 were years of good U.S. relations with both Moscow and Peking, reflecting not only the key triangular process but the international environment and our bilateral relationships. Since 1974 new problems have arisen in U.S. relations with both.

Clearly, Kennedy is interested in the health of the triangular process, by which he means the capacity of the White House to play the Soviet Union and China against each other.

Despite his seeming readiness to put the key triangular process above third- or fourth-rate items like the fate of Taiwan, Kennedy wriggled on the latter issue. "We should continue to ensure that Taiwan has access to supplies needed for self-defense."

"The Chinese, in turn," Kennedy said, "should be expected to be sensitive to our interests and concerns."

This means, he said, that China would "not . . . oppose reasonable steps by the United States to provide for a prosperous and peaceful Taiwan."

Perhaps Kennedy had in mind keeping up arms sales to Taipei. Taiwan's armed forces consist of 500,000. This includes 350,000 army troops, 70,000 in the navy and marines, and 80,000 in the air force.

This year's budget provides for 48.3 percent in military spending.

Secret computer tests show that Taipei can produce nuclear weapons if necessary.

Carter thus faces three dilemmas. The first is the domestic political threat from the rightist Republicans and Democrats. Should he or should he not meet the Reagans head-on in the higher interests of imperialist America?

The second is Taiwan. Should he risk putting in jeopardy lucrative investments on that island in hope of eventually opening the doors to trade—and perhaps much more—with China?

The third is the relationship with China and the Soviet Union. How can Carter continue to play the triangular game without soon normalizing relations with China? And how can this be fitted in with increasing the pressure on Moscow?

The reports on Vance's talks with Teng offered nothing in the way of answers to these questions.

At the moment, Carter seems to have given top place to his domestic political problems.

If this is the case, then the most that Vance was able to buy from Teng was a little time on international issues that could soon become first-rate headaches for the president of imperialist America. □

## In This Issue

Closing News Date: August 29, 1977

FEATURES	956	<i>Out Now!</i> —Chapter 25: The March Against Death and the November 15, 1969, Demonstrations —by Fred Halstead
IRELAND	948	Parading the British Crown in Northern Ireland—by Gerry Foley
CHINA	950	The Reinstatement of Teng Hsiao-p'ing
PANAMA	951	American Rightwingers Condemn "Giveaway" of Canal—by Michael Baumann
	952	Trotskyists Demand Immediate Return of Canal
ALBANIA	954	Why CP Discovered "Differences" With Peking
IRAN	955	Shah Publicity Shy About Shiraz Art Festival
	955	Dissident Writers Win Wide Support
BRAZIL	959	Free the Student Demonstrators!
ARGENTINA	959	Enrique Broquen Released
AUSTRALIA	968	50,000 Protest Uranium Mining —by Fred Murphy
NEWS ANALYSIS	946	Questions Left Unanswered in Teng, Vance Secret Talks —by Joseph Hansen
BOOKS	960	Trotskyism in Latin America —reviewed by Joseph Hansen
DOCUMENTS	966	Túpac Amaru Bank Holdup in Peru
	966	Peruvian Students Explain Bank Robbery
	967	Australian CL and SWP Agree to Seek Unity
DRAWINGS	953	Omar Torrijos—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.

Second-class postage paid 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, Glebe 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.

## Parading the British Crown in Northern Ireland

By Gerry Foley

The queen of the British empire decided to wind up her Silver Jubilee visits to the various parts of her "realm" by making an appearance in Northern Ireland.

Her trip to the British imperialist enclave in Ireland lasted thirty-six hours over August 10-11. It obviously had a different purpose from her visits to other parts of the United Kingdom.

She made no effort to show a good queen's royal interest in the masses of her "subjects" or in the conditions in which they live. She spent most of her brief visit on her 5,700-ton yacht *Britannia*, anchored in Belfast harbor, as well-protected as an atomic aircraft carrier.

*Washington Post* correspondent Bernard Nossiter reported August 10:

The Queen, Prince Philip and their two young sons, Andrew and Edward, sailed into Belfast Lough this morning. . . . They were accompanied by a guided-missile destroyer. Frogmen reportedly had searched the waters for mines and at least one submarine was said to be in the area.

To make her ceremonial appearances in Northern Ireland, the queen was obliged to take the first helicopter flight in her life. *New York Times* correspondent R.W. Apple thought she might have found it an unpleasant experience. In an August 10 dispatch, he wrote:

As she stood for the playing of the national anthem in the courtyard of the [Hillsborough] castle, which was built in 1740 and served for 40 years as the residence for the governors of Northern Ireland, the Queen appeared somewhat tense—perhaps because of the flight, perhaps because of the fears raised by her visit to this tense province.

The children who handed flowers to the queen had to pass the strictest security check of their families and undergo three successive body searches. Apple reported:

Not a single incident marred the Queen's day, thanks to the largest security force ever deployed here—more than 32,000 troops and policemen. But in the city itself, antimonarchist Roman Catholic marchers clashed with soldiers who prevented them from reaching the City Hall in central Belfast.

Belfast is a city of only about 400,000 persons. If Apple's figures were correct, the British authorities mustered close to one armed "guardian of order" for every ten inhabitants of the place.

In its August 10 issue, the *New York Daily News* reported:

Authorities have launched Operation Monarch, called the largest royal security operation ever mounted, to protect the queen. . . .

"Operation Monarch" was not confined to surrounding the crowned symbol of British imperialist authority with a vast array of military forces. It also included "preventive strikes" against "disloyal subjects." Not only "guided-missile destroyers," but sensitive canine noses were brought into play.

One victim of such a "preventive strike" was James Daly, a lecturer in philosophy at Queens University in Belfast and a public spokesman for the Irish Republican Socialist Party. In the August 19 issue of the Dublin literary biweekly *Hibernia*, he described the operation directed against him and his family:

On the second day of the Queen's visit, at 6 a.m., we were roused by thunderous knocking at the door and English accents coming from all around the outside of the house. A frightened looking R.U.C. [Royal Ulster Constabulary] man stood in a corner while my family and guests were rounded up. He disappeared soon after, his only contribution being to tell me on request that he knew very little about the law but that, yes, arrest and detention for no reason was part of it. A gelly [explosive]-sniffing Labrador dog was then forced through the house with hisses of "Seek, Seek." It peed with excitement everywhere it came across scents of our terrier bitch but otherwise found nothing of interest.

The troops systematically wrecked the Daly's home, leaving live electrical connections exposed, among other things. Daly continued:

The whole operation was accompanied by a running stream of abuse, provocation, and bravado. The officer-in-charge said, for instance, to our seven-year-old twins: "Poor little bastards! Fancy having a mother and father like that." Seeing a photograph of Miriam [Daly's wife and a leading activist in the campaign against the restoration of hanging] addressing a meeting, he asked: "Would you like to see your mummy end up like Maire Drumm?"

Maire Drumm, a well-known militant nationalist speaker, was shot by a Loyalist murder gang while she lay helpless in a hospital bed.

The queen's visit came at a time when the repression against the oppressed Catholic population has reached its worst since the pogroms of the early 1920s, when the British enclave was consolidated.

Massive intimidation was necessary in the 1920s to break the northern section of the independent movement that had forced London to relinquish most of its formal sovereignty over four-fifths of Ireland.

The conditions that exist in the second half of the 1970s are similar to those of the

early 1920s. British rule in the north was shaken by a mass movement of the oppressed Catholics. This movement has been forced into retreat and the British forces are determined to root it out by thoroughly terrorizing the people in the Catholic ghettos. The queen's visit provided the opportunity for a new tightening of the screws.

Reportedly, 312 persons were jailed in "preventive" arrests involved in "Operation Monarch," making this one of the largest roundups since the August 1971 internment raids, whose anniversary the queen commemorated by her royal visit.

In these circumstances, it is not surprising that a young boy was shot down by British troops during the queen's visit. His funeral was described by Denis Hamill in the August 22 issue of the *New York* weekly paper the *Village Voice*:

A 12-year-old boy named Kevin Clarke manipulates his stainless-steel crutches down the narrow sidewalks, picking his way through the crowd. Kevin Clarke was shot last month by a British soldier. He will need crutches the rest of his life.

But his legs are not all he has lost. The hearse he is trying to keep pace with is carrying a five-foot coffin draped with a tricolored green, white, and gold Irish flag. Inside the coffin is the body of 14-year-old Paul McWilliams.

"He was good at hurling and math," Kevin Clarke says of his dead friend. "And he was fond of chips and tea and club orange. He was my friend and I'll miss him. The bastards murdered him in cold blood"

Hamill continued:

Most of the local people agree that a British soldier gunned down Paul McWilliams in cold blood. The army, of course, tells a different story. It claims that McWilliams was sighted tossing petrol bombs at an empty lumberyard and was ordered several times to stop. It claims he instead turned to hurl a petrol bomb at the soldiers. It was then that they fired a single shot at McWilliams.

The boy was hit full blast in the chest. His lung was punctured. Leaking blood and sucking for air, McWilliams crawled out of the lumberyard. . . .

In the context of deepening British terror in Northern Ireland, the reason becomes apparent why the queen was displayed at a garden party (sealed off by enough military forces to occupy the entire country). It was an exercise known in Ireland as "coat-trailing." The term comes from the practice of eighteenth-century bullies who dared people to tread on the tails of their long coats. Failing to accept such a

challenge meant having to cringe before the bully.

To the queen and her advisers, the British monarchy symbolizes imperialist rule in Ireland. Any "royal visit" serves to revive memories of the Irish people's subjection to British nabobs decked out in garish aristocratic trappings. The queen's visit was supposed to tell the people of Ireland that they had been beaten, that the "empire" was back in all its "glory."

The queen's visit served the same function as the Orange marches in July and August that celebrate the victories that consolidated the settlement of British colonists in Ireland. Her visit in fact coincided with the second of the two main Orange marches, the Prentice Boys march in Derry, which pays tribute to the impregnability of the early fortress towns of the settlers. The Loyalists call Derry "the virgin city," because the natives never breached its walls.

The fact that the queen visited Northern Ireland in the way she did, in the midst of a terror campaign by the British army, precisely at the time of the most aggressively Protestant supremacist march, shows clearly the political nature of the conflict in Northern Ireland. The root of the "trouble" is British rule and the determination of the British imperialists to maintain their control of Ireland in the only way they can.

The British government has no intention of relinquishing its control over Northern Ireland. Any concessions to the nationalist population, north or south, are designed to defend the imperialist fortress and the British domination of all of Ireland that it represents and guarantees. The British would like to convince the Catholics to accept the existing system as the best of all possible worlds. But they know that any small concession they may offer only sweetens the pill; accomplishment of their objectives depends fundamentally on the bludgeon.

If the British succeed in inflicting as severe a defeat on the nationalist movement as they did at the time of the last IRA campaign at the end of the 1950s, they may make new concessions to the Catholics, in the same way they did then. But their objective at present is to terrorize and humiliate the Irish people.

If the queen wanted to show that she was the "mother of all her people," she had an excellent opportunity in her Northern Ireland visit. She could have spoken out against discrimination against Catholics in the presence of all the Protestant Loyalist worthies who attended such affairs as the Hillsborough Castle garden party.

However, "her Britannic majesty" did nothing of the sort. She identified improving relations between the two communities with getting more people to inform to the police that are terrorizing Catholic neighborhoods.

At the New University of Ulster, estab-

lished in the Loyalist town of Coleraine rather than in majority-Catholic Derry, which is the center for the area, the queen said:

"There are hopeful signs of reconcilia-



Red Weekly

THE QUEEN: Woos hearts of Irish subjects.

tion and understanding. Policemen and soldiers have told me of the real cooperation they are receiving."

Under the circumstances in which the queen visited Northern Ireland, however, no matter how much the local Catholic bourgeois politicians might have liked to kiss the mailed fist of the monarchy, they did not dare do it. In the August 19 *Hibernia*, Andrew Boyd wrote:

The Queen's jubilee visit was a time for sore stomachs. Gerry Fitt found that his duodenal ulcer was playing him up again when he received an invitation to meet the Queen at Hillsborough. It is said that other prominent Catholics had symptoms of colic, diarrhoea and such unpleasant disorders when they were summoned to the Royal fetes.

The leaders of the "Peace Movement" did eat the queen's food on her yacht. They even told the press that the Catholics in the West Belfast ghettos were dying for a chance to gaze on "her majesty" in person. Boyd noted:

It is a pity too that the peace women, Betty Williams and Mairead Corrigan didn't have a word in the Queen's ear about the behaviour of the troops in Turf Lodge [a West Belfast ghetto]. . . . The day after Britannia sailed for Scotland the Turf Lodge troops were again tearing apart the houses of the defenceless and inoffending people. The rampaging soldiers were so violent that even the Peace People protested.

In the August 17 *Irish Times*, the writers of the weekly column in the Irish language compared the peace women's visit with the

queen to an incident during an appearance in Ireland of "the most alcoholic of the Georges" during which a Loyalist managed to get through the security cordon to shake the king's hand. He then raised his own hand to the police saying:

"There's wan hand, byes, that 'ill niver be washed!"

The British had to pay a political price, as well as the financial cost of "Operation Monarch," for the queen's visit. By provoking the national anger of the Irish people, they forced the Irish bourgeois forces to assume a cooler attitude toward the English government after working up friendly relations with London before the recent elections in the formally independent part of the country. The elections have already given Britain and its best friends in Ireland a nasty shock.

The *Irish Times*, the most prestigious bourgeois paper in the country, was obliged to protest against the British display in the north. In an August 22 editorial, it said:

To British people, in the great majority, the monarchy is a symbol of unity. In the North, the opposite holds true: the monarchy is a symbol of division. It is probable that the Queen's visit deepened, rather than smoothed, community divisions.

During the visit, considerable care was taken by the authorities to conceal these fundamental facts from the British public. When Thames Television tried to provide a remedy, the programme it made was banned by the Independent Broadcasting Authority, whose chief is a former Labour Minister. Neither the Government nor the IBA wishes uncomfortable truths to be publicised.

This affair must cast doubts on the British Government's sincerity in searching for a settlement in Northern Ireland. . . . It must increase scepticism about the Government's motives in allowing the royal visit to go ahead. . . .

It was precisely because the British authorities thought that they had achieved a situation where pretenses were no longer necessary that they staged the queen's visit. But for some months the signs have pointed to a shift in the tide in Ireland, toward a growing unwillingness of the masses to accept repression.

The British authorities may find that they chose exactly the wrong time to try to humiliate the Irish people. Parading the crown through Northern Ireland may be just the thing that can most effectively spur the revival of a national fighting spirit throughout the island. □

### Made in USSR

Among the suppliers of spare parts for the British Scorpion light tank is the Soviet Union, British Minister of State for Defense John Gilbert confirmed July 29, according to a Reuters dispatch from London.

In response to a question in Parliament, Gilbert said that Soviet-made bearings for the tank had been obtained through Belgian and British commercial channels and had been in stock since 1973.

## The Reinstatement of Teng Hsiao-p'ing

[The following editorial appeared in the August 5 issue of *October Review*, a Trotskyist monthly published in Hong Kong. The translation is by Reed.]

\* \* \*

The Third Plenary Session of the Tenth Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party was held July 16-21. It officially reinstated Teng Hsiao-p'ing to all his posts, and it marked a new turning point in the CCP's factional struggles. It signified a success for Teng and his supporters and a defeat for the anti-Teng movement initiated by Mao and other cadres.

The official press communiqué called it "a session with great historical significance." If this refers to the "confirmation" of Hua Kuo-feng as "chairman" and the expulsion from the party of Wang, Chang, Chiang, and Yao [the "gang of four"—IP], it is merely a satire on the role of the session of the highest leading body for more than thirty million party members. If indeed this session had such a "great significance" and role, why was it not called soon after Mao's death to settle such important problems as the party struggle then taking place? Why instead was it delayed for ten months?

In fact, the long delay was to allow several top leaders, or even one, time to ally or negotiate with, persuade, or suppress dissidents. Only after everything had been lined up were the compliant Central Committee members called together under the name "Plenary Session of the Central Committee" to "pass unanimously" the leaders' "proposals."

Deliberately omitted from the communiqué was the number of Central Committee members at the session. This shows that quite a number of them had been deprived of their right to attend.

The charges against Wang, Chang, Chiang, and Yao of being "secret agents of the Kuomintang," "traitors," "class dissidents," "newborn bourgeois elements," and so on show that the session was marked by the old Stalinist tricks the CCP has always played. The communiqué went so far as to say that the session "fully manifested democracy," which is a lie, totally contrary to the facts.

The communiqué used a great number of words to condemn the "gang of four." But it offered not one word to explain why Teng was dismissed from his posts last year and reinstated today.

Everyone will recall the "reasons" for dismissing Teng decided on by the old Politburo: "the antirevolutionary event at

Tien An Men Square"\* and "the recent performance of Teng Hsiao-p'ing." And they will ask: If these were "all slanders and lies that the gang of four raised against Comrade Teng, which should be rejected" (reported to be Hua's new arguments in March of this year), then isn't it logical that the April 7 [1976] resolution of the Politburo [dismissing Teng—IP] also be thrown out?

Besides Mao, Wang, Chang, Chiang, and Yao—the five members who "proposed" the resolution—some ten Politburo members who attended the recent plenary session had also "unanimously" agreed to the anti-Teng resolution.

If the resolution was wrong and should have been rejected, all Politburo members who "unanimously passed" it should be held responsible and admit their errors.

If they still insist that the resolution was correct, then how could the "antagonistic contradiction" the resolution said the Teng problem had become (the contradiction having changed from one "among the people" to one "between the enemy and us," or "between the exploiting and the exploited") dissolve and disappear so rapidly, after only one year?

How is it that Teng is now even able to resume the important post of party vice-chairman?

The communiqué stated that the Teng problem "had been seriously discussed." But why did it not reveal the opinions expressed in the Plenary session with regard to the Politburo's April 7 resolution, and whether the session reaffirmed or rescinded the resolution, and also give the reasons? This should be done so that a serious, responsible answer is given to the people of the whole country and to every member of the party.

But even though the CCP left everyone in the dark regarding these matters, the reinstatement of Teng is already, in the eyes of the Chinese people, a direct repudiation of the Politburo's April 7 resolution—i.e., an obvious admission of the falsity of that resolution.

Why did the Chinese Communist leadership make such a change? The main reasons are these: The leadership is now in the most difficult political and economic situation since 1949, and it needs figures like Teng who have the prestige, experience, and capability to help stabilize the

situation, pacify some of the people, foster illusions in the new rulers, and restore the morale of working people in order to "uplift the economy."

The forces within the party sympathetic to and supporting Teng are quite strong; the pressure for clearing Teng of the slanderous charges and reinstating him was growing and could not be suppressed any longer. If concessions were not granted to this layer of cadres within the party (even if temporary and limited) and negotiations not begun, then the power of the new leaders could be lost in a new explosive struggle.

Teng's reinstatement will only slightly strengthen the already badly shaken power of the Chinese Communist leadership. On the basis of a limited collaboration among forces that have different positions and interests in the party, there may evolve in China a situation in which there appear to be less violent factional struggles than in the past ten years. But this will not mean that all power struggles inside the party have ended, or that the political crisis has been overcome.

In the near future new factors and internal contradictions will cause the temporary truce to be broken. This will happen because the bureaucratic system, the source of all the struggles and crises, still exists. On the other hand, the temporary relaxation of struggles within the upper caste will be accompanied by more obvious contradictions between the bureaucracy and the people.

Teng's reinstatement will foster hope among quite a number of people who think he will institute some new measures such as raising wages. But even if Teng proceeds with what he proposed in his document (condemned as "three poisonous weeds" a year ago and now praised as "three fragrant flowers"), it will be only a gradual, conditional increase of wages for a small layer.

Meeting these expectations is the first test Teng faces in resuming power. If he and Hua and the others do not give some concessions to the laboring masses and better their living conditions, the few hopes that a layer of people now hold will quickly vanish.

If Teng can wield sufficient power in the bureaucracy, he may bring about greater changes, as compared to the past ten years, than would Hua and the others. In other words, he may restore more of the policies that were in force before the Cultural Revolution. This would mean the abandonment of more of Mao's policies of the later period and perhaps a changed evaluation of the Cultural Revolution. Such an outcome would be a great blow to Mao's prestige.

But the most Teng will be able to do is return to the path traveled by the regime prior to the Cultural Revolution. If the masses do not forcefully intervene and play their role of master of the country,

\*More than 100,000 workers and students demonstrated in Peking's Tien An Men Square April 5, 1976, to protest a government order to remove wreaths and posters that had been brought to the square in memory of Chou En-lai.

then what will happen will be an uplifting of China's economy and a subsequent expansion of the material privileges of the bureaucracy, which is likely to move China along the USSR's extreme rightist road.

With the resumption and strengthening of the political power of Teng and other old cadres, the "controls, restrictions, and pressures" on the working masses will surely increase. This will mean stepped up economic exploitation and political repres-

sion and a sharpening of the conflicts and struggles between the rulers and the ruled.

On the other hand, the future foreign policy will be more rightist than before—i.e., there will be more allying with and concessions to capitalist and imperialist countries.

A new lineup in the upper caste of rulers will not change the basic political line, party system, and political structure that have been in existence in China for the past twenty years. It will not change the

opposing positions of the rulers and the ruled. And it will not resolve the present crisis in China.

Revolutionaries should not and will not harbor any illusions in the decisions reached at the Third Plenary Session of the Central Committee or in the coming Eleventh National Congress of the CCP, or in Hua and Teng's assumption of power. The illusions of a sector of the masses will surely vanish with the new lessons of experience. □

## Pinochet and Videla Line up With Carter

# American Rightwingers Condemn 'Giveaway' of Canal

By Michael Baumann

Buoyed by polls that purport to show that a large majority of the American public opposes a "giveaway" of the Panama Canal, American ultrarights have mounted a publicity blitz urging rejection of the proposed new treaty with Panama.

Despite the fact that the accord extracted by the Carter administration guarantees continued American control over the canal virtually forever, the rightwingers view even verbal concessions to the demand for return of the canal as tantamount to treason.

A prominent leader in the keep-the-canal drive is Ronald Reagan, who as a contender for the Republican presidential nomination last year rallied reactionary sentiment with jingoist declarations about the "American canal in Panama."

Seeking to retain this support with an eye toward the 1978 and 1980 elections, the rightwingers are urging a defeat for the treaty in the Senate, which must ratify the accord by a two-thirds vote.

Addressing the national convention of the Young Americans for Freedom, the country's largest right-wing youth group, in New York August 25, Reagan denounced the proposed treaty, suggesting it would create a "power vacuum," which Fidel Castro and "his patron" the Soviet Union might try to exploit.

On August 23, the 5,000 delegates to the Veterans of Foreign Wars national convention, meeting in Minneapolis, voted unanimously for rejection of the treaty.

On August 21, the American Conservative Union, which claims a membership of 100,000, began a one-week \$50,000 campaign to blanket the newspapers of the South with full-page advertisements urging rejection of the treaty.

"There is no Panama Canal!" one of its ads said. "There is an American canal at Panama. Don't let President Carter give it away!"

The campaign is aimed in part at coun-

tering the effect of endorsement of the treaty by such notable pillars of reaction as former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, former President Gerald Ford, and even the Pentagon high command.

Its result has been to create a difficult situation for the Carter administration, which must seek to portray the treaty internationally as a gain for the Panamanian people while making clear domestically that it gives up nothing of substance.

The case for the treaty, from the standpoint of enhancing the interests of American imperialism, was ably argued by columnist Joseph C. Harsch in the August 25 *Christian Science Monitor*.

American conservatives, he said, should give a "second thought" to the consequences "before they go ahead and do what they think they want to do—spoil the proposed new treaties between the United States and the Republic of Panama."

The existing condition in Panama is, whether fairly or unfairly, a prime propaganda asset for the communist parties of Latin America. They use it, daily, in their propaganda, as evidence of "Yankee imperialism."

The foreseeable results of ratification are disappointment for the communists, and more than adequate protection for vital U.S. interests.

The decisive power of the United States in the area is not in question. . . . It is not giving up de facto control. It is only giving up the things which galling Latin Americans the most, the special and privileged status of American citizens in a special "zone" and the exclusion of Panamanian authority from a zone which bisects their country.

The treaties are in fact nothing more than an exercise in making appearances conform with the standards of the times.

The major American trusts, concerned about their \$24 billion in investments in Latin America, have shown a notable lack of interest in the "keep the canal" campaign. A report by John Goshko in the August 22 *Washington Post* explained why:

On the canal issue . . . the attitudes of the multinational corporate managers seem to be shaped less by ideological preferences than by concern about what rejection of the treaties—and possible subsequent Latin American political reaction—might mean for their sizable trade and investment stakes in Latin America.

Because they earn a great deal of money from the Latin countries, American firms doing business there have frequently been targets of nationalistic attacks and threats of expropriation. For that reason, banks, oil and mining companies, manufacturers and trading concerns with sizable Latin American interests are all anxious to avoid situations that might stir new waves of anti-Americanism.

These companies also are keenly aware that the most sensitive issue in U.S.-Latin American relations is the demand, backed by every country of the region, that sovereignty over the canal be transferred to Panama.

As an object lesson of the importance of giving up naked American control over the canal so as to improve overall American diplomatic interests, Carter has invited the heads of some twenty Latin American governments to the signing of the treaty, scheduled for September 7 in Washington.

Among the first to accept the invitations were dictators Pinochet of Chile and Videla of Argentina, amply demonstrating support for the treaty by two of the most reactionary regimes on the continent.

An obstacle far greater than the American right wing remains for the Carter administration, however. That is the need to force the people of Panama and the rest of Latin America to accept the new treaty as an "improvement" over the outright takeover of the canal zone more than seventy years ago.

Even if Torrijos succeeds in stage-managing approval for the accord in the scheduled plebiscite in Panama, as long as American troops remain the final arbiter over the canal's "neutrality," the canal's status as an American enclave will remain one of the most hated symbols of Wall Street's domination over Latin America. □

## **Panamanian Trotskyists Demand Immediate Return of Canal**

[The following statement was published as a special supplement to the August issue of *Revolución Socialista*, newspaper of the Liga Socialista Revolucionaria (LSR—Revolutionary Socialist League), a sympathizing organization of the Fourth International in Panama. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

\* \* \*

An agreement between the American imperialists and the national government in the negotiations for a new treaty on the Panama Canal has been announced in the last few days.

Although the precise content of this treaty has not been disclosed, we socialists have an obligation to express our opinion, based on the little information given about what has been termed an agreement on principles.

### **The Meaning of the Treaty**

This treaty has been made possible by the forceful struggles of the Panamanian people. But the people know little about the development of the negotiations or the treaty's present form, except for the "news" that an agreement has been reached.

According to what is now known—only the agreement on principles—some partial gains have been made regarding territory, administration, judges, postal services, and so on.

But the Panamanian government has made concessions on such "questions of national dignity" as the military presence, joint defense, and perpetuity—disguised in a parallel treaty on neutrality, which reserves for the United States permanent defense of the canal (read "in perpetuity") in the event of intervention by a third country.

To us, the latter points mean sacrificing the fundamental goals the Panamanian people have always sought and still seek. In other words, the treaty negotiated by the government does not meet the aspirations of our people for full and immediate sovereignty, for total sovereignty, for expulsion of the military bases—demands the people have always struggled for and still do.

This is so, because while the struggles of the Panamanian people have made possible not only the negotiations but also some partial victories, these gains have been deformed by the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie has ridden on the back of the popular anti-imperialist movement, not only slowing down the mobilizations but also trying to remove the class seal that our people

have always put on their struggles. The political organizations that give unconditional support to the regime have contributed to this, giving the popular movement confidence in the bourgeoisie rather than in its own strength, in mobilization.

Now that the government is showing us some of the agreements, we see that in substance they fall short of what was demanded by this government at the time that it won the support of the mass movement. That is, even the promises made by Torrijos, the chief of government, and his ex-counselor, Juan A. Tack, during their first years in power have not been kept.

We socialists think the concessions made by the government to imperialism in the "new" treaty stand in sharp contrast to what could be attained today, when imperialism is in crisis and has been demystified, when a united popular movement stands at the head of the anti-imperialist struggle, and when there is tremendous international support for our demands against imperialism.

### **Not a Single U.S. Soldier, Not a Single U.S. Base on Our Soil!**

Our people have struggled for decades against imperialism and its presence on the Isthmus of Panama. These struggles have been marked by independence from the bosses and from all the governments that have existed in our country. Our people have mobilized in big struggles from the 1920s on, whether against direct imperialist intervention at particular times, or against the imperialists' permanent presence in our country.

On the face of each imperialist aggression and each attempt by the local bourgeoisie to come to an agreement with the imperialists, the Panamanian people have risen up as the most consistent defenders of our sovereignty. In this way the surrender treaty of 1926 was rejected, and the attempts to establish permanent military bases in the country in 1947 were defeated. In this way the battle against imperialism in 1964 was fought, and the "three-in-one" treaties of 1967 were rejected. (These treaties would have betrayed the struggles of the people by legalizing the military bases, installing a "joint defense," permitting the United States to build a sea-level canal, and so on.)

Throughout all these struggles the Panamanian people have consistently put forward demands that summarize their historical aspirations: full and immediate sovereignty, expulsion of all military bases, imperialism out of Panama! These

slogans and aspirations retain all their force in the struggle for recovery of the canal and the zone and the winning of total sovereignty.

### **What Led to the Negotiations?**

The American imperialists have always beaten back the efforts of the Panamanian people to put an end to Yankee exploitation. Thus at various moments in our anti-imperialist struggle they have not only opposed the demands expressed by our people through mobilizations, and denounced them at home and internationally, but they have even been opposed to sitting down at the negotiating table.

Before 1964, the imperialists rejected every call (made by the local bourgeoisie) to negotiate a new treaty.

When the Panamanian people decided to mobilize and confront imperialism openly in the glorious days of 1964, the imperialists agreed to negotiate a new treaty. This was the result of national and international pressure brought on by their cowardly massacre of our people, whose only weapon was consciousness of the justice of their struggle for what belonged to them. For this and no other reason, the American imperialists sat down at the negotiating table.

Our bosses have never been concerned about the struggle for recovery of our principal natural resource and our total sovereignty over it. (They couldn't be, owing to the chains that bind them fast to imperialism.) But the Panamanian people have always stood up, prepared to shed their blood in confrontation with the Yankee aggressor. The Panamanian people, through their struggles, have forced the American imperialists to enter negotiations.

But this is not all. The Panamanian people have been obliged (by this government) to subordinate their struggles for higher wages and for overcoming the high cost of living to the hope of seeing the definitive expulsion of imperialism and all its bases. In other words, in the name of a struggle against imperialism, they have been made to pay for the crisis of the bourgeoisie.

Even in this our people have been consistent. On the basis of what they believed (or were made to believe) would be the definitive expulsion of imperialism, they sacrificed and let their leaders slow down their struggles—allowing reform of the Labor Code, a tax increase of 5 percent, a rise in prices, and so on. All this was accepted because of confidence in what



their leaders told them—that imperialism and its military presence were going to be expelled once and for all, that the long-awaited total sovereignty would be achieved.

#### Who Is Negotiating? How? Why?

Despite what we have seen—that the Panamanian people, who stand out in the anti-imperialist struggle and are the only consistent fighters in our struggle for national liberation and sovereignty—the people are not the ones who play a leading role at the negotiating table, nor even participate. And this is not all. Not only do the people not participate, but they don't even know how the negotiations are being conducted or what is being negotiated. And even when the document appears, our people won't know what the draft of the treaty negotiated behind their backs contains.

One thing is clear. The treaty does not even attempt to meet the historic aspirations of our people. This has never been the objective.

The negotiations headed by the bourgeoisie (Torrijos) have a single objective: to put a brake on the development of the anti-imperialist struggle of the Panamanian workers and people; at no time has there been any guarantee that the aspirations of the Panamanians would be met.

In this sense the (bonapartist) regime of Torrijos has completed its principal task: to slow down, as a service to imperialism, the popular struggles against its presence on our soil. This is the main motive of the national bourgeoisie in not permitting the Panamanian people to participate in the negotiations and not even reporting on the development of the negotiations. Public negotiations and mass mobilizations against imperialism would detract from this goal, and that was not the objective of those who were negotiating. But it was and is the objective of the Panamanian people.

#### Continue the Anti-imperialist Struggles!

This treaty now shows us clearly that the bourgeoisie is incapable of bringing about national liberation. It shows us that bonapartism has gone as far as it can go, has reached its limit. It cannot achieve anything else. The inability of the ruling class to solve the democratic tasks is clear.

But the most important lesson that we must draw today is that only the masses, mobilized and organized independently of the bourgeoisie, can achieve national liberation. It is now impossible to place confidence in the bourgeoisie or in sectors of it, as do the reformist organizations that unconditionally support the regime. It is time for the popular movement to return to its mobilizations independent of the bourgeoisie. This is the only way to win the historic aspirations of our people.

The anti-imperialist struggle in Panama

will continue until not one Yankee soldier remains on our soil and total national sovereignty is achieved. All the historic slogans retain their force today: No bases!



TORRIJOS

Full and immediate return of the canal! Total sovereignty! These slogans must be brought to the fore in the factories, in the schools, in the universities, in the streets!

In face of the coming plebiscite and the agreements between the national government and the imperialists, we socialists make the following proposals for this phase of struggle:

- For the return of the anti-imperialist exiles!

It is now more necessary than ever to guarantee that all of us who have struggled consistently against imperialism are present in the country. In this sense, in a response to our first letter, the chief of government, Torrijos, committed himself to allow entry of all exiles who want to return.\* In a second letter, published August 14 in *Estrella de Panamá*, we gave General Torrijos formal notice that the anti-imperialist exiles want to return, and

\*In a letter to the LSR dated May 26, 1977, Torrijos said: "... In the case of those exiles who have expressed an interest in participating [in the struggle for full national sovereignty]... we have spoken with the writer Gabriel García Márquez, who also asked that one of the exiles be allowed to return to Panama and examine the national situation, the unity and will to struggle on the part of our people, and the conditions of security and respect. If his report is favorable, as it would have to be, then the doors will be open for those who are not apostates to the religion that unites us all and makes us strong before the world. Each case will be the object of a special review. . . .

"I can also tell you that in some documents

that attorney Jorge Turner said the same thing when he was in Panama. These compañeros are awaiting only the declaration of a general amnesty.

We socialists think this would be the best demonstration that a climate of democratic liberties is opening up in the country—permit the return of the exiled anti-imperialists.

- For democratic liberties!

Now that the discussion of a treaty is approaching, an improved atmosphere for democratic rights is necessary. Each Panamanian must be guaranteed freedom of expression and access to means of communications.

It is of fundamental importance that no Panamanian be left without the opportunity to freely express an opinion about the negotiations.

- For a broad, democratic debate before the plebiscite.

We socialists think that it is necessary to struggle for a broad, democratic debate preceding the plebiscite. This debate must begin no less than three months before the vote, and must involve publication of the treaty *in full* in all the communications media in the country.

Before saying yes or no in a plebiscite, all Panamanians must know all the terms of the treaty, and it must be discussed with all the various political and popular tendencies. Thus the government should put all the communications media—radio, press, and television—at the disposal of the various tendencies that have an interest in this discussion.

Besides this, all other facilities necessary for the debate must be provided—the treaty is that important to the country's future. The government must comply with these demands of the Panamanian people!

We call on all anti-imperialist organizations: Mobilize against the military bases—for full, immediate sovereignty, for total sovereignty!

It is more necessary now than ever before to show imperialism that the Panamanian people will continue to struggle until the last outpost of imperialism is removed from our soil.

We must continue the struggle for the historic aspirations of our people. We must continue to mobilize ourselves against the Yankee military presence, against the joint defense, for full and immediate sovereignty. □

that have been circulated on the pretext of defending human rights I see that the names of some persons appear as political exiles, but who frankly have nothing to do with politics or with exile. At least, with serious politics. They . . . can return to the country with all guarantees however they want and at any time they want.

"We hope the agreement reached with García Márquez will be honored, and that the Panamanians abroad will tell us of their decision to participate loyally in the great cause of national dignity."

## Why Albanian CP Discovered 'Differences' With Peking

[The following article was published in the August 5 issue of *Internationalen*, the weekly paper of the Kommunistiska Arbetarförbundet (Communist Workers League, Swedish section of the Fourth International). The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

\* \* \*

After making some headway for a time with the "superpowers theory" and the "theory of three worlds," the Chinese CP has run into opposition among its own followers.

When the Albanian Communist Party organ *Zëri i Popullit* published a frontal attack on these theories July 7, this was at once the culmination of previous more cautious criticisms and the opening blast in a new "major polemic" among Peking-oriented Communists.

It is clear that the Albanian editorial [in *Zëri i Popullit*] is a relatively broad and deepgoing criticism of the theory of the Chinese CP, and thus indirectly of China's present foreign policy. Many elements of this criticism have been seen before. Albania has always viewed a strong Common Market as something reactionary. But before now such positions were never expressed clearly. Enver Hoxha set the tone at the Sixth Congress of the Albanian Party of Labor [the CP] when he said in his speech on "the international situation":

The terms "third world," "unaligned states," or "developing countries" create illusions among the broad masses who are struggling for national and social liberation that such categories offer a refuge from the threat of the superpowers.

Hoxha said that dividing up the world into three parts was a nonclass approach and at most such a procedure could serve as a gauge of the "influence and power of world capital internationally or in various states and regions of the world."

Instead, Hoxha said, the conflicts in the world must be viewed from a "class standpoint" and he pointed out the revolutionary and proletarian character of the present epoch: "Marxism-Leninism teaches us that in our time countries can be distinguished by the social systems in power within them." A sharp criticism was directed at attempts to whitewash bourgeois regimes in the "third world" that are fighting for national and economic independence. Instead:

... All those who are for revolution and socialism must link their struggle with the people's struggle for independence. This can be done only by struggling resolutely against

imperialism and its piratical wars. This is also the most effective and the most direct support that the proletariat can give people's liberation movements.

The editorial in *Zëri i Popullit* broadened out and clarified this conception. It branded the "theory of three worlds" as an "antirevolutionary" and "pseudo anti-imperialist" theory because:

- It calls for social peace, class collaboration, and giving up the proletariat in Europe, Japan, Canada, etc. as lost to the revolution.

- It justifies and supports the neocolonial policy of exploitation on the part of the imperialist regimes of the "second world" and calls on the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America not to fight against these regimes in order not to disrupt the struggle against the superpowers.

Naturally, this criticism is not explicitly directed against the Chinese CP, but the target is nonetheless clear. The examples given in the article are all directly connected to positions China has taken in its foreign policy.

The view that the "third world" should be "the main force in the struggle against imperialism" is flayed in the following terms:

According to this logic, the oil sheiks who deposit their money in Wall Street or London should be devoted fighters against imperialism. ... According to the "third world" theory the peoples in such countries should not fight against the fascist dictatorships in Brazil or Chile, against Suharto in Indonesia, the shah of Iran, or the king of Jordan.

Blocs such as the Common Market and NATO are condemned. There is no talk about their having "both a good and a bad side," as is very common in the right-wing Maoist press. Instead, the countries in the so-called second world are seen as "the main economic and military support for the aggressive and expansionist alliances that the two superpowers advocate."

What prompted this rather sharp criticism by Albania? The explanation for it must be sought in the clash between the political interests of Peking and those of the Tirana bureaucracy.

Albania is a small country that has broken from capitalism and imperialism. It has neither the resources nor the ambition to conduct "great power politics" in the style of Peking.

First and foremost, Albania has no interest whatsoever in seeing an economically and militarily strengthened Common Market or NATO. To the contrary, these

blocs represent a direct threat to her security.

Secondly, Albania has no interest in being part of something called the "third world," "the unaligned states," in which all states, social systems, and regimes are put on the same level, just because they are small countries. The Albanian bureaucracy's instinct for self-preservation is stronger than any fiction of a "common interest" with Mobuto, Pinochet, etc.

Another factor is Albania's permanent border conflict with "revisionist" Yugoslavia, with which the Chinese CP is now seeking cooperation. (Tito has been invited to visit Peking this September.) *In short, China's foreign policy has come into conflict with the interests of the Albanian bureaucracy. That's the heart of the matter.*

This framework also limits the extent of the Albanian criticisms. The Albanians continue to uphold the non-Marxist conception that the Soviet Union is a "capitalist and social-imperialist state," and thus a "superpower," as dangerous but not more dangerous than the U.S.

Despite all their internationalist-sounding phrases, the theory of socialism in one country underlies their attitude. Despite the insistence that the working class and the people in "third world" countries must also fight against their own bourgeoisies, the Albanians' criticisms represent no break, for example, with the theory of "revolution in stages."

Thus far it is only criticism "within the family." Albania continues to have too strong ties, not least of all economic ones, with China for a definitive break with the Chinese CP to be possible in the present situation.

On the other hand, the polemic is making a harder impact on the pro-Chinese and pro-Albanian groups around the world. The FRAP [Frente Revolucionario Antifascista y Patriota—Revolutionary Anti-Fascist and Patriotic Front] in Spain lined up behind Albania, while the PCP (ml) [Partido Comunista Português (marxista-leninista)—Portuguese Communist Party (Marxist-Leninist)] has not hesitated to call the Albanian criticisms "revisionist and counterrevolutionary."

The Portuguese UDP [União Democrática do Povo—People's Democratic Union] has lined up behind the FRAP and Albania, as has the KPD-ml [Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands—marxistisch-leninistisch—Communist Party of Germany—Marxist-Leninist] in the German Federal Republic.

Naturally, this conflict is beginning to have an impact on the Maoists in Sweden.

The KFML(r) [Kommunistiska Förbundet Marxist-Leninisterna (Revolutionära)—Communist League Marxist-Leninist (Revolutionary)] thinks it sees which way the wind is blowing. It has hailed the criticism as "a word at the right time."

The SKP [Sveriges Kommunistiska Parti—Communist Party of Sweden, a right-wing Maoist group] and its paper *Gnistan* have remained silent so far. Stefan Lindgren & Co. are still having difficulty rehabilitating Teng Hsiao-p'ing.

The MLK [Marxist-Leninistiska Kampförbundet—Marxist-Leninist Struggle League, the most nationalistic of the Swedish Maoist groups] has indirectly rejected the Albanians' criticisms by attacking the KPD-ml's critique of the "theory of three worlds."

The latter critique was published in Sweden by the KEG [Kommunistiska Enhetsgrupper—Communist Unity Groups, a splitoff from the KFML(r)], which for some time has been trying to maintain some kind of independent existence in the shadow of the SKP and the MLK.

As an organization, however, the KEG has taken no position for or against the Albanian criticisms.

All the signs point to a division of the Mao-Stalinist left into a "Chinese" and an "Albanian" camp, with various shadings. Among the groups more influenced by the Albanians, we can expect to find the KFML(r), a part of the KEG, and a probable split from the SKP. In the opposing camp, we can expect to see the SKP, the MLK, and sections of the KEG.

Unquestionably, the Albanian criticism constitutes a blow against the most counterrevolutionary features of the Chinese CP's theory and politics. However, it is far from being a *decisive rejection* of them. It is creating a new climate on the left. But at the same time it can promote new illusions. □

## Shah Publicity Shy About Shiraz Art Festival

The Iranian government has clamped a veil of secrecy over this year's Shiraz Art Festival, an annual extravaganza sponsored by the shah and Empress Farah and held at the ruins of the ancient Persepolis.

According to a statement issued August 18 by the Committee for Artistic and Intellectual Freedom in Iran (CAIFI), the dearth of publicity is apparently due to the boycott initiated last year by the eminent American playwright and critic Eric Bentley.

Among several internationally recognized cultural figures who turned down invitations after Bentley's call were American dancer Merce Cunningham and his entire company, American director Robert Wilson, British director Peter Brook, and Polish director Jerzy Grotowski.

The lasting impact of the boycott was shown, according to CAIFI, by the lack of participation of Western countries in this year's festival, which ran August 17-26. An exception was the presence of an American group, the LaMama Experimental Theater

(producer Ellen Stewart, director Andrei Serban), which performed Shakespeare's *As You Like It*.

The shah and empress seek the participation of names that have the stamp of avant garde so they can pose as benefactors of art and culture. The real purpose of the festival, however, "is to cover up the gross violations of human rights in Iran, especially the victimization of the country's artistic and intellectual community," CAIFI said.

The CAIFI statement appealed to all people who respect human rights to "urge the Iranian government to observe basic academic rights of the people of Iran."

In particular CAIFI called attention to the cases of Nasser Rahmani-Nejad, playwright, director, and critic, who was imprisoned for staging Maxim Gorky's *The Lower Depths*, and Dr. Gholamhossein Sa'edi, Iran's greatest playwright and leading anthropologist, who has been imprisoned and tortured eight times and is forbidden to travel abroad. □

## Iranian Writers Win International Support

[The Committee for Artistic and Intellectual Freedom in Iran (CAIFI) made public August 25 the text of the following telegram, signed by thirty-six prominent American, British, Iranian, and Israeli citizens, to the prime minister of Iran.]

\* \* \*

August 17, 1977

Dear Mr. Prime Minister,

We have received a copy of a June 13, 1977, open letter to you signed by forty of the most prominent Iranian intellectuals.\* In that letter these distinguished literary figures make the following requests of your government:

1. The Writers Association of Iran be activated as a gathering for the dialogue of Iranian intellectuals.
2. All existing obstacles to the creation of centers or clubs for gathering of members of the association in Teheran and other cities of the country be removed.
3. Legal facilities be provided for the publication and unhampered distribution of an organ by the association.

We sincerely believe that the fulfillment

of the above requests will be a step toward the restoration of human rights and academic freedom in Iran. We urge your government to honor these basic human rights requested by the literary community of Iran.

Should punitive action be taken against any of the signatories of the open letter it will be strongly condemned by world public opinion.

Sincerely yours,

*Bella Abzug, Frank Allaun (MP, England), Reza Baraheni, Eric Bentley, Philip Berrigan, Kay Boyle, Charles Cairns, Helen Cairns, Jacqueline Ceballos, Noam Chomsky, Ken Coates (England), Joan Crowell, Lawrence Ferlinghetti, Frances Fitzgerald, Jane Fonda, Allen Ginsberg, Morton Halperin, Joseph Heller, Nat Hentoff, Irving Howe, Ahmad Karimi, Jerzy Kosinski, Felicia Langer (Israel), Norman Mailer, Joan Maynard (MP, England), Zhores Medvedev, Joan Mellen, Arthur Miller, Kate Millett, Lewis Mumford, Philip Oke, Mahmoud Sayrafiezadeh, Ahmad Shamlou, I.F. Stone, William Wilson (MP, England), Babak Zahraie*

The original signatures are in the keeping of the Committee for Artistic and Intellectual Freedom in Iran (CAIFI), 853 Broadway, Suite 414, New York, N.Y. 10003.

### Still Available

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

1967	42 issues (1,072 pages)	\$25
1968	44 issues (1,176 pages)	\$25
1969	43 issues (1,152 pages)	\$25
1970	43 issues (1,120 pages)	\$25
1971	45 issues (1,128 pages)	\$25
1972	47 issues (1,448 pages)	\$25
1973	46 issues (1,520 pages)	\$25
1974	47 issues (1,888 pages)	\$25
1975	47 issues (1,888 pages)	\$35
1976	49 issues (1,888 pages)	\$35

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

\*For an English translation of the full text of the open letter, see *Intercontinental Press*, July 18, 1977, p. 826.

# OUT NOW!

## Chapter 25

### The March Against Death and the November 15, 1969, Demonstrations

By Fred Halstead

[Second of three parts]

On November 9, the GI Press Service of the Student Mobilization Committee ran a full page ad in the Sunday edition of the *New York Times*. It was signed by 1,365 active duty GIs, many of them stationed in Vietnam. The ad, which carried the name, rank, and station of each signer, appealed for Americans to attend the demonstrations in Washington and San Francisco November 15. It also stated: "We are opposed to American involvement in the war in Vietnam. We resent the needless wasting of lives to save face for the politicians in Washington. We speak, believing our views are shared by many of our fellow servicemen. Join us!"

Nothing like this had ever happened before in American history, and, according to Washington correspondent William McGaffin, "the Pentagon obviously does not like it one bit."

"Pentagon officials," wrote McGaffin, "were frankly surprised that this many GIs would permit their names to be used in a protest ad."<sup>17</sup> This only showed the Pentagon's blindness to the real mood among rank-and-file GIs. Although the Pentagon tried,

---

With this chapter we continue the serialization of **Out Now!—A Participant's Account of the American Antiwar Movement** by Fred Halstead. Copyright © 1977 by the Anchor Foundation, Inc. All rights reserved. Printed by permission. To be published by Monad Press.

---

it failed to find signers who would declare their names had been used falsely. (The GI Press Service had each authorization in writing before it published the ad.) Lawyers from the Judge Advocate sections of the army, navy, air force, and marine corps were assigned to find something illegal in what the GIs had done. The best they could come up with was that signing might be construed as "conduct of a nature to bring discredit upon the armed forces," which was a quote from the catchall Article 134 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

The GI Civil Liberties Defense Committee threatened to sue against persecution of the GI signers. The Pentagon dropped the matter rather than precipitate another *cause célèbre*.

This incident was only one item in the veritable crescendo of antiwar activities, publicity, and interest that was generated between October 15 and November 15, in spite of the counterefforts of the Nixon administration. One of the most dramatic of these was the breaking into the major American news media of the story of the My Lai massacre.

My Lai was a hamlet in the village of Son My (sometimes written "Songmy" and occasionally referred to by Americans as

"Pinkville") in South Vietnam. On the morning of March 16, 1968—that is, a year and a half before the story surfaced—My Lai was occupied by a unit of U.S. infantry from the Americal Division. The villagers offered no resistance and none of them bore arms. They were ordered out of their houses, which were dynamited if made of stone and burned if made of wood. All this was standard operating procedure on American "search and destroy" missions in Vietnam. What followed was more unusual. The villagers—799 men, women, and children—were assembled in groups and some of the Americans fired directly at them with automatic rifles until not one seemed left alive. That was the My Lai massacre.

As it turned out, 132 of the Vietnamese survived, lying under the bodies of their relatives and neighbors, until their murderers left. Some of them reported the story to local Vietnamese officials who were, however, under U.S.-Saigon control. But the atrocity was no secret. In addition to those who ordered it, and committed it, there were other Americans who had evidence of the crime. Nevertheless it was covered up as far as the American press was concerned.

One reason for this was that the indiscriminate killing of noncombatants was not uncommon in Vietnam, especially by American air strikes. My Lai was just an especially brutal example of the kind of counterrevolutionary war against a whole population that the U.S. military machine was engaged in.

An American GI, Ronald Lee Ridenhour, heard about the My Lai massacre and for his remaining eight months in Vietnam devoted his free time to gathering and sifting accounts of the affair. He returned to the U.S. with a substantial dossier and wrote a summary of his findings. In early 1969 he sent this to the White House, the secretary of defense, and a number of "dove" senators. He received one visit from an army investigator.

In June 1969, tired of waiting for official action, he gave his report to a literary agent who offered it to major newspapers, magazines, and at least one of the three major TV networks. None were interested. Ridenhour gave up.

In September 1969, the army, as unobtrusively as possible, announced through the command at Fort Benning, Georgia, that an army officer had been charged with murder in the death of an unspecified number of civilians in Vietnam in 1968. The Associated Press carried this on its wire September 6, but few papers picked it up and none assigned an investigative reporter to follow up. It was not until shortly after the October 15 Moratorium that a reporter began to pursue the affair. He was Seymour M. Hersh, a free-lancer, operating on a \$1,000 grant from the Foundation for Investigative Journalism, funded by Philip M. Stern, a resident of Washington and a supporter of the Moratorium and the New Mobe. Incidentally, Stern was one of many Washingtonians who offered housing to antiwar staffers from out of town, and Brad Lyttle was staying at Stern's home at the time.

Hersh resurrected Ridenhour's memorandum and found three GIs who had witnessed the My Lai massacre. He arranged for one of them, Paul Meadlo, to appear on television.

*Militant* reporter Robert Langston later commented: "The capitalist media had been wholly indifferent to Ridenhour's

17. *New York Post*, November 11, 1969.

report, and to the September AP dispatch. Two months earlier, they could and would have given the same treatment to Hersh's story. . . . But in the second week of November that was virtually impossible. The antiwar movement's activity had made the Songmy story the hottest piece of merchandise in the journalistic market."<sup>18</sup>

The day the first installment of Seymour Hersh's My Lai series broke into the major dailies was November 13, 1969. The macabre story would be in the news for years and haunt the war-makers as no other publicity in the history of the war had done.

\* \* \*

The cold split of the antiwar forces in San Francisco was never fully resolved, though a *modus vivendi* was worked out to allow the permits to be released and the demonstration go off smoothly. The Hallinan group kept control of the program but had to resign itself to eight speakers, including two nominated by the Membership Committee. These were Corky Gonzales of the Chicano Crusade for Justice in Denver, and Dan Seigel, student body president at the University of California at Berkeley. Hallinan had originally opposed both as too radical. In addition it was agreed that the expenses both groups had incurred in building the action would be paid out of the collection and anything left over would go to national New Mobe. The SMC provided most of the marshals, concentrating on the march, while the Hallinan group's marshals concentrated on the platform.

In Washington, unlike San Francisco, a comprehensive permit covering a maze of jurisdictions had to be negotiated directly with the federal administration. On this occasion the government liaison negotiator was Assistant Deputy Attorney General John Dean, later to become notorious as the counsel to the president who refused to take all the blame as scapegoat for the Watergate coverup.

Dean was assisted by Ken Tapman, a lawyer for the Department of the Interior. They were both quite young and not at all like the tall, grey-templed aristocrat, Van Cleve, with whom we had negotiated the Pentagon march. At the first meeting, in October, they asked for assurances against violence. We weren't planning any and said we hoped the government wasn't either. As I recall, Tapman made some crack about putting us in jail if we broke the law. From what we learned later this was out of character for Tapman, or perhaps he was just making a lame try at a bad joke. The idea that it would be Dean, not us, who would later be going to jail was the last thing in anyone's head at the time.

The negotiations themselves were polite enough, in spite of the tensions generated by the government's stalling, which was a decision made at higher levels anyway.

Before the negotiations were completed, I remember encountering Tapman hanging around the New Mobe office without a tie and sporting antiwar buttons. It seemed a strange way to spy on us, since the government no doubt had us well covered by less conspicuous types. In fact, Tapman had become sympathetic with the movement. In one sense this was purely incidental. In another it was more meaningful. The antiwar sentiment was so pervasive that we kept finding friends in the strangest places, including within the Pentagon.

It got so we even knew what military moves the government was making in preparation for the demonstrations because GIs in the units they were ordering around told us about them.

We first asked for a march from the area of the Capitol, along Pennsylvania Avenue, around the White House, to a rally south of the White House. It was Brad Lyttle's opinion that on the basis of their conceptions of military security alone, the authorities would not agree to part of this. As he put it: "I believed that the U.S. government would rather see a riot in Washington than allow the White House to be surrounded by a mass march."<sup>19</sup>

The route around the White House was left in abeyance while the major sticking point became Pennsylvania Avenue. It was the traditional prestige street for parades and the administration didn't want us on it. We had broad public support, however, and even the *Washington Post* expressed some outrage at the government's refusal.

Lyttle, who favored holding out for Pennsylvania Avenue to the end, later recalled: "To me, the most surprising feature of these negotiations about Pennsylvania Avenue was the attitude of Phil Hirschkop [the New Mobe's attorney]. Phil was asked again and again if we shouldn't take the matter to court. He always replied emphatically No, that to do so would be a major error. It would take the government negotiators off the political hook and we would almost certainly lose in court. Furthermore, Phil recommended that we hold out for Pennsylvania Avenue to almost the last moment. He was nearly as hard-nosed as I. Never in more than ten years of demonstrating had I known a lawyer to have such an attitude. Every attorney I had worked with before would have recommended, indeed insisted, that we go at once to court, and all would have urged that we give in to the government at an early stage."<sup>20</sup>

Finally, on Wednesday afternoon, November 12, the government agreed to Pennsylvania Avenue, provided we would turn south on Fifteenth Street and march directly to the Washington Monument area, avoiding the loop around the White House. We accepted.

Hirschkop reported that the mayor of the city, Walter Washington, had intervened personally with President Nixon to get him to agree to this arrangement. The November 15 march could now proceed without a built-in confrontation.

\* \* \*

There was no special difficulty about the permits for the March Against Death, since only a single file line on the sidewalk would be passing the White House. The big problem was technical.

We had to maintain a flow of more than 1,000 people per hour for forty-two hours, and we couldn't let all 45,000 stand at Arlington Cemetery awaiting their turn. We set up a series of tents on the Arlington side of Memorial Bridge, where buses from around the country arrived on a staggered schedule. There the passengers had a chance to stretch, use toilets, get refreshments and instructions before stepping off one by one on their two-and-a-half hour walk across the bridge, past the White House, and on to the Capitol. At night they carried candles, as well as a placard with the name of a deceased GI, or a Vietnamese village, and as each passed the front gate of the White House the name was called out. Incidentally, very few relatives asked us not to use the names of their dead in this antiwar demonstration, and a sizable number of relatives participated, carrying the names of their own deceased loved ones.

In the city, a series of reception centers were set up for people whose buses arrived too early, or who came on other transportation. These were taken to Arlington on shuttle buses. One kind of bus or another arrived at the Arlington tents every three minutes around the clock. At the Capitol end, those who completed the march could board shuttle buses to mass housing accommodations in churches or gymnasiums. Or they could go to movement centers where various groups held programs, meetings, and so on.

There were all sorts of sticky details involved in the logistics of this huge operation. For example, the problem of how the sleeping bags and hand luggage of tens of thousands of people, which were left at the Arlington end before the walk, would connect with their owners later. This was in the province of the Mass Accommodations committee. As Brad put it: "We in Logistics looked at Mass Accommodations with awe. Our problems were child's play compared with theirs."<sup>21</sup>

18. *Militant*, December 12, 1969.

19. Lyttle, *Washington Action*, p. 11.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 13.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 31.



Flax Hermes/Militant

Part of demonstration of 750,000 in Washington, D.C., November 15, 1969.

The New Mobe had little money to pay for rent and the space used for housing, movement centers, marshal training, and so on was donated. The city opened up its heart, another indication of the depth of the antiwar sentiment. The New Mobe's Local Arrangements committee, sparked by Alice Arshak, handled this as well as numerous other details. Arshak had a voracious appetite for work and responsibility, and sometimes absorbed matters Logistics was supposed to handle, not without a certain irritation. It was probably just as well, since Brad and I were almost overwhelmed. In fact, during the last week of preparations the Moratorium became convinced the task was over the heads of the New Mobe staff. There was a grain of truth to this, though it was also born of prejudice that people who had such a cavalier attitude toward the sensitivities of congressmen to red-baiting couldn't be very practical organizers.

Writer Murray Kempton talked to Moratorium backer Adam Walinsky during this period and quoted him as saying of the New Mobe: "They don't know what they are doing. They announced that they would start the March against Death some place near Arlington Cemetery. They picked an island where there's no access, where you can't even put in telephones. They didn't even go out and look; some Trotskyite picked it from the map. I don't know what would have happened if thirty-five of our kids hadn't come in, without complaining, and just gone to work on the logistics." Kempton continued: "The Mobe had not, he [Walinski] clinched his point, even thought about toilets."<sup>22</sup>

Actually, it was Deputy Assistant Attorney General John Dean who had picked that spot, on the advice of traffic experts, and Brad had carefully inspected it personally along with Ken Tapman and Chief Inspector Bye of the Park Police, before we made the decision. And we had thought about the toilets until the

problem gave us nightmares. We just didn't have the money to rent them and were counting on the D.C. Health Department to provide them out of desperation, which it finally did. But we needed all the help we could get and the Moratorium volunteers did a splendid job.

Finances posed a constant headache for the New Mobe. A day or two before the demonstration Sid Peck had to take up a collection in the office to keep the phones from being shut off before the day was out. At that time the New Mobe had barely enough money in the bank to keep the account open, and was tens of thousands of dollars in debt. I didn't envy Dick Fernandez, who spent this time bent over the phone, arranging more loans. Brad despaired of getting any money to operate the marshal center and hopefully set up a collection box there. It worked, and we ended up paying for the whole marshal operation, with a few hundred dollars left over to apply to the general debt.

Some 700 marshals were used on the March Against Death, including replacements and backup. Each worked two five-hour shifts and was dispatched out of a marshals' center at the Ebenezer Methodist Church southeast of the Capitol. There was one night attack by a small group of American Nazis, but that was quickly isolated.

Except for some confusion in the first hour or so, the March Against Death went smoothly. The mood was solemn and determined, and for many of the participants it was obviously a deeply felt spiritual experience.

The scene at the White House at night had an eerie and ominous quality because the floodlights, which ordinarily light up the building, were turned around to blare at the approaches. A mercury vapor lamp about ten feet long was added and the glare almost blinded anyone looking toward the building. Brad later recalled:

"Those nights, the White House reminded me of the descriptions I had read of Special Forces camps deep in VC territory. It was easy to imagine machine gunners stationed in the building's

22. *New York Review of Books*, December 18, 1969.

windows ready to mow down the first wave of high school students who breached the fence. I could scarcely think of a grosser expression of the Nixon Administration's fear of the people than these security precautions at the White House."<sup>23</sup>

\* \* \*

It rained intermittently, but hard, Friday night, November 14, and I was driving along the route of the March Against Death making sure marshals who got soaked had relief, when a news report came over the regular car radio. According to this, a riot had broken out at Du Pont Circle, a couple of miles to the north.

RYM II and some other small groups loosely united in a "Revolutionary Contingent" had planned a march from the circle to the Saigon embassy, and it was a reasonable assumption that Weatherman would also be involved. There had even been a report—for which I personally had no first-hand knowledge or verification—that Weatherman had demanded without success \$25,000 from the Moratorium as its price for staying out of Washington over the weekend.<sup>24</sup> Weatherman later boasted of its

23. Lyttle, *Washington Action*, p. 11.

24. An account of this demand is contained in the article by Murray Kempton in the December 18, 1969, *New York Review of Books*.

activities on this occasion as follows:

"We were the people our parents warned us about. We moved through the streets in groups, marching, dancing, running, chanting, singing, downing jugs of wine. Running together with the people we knew well and trusted a lot. We carried VC flags and used the flagpoles as weapons. Trashing windows and pig cars. Setting fires at street corners."<sup>25</sup>

I drove to Du Pont Circle, but saw no riot. The cops had just broken up the small march and swept back through the circle, using tear gas and chasing away youths hanging around. It was all over by the time I got there. About twenty were arrested, and there couldn't have been more than a few hundred in the action. But the radio was still reporting the incident in the most exaggerated terms. A listener could have the impression that the whole town was about to go out of control. I checked out the March Against Death again. It was going smooth as silk. And the rest of the city was quiet, in spite of the ominous tone set by the radio reports. I headed back to the marshals' center to make some final preparations for the big march the next morning.

25. *Fire*, November 21, 1969. Reprinted in *Weatherman*, edited by Harold Jacobs (Palo Alto, California: Ramparts Press, 1970), pp. 275-76.

[To be continued]

## Free the Student Demonstrators Behind Bars in Brazil!

[The following international appeal is being circulated by *Campanha*, a newspaper published by Brazilian exiles in Paris. Translation from the French is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

\* \* \*

A wave of repression has hit Brazil following the student demonstrations in May and June. Eight hundred students were arrested at the end of June, during the Third National Student Conference. Thirty students were expelled from the National University of Brasilia in the course of a strike which began in May.

At the end of July, the university campus was occupied by troops, and 300 students were arrested and interrogated. More recently, twenty persons were arrested in Rio de Janeiro and accused of belonging to student groups which, according to the police, are "linked to an underground political organization, the Movement for the Emancipation of the Proletariat."

These persons, according to the official memorandum of the Department of Political and Social Police, "belonged to a student committee of the MEP in Rio de Janeiro, which was active in the student movement through several political and ideological 'recruitment' groups: Novo Rumo, Organizando, Trabalho e Luta, União e Luta, Perspectiva [New Direction, Organizing, Work and Struggle, Unity and Struggle, Perspective]."

In view of these grave events, we wish to express our indignation at the Brazilian government's response to the just demands and demonstrations of students.

We ask that you lodge a protest with the Brazilian embassy and the Brazilian government against the repression that is hitting all who fight for freedom in Brazil, and that you demand the release of all the arrested students and an end to all reprisals against the mass movement. Since their arrest on July 19, these students have suffered brutal torture.

We know that the Brazilian government turns a deaf ear to protests by democratic organizations. Our main aim is to see to it that our protest has an impact on the Brazilian press. For this reason, we are asking for a photocopy of the telegram sent to the Brazilian embassy by your organization. We would like to collect photocopies from the various democratic organizations working for the release of political prisoners, and have them published in the Brazilian press.

We thank you in advance for your willingness to respond to our request.

Revolutionary greetings.

August 11, 1977

For the release of: Luiz Arnaldo Dias Campos, José Mendes Ribeiro, José Augusto Dias Filho, Andre Teixeira Moreira, Artur Obino, Margareth da Silva, Henrique Dantas Neder, Ricardo Spares Pamico, Maria Luisa Villares, Marilita Grecco de C. Braga, Ivan Valente, Roberto Wanderley Valente, Errol Dias Pessanha, Franklin D. Coelho, Claudio Rocha Roquette, Elza M. Parreiro Lianza, Sidney Lianza, Inácio Guaracy de Souza Lemos, Fernanda Duclos Carisio, Frederico José Falcão.

Copies of telegrams should be sent to: *Brésil ça bouge*, c/o F. Charbonnier, 46, rue de Vaugirard, Paris 6e, France. □

## Enrique Broquen Released

Enrique Broquen, kidnapped in Buenos Aires on July 5, has been released. He is in good health and was not tortured.

Broquen is the main legal adviser of the Argentine Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores (PST—Socialist Workers Party). He has been an outspoken opponent of the activities of right-wing terrorist groups and the official protection they enjoy. As a result, he has been the target of death threats and had been arrested several times by military authorities prior to being

kidnapped.

Another activist in the PST, Eduardo Villabril, was kidnapped a few days before Broquen. He was seen alive two weeks later, having already been tortured. His whereabouts remain unknown, and his name has not appeared on any of the lists issued by the police or the army of persons they admit detaining.

Villabril is twenty-five years old and has been a leader of the youth organization affiliated with the PST. □

## Trotskyism in Latin America—2

Reviewed by Joseph Hansen

[This concludes a two-part review article.]

\* \* \*

The most interesting feature of the book is its account of the origins of Trotskyism in Latin America. Besides ephemeral publications, rare pamphlets, difficult-to-obtain books, and even American diplomatic reports, Alexander has relied on interviews that he began collecting in 1946. The latter are especially important, for even if they may not check out finally in every detail because of the hazy memory or political bias of some of those interviewed, they record the recollections of participants in the Trotskyist movement in the early days. This alone gives value to *Trotskyism in Latin America* and warrants listing it as a serious study.

Here are some indications of what the book contains:

### Argentina

In Argentina the first Trotskyist group was established in 1929 by three workers, Roberto Guinney, Camilo López, and M. Guinney. In 1928 they had begun to defend the positions of the Left Opposition organized by Trotsky in the Soviet Union. In March 1930 they published the first issue of *La Verdad* in which they stated their reasons for forming the Comité Comunista de Oposición and published Lenin's "Testament" denouncing Stalin.

The members of this group, reports Alexander, "immediately established contact with their counterparts in the United States and elsewhere," and *The Militant*, at that time the newspaper of the Communist League of America, the predecessor of the Socialist Workers Party, announced in its issue of December 21, 1929, the "formation of the first South American group of the Opposition. . . ."

Alexander divides the history of the Argentine Trotskyist movement into various phases in which, relying heavily on material supplied by figures like Liborio Justo, who long ago became opponents of Trotskyism, he seeks to follow the involved internal struggles and the many splits and unifications that occurred on very unclear bases in most instances.

In attempting to cover the most recent

phase of the history of Argentine Trotskyism, Alexander runs into difficulties, no doubt because of inadequate sources. Thus he judges the Posadas group to be much more influential in the late 1960s than it actually was and completely misses the

*Trotskyism in Latin America*, by Robert J. Alexander. Stanford, California: Hoover Institution Press, Stanford University, 1973. 303 pp. \$10. Index, bibliography.

split that occurred early in 1968 in the much more important Partido Revolucionario de Trabajadores. According to Alexander, "By 1969 the name of the PRT paper had been changed to *El Combatiente*." However, following the split, the faction headed by Nahuel Moreno continued to publish *La Verdad* until March 1973. The faction headed by Mario Roberto Santucho Juárez published *El Combatiente*. Both factions claimed the name of the PRT; consequently the two PRTs became identified as the PRT (*La Verdad*) and the PRT (*Combatiente*).

At the 1969 congress of the Fourth International, the PRT (*Combatiente*) was recognized as the official section of the Fourth International on the basis of a slim majority in the Central Committee of the PRT before the split. Whether this reflected a majority in the rank and file could not be determined in the underground conditions under which the Trotskyists in Argentina had to operate at the time. The PRT (*La Verdad*) was recognized as a sympathizing organization of the Fourth International. The political differences between the two factions centered on whether to initiate guerrilla warfare in Argentina, Santucho favoring this orientation, Moreno opposing it.

The PRT (*Combatiente*) organized the Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo (ERP), which soon gained international attention because of its kidnappings and other guerrilla actions. As an urban guerrilla force it vied with the Tupamaros in Uruguay in the extent of its forays.

However, in its program and practices the PRT (*Combatiente*) was not a Trotskyist organization. (Alexander, of course, applying criteria of his own, might not



agree with this.) The PRT (*Combatiente*) formalized their split from the Fourth International in 1973, and Santucho asked the press to cease describing his guerrilla group as "Trotskyist."<sup>7</sup>

The PRT (*La Verdad*) sought to root itself in the Argentine labor movement. In October 1971 the organization reached an agreement with the Partido Socialista Argentino headed by Juan Coral that shortly led to a fusion of forces.<sup>8</sup> The grouping retained the name "Partido Socialista Argentino"; however, to meet electoral requirements, the name was later changed to "Partido Socialista de los Trabajadores." The publication of *La Verdad* was suspended and the PST launched a new weekly, *Avanzada Socialista*, the first issue being dated March 1, 1972.

### Brazil

In Brazil the Trotskyist movement resulted from a split in the ranks of the Young Communists, Alexander notes. "The leader of the dissident group was a student who had already achieved a position of considerable importance in Communist ranks, Mario Pedrosa." In 1929 at the University of Berlin, where he had gone to study, Pedrosa became acquainted with the factional struggle over "Trotskyism" that had split the Communist International. "After studying the issue for some time, he decided to side with the Trotskyists and chose not to go on to Moscow to study in the Comintern's Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute, as he had originally planned."

Proceeding to Paris, Pedrosa met the French Trotskyists and began sending their magazine *Clarté* to friends and associates in Brazil. "Meanwhile, Rodolfo Coutinho, who had traveled with the

7. See "Press Conference of the ERP," *Intercontinental Press*, June 18, 1973, p. 751. For a report on internal differences that led to several splits in the PRT (*Combatiente*), see "Origin of the 'Fracción Roja' of Argentine PRT," *Intercontinental Press*, October 8, 1973, p. 1134.

8. For the statement of principles on which both sides agreed, see "Basis of Unification of the PSA-PRT," *Intercontinental Press*, November 13, 1972, p. 1253.



Brazilian delegation to the Sixth Congress of the Communist International, held in Moscow in 1928, at which the Stalin-Trotsky feud had generally been brought to the attention of Communists outside the Soviet Union, returned home sympathetic to the Trotskyist cause and withdrew from the Communist Party."

Through the efforts of Pedrosa and Coutinho, the "first Trotskyist group in the country, the Grupo Comunista Leninista," was established. In 1931 the organization changed its name to the Liga dos Comunistas.

A very active group, they had hopes of moving rapidly ahead. For a time, it appeared that they might even win over Luíz Carlos Prestes, who was then famed for the guerrilla struggle he had led in 1924-26. The Stalinists, however, were more attractive to Prestes. They gained his adherence and eventually housebroke him.

Nonetheless the Trotskyists did make encouraging gains. For instance, the São Paulo recruits "had considerably more influence in the state than did the orthodox Stalinist Communists." And during the first years of the Vargas regime, "the Trotskyists continued to be a significant element in the Brazilian left." They held the leadership in "the printing trades workers and metallurgical workers unions in both Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo, and they had some influence in other labor groups."

After Vargas established the "Estado Novo" in 1937, the Trotskyists met with heavy repression. "The Trotskyist group was driven underground, many of its leaders were jailed, and some were driven into exile."

One of the Brazilian Trotskyists, L. Rodríguez, described in a letter to Liborio Justo the effect of the persecution. Alexander quotes from the letter:

After almost seven years of ferocious repression, the Brazilian "Fourth International movement" . . . is now entirely anemic, and no pardons are given to those who escape or to those who succeed in returning from somber prisons, nor are they given a chance to begin their lives again. We are thus entirely fragmented, and struggling with even more difficulty since the frightful resistance of the Russians to Hitler has brought about the rebirth of a certain confidence in Stalinism.

The Brazilian Trotskyist movement never really recovered. Mario Pedrosa, who had gone abroad (he attended the founding congress of the Fourth International in 1938), followed Max Shachtman out of the Trotskyist movement. In 1962, most of the members of the Brazilian section of the Fourth International went with Posadas. After the military coup in 1964, the savage repression of the labor movement and the entire left reduced communications among revolutionists to the minimum and it took a few years for the Posadas group to fall apart. At present the Trotskyist movement in Brazil is beginning to revive.

## Chile

The Trotskyist movement in Chile emerged out of the internal divisions in the Chilean Communist Party going as far back as 1924. At first the divisions were not sharp; the party merely had two main groupings, one around Manuel Hidalgo, the other around Elias Lafferte, which found it possible to collaborate without undue heat. The two groupings were put at loggerheads through the intervention of the Comintern after it came under the control of Stalin. The efforts of the Comintern representatives to isolate and smash the Hidalgo grouping, which sought to retain its independence from the Kremlin (and also its majority in the party) constitute a striking parallel to the unprincipled maneuvers and machinations of the Comintern in the American Communist Party. Alexander opens his study of Chilean Trotskyism with a brief account of the Stalinist hatchet job.

The intervention of the Comintern led to the formation of two central committees in 1931, each of which spoke in the name of the Partido Comunista (Sección Chilena de la Internacional Comunista). The opposition group headed by Manuel Hidalgo continued to oppose Stalinism and by 1933 decided to join forces with the Trotskyists. "The first congress of the opposition Communists," Alexander writes, "made several important decisions. For one thing, it voted to change the party's name from Partido Comunista to Izquierda Comunista (Communist Left). Second, it decided to affiliate with the International Left Opposition, the world Trotskyist organization. For some years thereafter it was without doubt the most influential of the Latin American affiliates of the International Left Opposition."

The Chilean Trotskyists did not succeed in building a stable party:

By 1935 the Izquierda Comunista joined in the formation of the Bloc de Izquierda (Left Bloc), along with the Socialists, the Partido Democrático, and the Partido Radical Socialista. This alliance proved to be a forerunner of the organization of the Popular Front. Finally, in 1937, the majority of the Izquierda Comunista decided to dissolve their party and enter as a group into the Partido Socialista de Chile.

There they were "generally integrated," and by the late 1940s they had "lost all separate identity within the Socialist Party."

A minority that refused to enter the Socialist Party sought to continue as Trotskyists. The group was plagued with splits over obscure issues and never succeeded in fully recovering from the blows suffered in the late thirties. As late as the sixties, the "entrist" tactic continued to divert them from establishing a solid independent organization. They participated in founding the Movimiento de la Izquierda Revolucionaria (MIR) only to be displaced in the leadership. They also

followed a policy of long-range involvement in the left wing of the Socialist Party. This tactical course accounts in part for the irregularity of their own publications.

With the downfall of the Allende regime in September 1973, the Chilean Trotskyists were forced deep underground. Luis Vitale, one of their well-known leaders, was arrested and subjected to torture by the military dictatorship. He was finally permitted to go into exile.

## Bolivia

The Trotskyist movement in Bolivia antedates the Stalinist movement in that country. The Partido Obrero Revolucionario was founded in December 1934 at a congress held in Córdoba, Argentina. The two main leaders at the time were José Aguirre Gainsborg and Tristán Marof, a former Bolivian diplomat who had come under the influence of the Russian revolution in the period following World War I.

Marof was not exactly a hardened Trotskyist. At the second congress of the POR, held in Bolivia at the end of 1938 (Alexander gives both October and December as the month), he was expelled. He later became a follower of Marceau Pivert of the French Socialist Party and finally ended his political career as a leftist by becoming the private secretary of Enrique Hertzog, who was elected president of Bolivia in 1947.

A few weeks after the second congress of the POR, Gainsborg, "the principal ideologist and political leader" of the POR, was killed in an accident. The young organization was thus confronted with an acute crisis in the continuity of leadership. In the subsequent years, Guillermo Lora, Hugo González Moscoso, Edwin Moller, Fernando Bravo and other youthful leaders succeeded in rooting the POR in the Bolivian labor movement. By 1947 the POR was so well known that it managed to elect three of its candidates to the Chamber of Deputies, one of them being Guillermo Lora. In the following period, the POR was involved in some big labor struggles, including a general strike in May 1950. On the eve of the 1952 revolution, the POR stood next in prominence only to the Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario (MNR), the petty-bourgeois, nationalist party that seized power in April of that year.

In view of the strength of the POR, Alexander is interested in the reasons for its subsequent decline and the consolidation of the MNR. He devotes an entire chapter to this question, exploring in particular the relations between the POR and labor leader Juan Lechín as well as internal developments in the POR. Alexander's answer is as follows:

In sum, it was the POR's dogmatic adherence to the model of the Bolshevik Revolution, rather than their failure to follow that model, which led

to their downfall in Bolivia. Once they had ceased to be a really significant factor in the trade union movement and the general revolutionary process going on in Bolivia in the 1950's, factionalism within their own ranks reduced them to a group of quarreling sects.

But this is to miss the main lesson of the Bolshevik model. In discussing the split in the Bolivian Trotskyist movement that followed in the wake of the 1953-54 division in the Fourth International, Alexander observes:

In the long run, what was more serious for the POR than this split was the abandonment of Trotskyism by some of the POR's principal trade-union figures, led by Edwin Moller. In 1954 they quit the POR and joined the MNR, in which they became regular members of the MNR left wing led by Juan Lechín. Moller was a victorious MNR candidate for the Chamber of Deputies in the 1956 general election, and was named Secretary of Organization of the COB and editor of its newspaper *Rebelión*.

The equivalent of this in the 1917 revolution in Russia would have been a major split in the Bolshevik Party, with key leaders going over to the Mensheviks. Obviously the crucial problem of constructing a leadership team and a mass revolutionary party comparable to that of the Bolsheviks had not been solved in Bolivia.

## Peru

The Trotskyist movement in Peru began in 1944 as a result of the merger of two groups. One of these consisted of intellectuals, of whom the most important were Francisco Abril de Vivero, Emilio Adolfo Bestfalling, and Rafael Méndez Dorch. The other element was made up of textile workers who had left the Communist Party because they felt that it had betrayed a textile workers strike, in conformity with their current line of "national union." The most important of these workers were Félix Zevallos and Leoncio Bueno.

In August 1946 they formed the Grupo Obrero Marxista, changing the name to Partido Obrero Revolucionario in 1947.

Alexander considers that Ismael Frías, who was recruited in 1952 at the age of eighteen, became "one of the leading figures in Peruvian Trotskyism." The judgment is rather dubious although no one who has talked with him can doubt the articulateness of Frías. He renounced Trotskyism by 1966 and later placed his talents as a propagandist at the disposal of the Velasco Alvarado regime.

Alexander recognizes that Hugo Blanco, through his work in the peasant struggle, became the main figure in the Peruvian Trotskyist movement, and he gives a summary of the battles in which Blanco played a leading role in the valley of La Convención. In addition, Alexander goes into the bank robberies organized by Daniel Alberto Pereyra Pérez, the leader of the Túpac Amaru group.

Alexander does not report the fact that

the Túpac Amaru group split from the POR, publicly renounced the Trotskyist program of patiently seeking to build a mass revolutionary party, and stated that it was taking the guerrilla road in the example set by the Cubans.<sup>9</sup>

On the other hand, Alexander repeats details of a sensationalistic nature concerning internal developments in the POR at the time that included placing responsibility for the adventures on Nahuel Moreno. Offsetting this, however, Alexander states:

... Moreno had a different concept. It was his idea that under the leadership of the Trotskyists, the peasants, organized into unions, should seize control of their landlords' land, organize self-defense forces to back up their actions with arms, and thus establish throughout the rural parts of the country "a dual power," which, if the movement spread rapidly enough, could challenge the ability of the existing government to rule.

Neither Hugo Blanco nor Nahuel Moreno have dealt with the sensationalistic allegations mentioned above, which involve such items as supposedly unkept promises on funds and the disappearance of part of the cash taken in the bank holdup carried out by the Túpac Amaru group. In his own account of this period, Hugo Blanco does not take up the tidbits of gossip. He confines himself to the problems that he considers to have been the most important. These involved the upsurge of the peasantry, how he became involved in it, and what he might have done to have given the movement greater impulsion on a national scale. His account is both instructive and reliable.<sup>10</sup>

## Mexico

Alexander considers Mexican Trotskyism to be of special interest because of the renown of some of its members and the presence there of Leon Trotsky for three years. The members included "such an internationally distinguished figure as Diego Rivera, the great mural painter, and among its sympathizers such other distinguished intellectual figures as the novelist José Revueltas and the musician Carlos Chávez."

Trotskyism was initiated in Mexico by Russell Blackwell, "an American Communist who came to the country in the late 1920's to organize the 'Pioneers,' the Communists' childrens' organization." Blackwell sympathized with Communists in the United States who supported Trotsky against Stalin. "With the establishment of the Communist League of Ameri-

ca, he began to receive the League's newspaper, *The Militant*, and other Trotskyist literature. He also began to seek converts among Mexican Communists."

The first one was Manuel Rodríguez, "a young man of indefinite profession who in the early 1920's had become interested in Marxist philosophy, particularly in the *Anti-Duhring*, Friedrich Engels' famous philosophical polemic, and had subsequently become actively involved in left-wing politics as a participant in campaigns organized by the Mexican Communists in favor of Augusto Sandino, the Nicaraguan who was carrying on a guerrilla war against the United States Marines, who were occupying his country." He began participating in a pro-Trotskyist group organized by Russell Blackwell. The group included José Revueltas, who later became a famous novelist.

After Rodríguez was expelled from various Stalinist front groups in which he had been very active, "he openly proclaimed his adherence to Trotskyism, and took the lead in establishing a frankly Trotskyist organization in Mexico. His group was joined by several others who had recently been expelled from the Communist Party for their Trotskyist sympathies.

"Those expelled from the ranks of the Communist Party and its front organizations formed the Oposición Comunista de Izquierda (Communist Left Opposition). During 1933 and 1934 they sought actively to establish contacts with the organized labor movement. Whenever an important strike broke out, the members of the OCI distributed propaganda to the striking workers, but they had little success at this time in recruiting them into their ranks."

A second group, headed by Luciano Galicia, Octavio Fernández, and Benjamin Alvarez, joined the group led by Manuel Rodríguez after being expelled from the Communist Party in 1934. Later in the year, the formation changed its name to Liga Comunista Internacionalista.

On the basis of the personal archives of Octavio Fernández, correspondence with Charles Curtiss (a former leader of the Socialist Workers Party who spent several years in Mexico working with the Trotskyists there, first in 1933-34 and again after Trotsky's arrival), various interviews, and other documentation, Alexander presents an account of Mexican Trotskyism that is accurate in the main. I will confine myself in the space available to a few items that appear to me to require comment.

First of all, Alexander makes the following assertion: "On several occasions, U.S. Trotskyists intervened directly and sometimes preemptorily in the internal quarrels of their Mexican comrades."

Before considering the evidence adduced by Alexander for this judgment, it may prove helpful to consider the question within a more general framework—the

9. For documentary material see *The Militant*, August 13, 1962. An editorial in the same issue of *The Militant* indicates the Trotskyist position on the Túpac Amaru action. (Republished elsewhere in this issue.)

10. *Land or Death—The Peasant Struggle in Peru*, Pathfinder Press, New York, 1972.

relationship between the international as a whole and its component parts. The central function of the Fourth International as a worldwide organization is to facilitate the process of building leadership teams on a national scale capable of leading a revolution to success once the masses take this road. The point is that revolutions occur within countries but require leaderships capable of using the accumulated experience of the world working class since its origins and able to absorb the lessons of current successes and defeats wherever they may occur. This calls for a sharing of experience and opinions through discussion and debate.

The American Trotskyists from the beginning have sought to defend and to advance this view. Not because it was "made in the U.S.A." but because they "learned it from the Russians, particularly Trotsky," as James P. Cannon, the founder of the American Trotskyist movement, explained many times.

Factional struggles have occurred in the Fourth International and its sympathizing organizations in which the norm has been violated. Nonetheless it is a norm in the Trotskyist movement and one that distinguishes it from other movements, particularly that of the Stalinists.

Alexander offers two examples of what he considers, on the basis of the evidence available to him, to have been peremptory intervention by the Americans in the affairs of the Mexican Trotskyists.

The first occurred in 1938. "Since Trotsky himself was not in a position to try to patch up the differences among his Mexican followers, he called in the aid of his United States comrades," writes Alexander. "Early in 1938 the U.S. Socialist Workers Party sent to Mexico a high-powered delegation consisting of James Cannon, Max Shachtman, and Vincent R. Dunne. They conferred with members of both the Galicia and Fernández groups and spoke at a meeting organized in their honor by the leaders of the Casa del Pueblo. However, nothing concrete came of this quick visit, and it was decided to send a Socialist Workers Party representative [Charles Curtiss] for a longer period to try to reorganize Mexican Trotskyism."

The truth is that the "highpowered delegation" had other objectives in mind besides discussing internal problems with the Mexican Trotskyists. Leon Sedov, the son of Natalia and Leon Trotsky, had died in a Paris hospital on February 16 under mysterious circumstances that pointed to the hand of the GPU. (It was later confirmed that the GPU had indeed assassinated Sedov.) Cannon, Shachtman, Dunne, and Rose Karsner arrived in Mexico City in the middle of March. One reason they took the trip was to be with Natalia and L.D. and share their grief over the loss of Sedov.

There were important political problems that had to be discussed, too. With the

death of Sedov, how was the founding congress of the Fourth International to be organized? What about the necessary programmatic documents?

In addition, the Socialist Workers Party, which had been formed recently, faced many problems that the "highpowered delegation" wanted to discuss with Trotsky.

Among the main results of the talks was Trotsky's agreement to write a programmatic document for the founding conference. This later became famous in the Fourth International under the title *The Transitional Program*. (Trotsky entitled it more accurately *The Death Agony of Capitalism and the Tasks of the Fourth International*.)

The six sessions of discussions, which are illuminating in showing the nature of conferences with Trotsky, were taken in shorthand. Three of them have been published in *Writings of Leon Trotsky (1937-38)*. The other three are to be found in the third edition of *The Transitional Program for Socialist Revolution*.<sup>11</sup>

It should be added that the idea of sending an American to work with the Mexican Trotskyists did not originate in the United States. It was Trotsky's proposal.<sup>12</sup>

The "highpowered delegation" clearly did not go to Mexico with the objective of ramming an arbitrary decision down the throats of their Mexican comrades.

As another example of "peremptory" intervention in the affairs of the Mexican Trotskyist movement, Alexander cites the testimony of Octavio Fernández, given in an interview in Mexico City January 23, 1971:

This growing divergence between the GSO and the Fourth International reached the crisis point early in 1947. Charles Curtiss once more came to Mexico, and one of his tasks was to try to resolve the differences between the GSO and the POI. In effect he gave the GSO leaders directions to merge with the POI headed by Luciano Galicia, and to abandon their critical position on the Soviet system. Curtiss informed the GSO that it could no longer consider itself the Mexican section of the Fourth International, and was told in turn that the GSO had no intention of taking orders from the Fourth International.<sup>13</sup>

Alexander asked Charles Curtiss to comment on this, which Curtiss did in a letter dated February 10, 1971:

11. Both books are available from Pathfinder Press, 410 West Street, New York, N.Y. 10014, or Pathfinder Press, 47 The Cut, London SE1 8LL.

12. See April 15, 1938, letter to Cannon from Trotsky in *Writings of Leon Trotsky (1937-38)*, p. 314.

13. In 1945 the Mexican Trotskyists had split into two groups—the Grupo Socialista Obrero (GSO), led by Octavio Fernández; and the Partido Obrero Internacionalista (POI), led by Luciano Galicia.

I have to plead dimness of memory, and I have no documents to restore the events. I cannot recall the conversation with Fernández. I was asked to go to Mexico in 1947 to help Natalia with some problems concerning the house and her position in Mexico. I surely visited with Fernández, and such a conversation may have taken place. I would trust Fernández' recall more than my own. . . . However I am very doubtful of the peremptory tone he says was used. . . . I am sure that I urged such unity between the two groups, but my certainty is not due to any recall of the specific exchange but as being consistent with general policy.

Another possibility is that Fernández has mixed his conversation with Curtiss with an earlier discussion. In April 1946, Sylvia and Morris Stein, Reba Hansen, and I went to Mexico City to visit Natalia Trotsky.

While we were there, we talked with each of the Mexican groups. To us in New York City the political differences remained obscure. In Mexico City, despite our inquiries, they still remained obscure. We came to the conclusion that the split was not politically justified. True, political differences might lie at the bottom of the split, but if this were so the differences had to be brought out so that the reasons for the split would be clearly understandable not only to the members but to Trotskyists in other countries.

Thus, in our opinion, the differences remained of a tactical order that ought to be resolvable without a split. Under these circumstances, we argued, the two sides should unify and again follow the course of seeking to build a leadership team capable of working together despite personal frictions.

Our impression was that Fernández was disappointed. His group, which stood in the minority, had taken the initiative in splitting. We told him that in our opinion he had made a political mistake and that his best course was to try to reunite with the majority.

Fernández was noncommittal about making such a turn. He obviously needed more time to think about it and to consult with his comrades. In any case, he said nothing to us about not taking "orders from the Fourth International." No orders were in fact given—even if we had had the power to give orders, which we did not, we were opposed to that way of operating. The problem had to be worked out by the Mexican comrades themselves. It was one of the tests facing them in building a leadership team.

\* \* \*

An anecdote about Trotsky and García Treviño, a CTM [Confederación de Trabajadores de México] official who had broken with the Stalinists, is reported by Alexander. Treviño visited Trotsky one time to discuss what position to take toward workers management of the oil industry and railways that had been taken over by

the Mexican government.

Treviño claims that he succeeded in getting Trotsky to reverse his preliminary position on the question and that as a result Trotsky sent him a memorandum that could be used in debating the subject in the union. In Alexander's account, Treviño published the memorandum about twelve years later with Natalia Sedova's permission, making it available in a Spanish version: "Rodrigo García Treviño, 'Un Artículo Inédito de Trotski Sobre México: Las Administraciones Obreras de las Industrias.' *Programa*, Mexico City, January 20, 1971."

Alexander offers an English translation of the final paragraph to show the nature of Trotsky's argumentation.

The fact is that an English translation of the full text first appeared in the August 1946 issue of the *Fourth International*. Under the title "Nationalized Industry and Workers' Management," it is currently available in *Writings of León Trotsky (1938-39)*, pp. 326-29.

Here is how *Fourth International* obtained the text: During the trip to Mexico City to visit Natalia in April 1946, I dropped into Treviño's bookstore to see what new titles were available. Treviño noticed me and came out to talk. He told me about the memorandum and asked if I knew about it. I told him, no. He gave me a copy with the stipulation that if we published it, his name was not to be mentioned.

The memorandum was in French, was undated, and unsigned. Nevertheless, judging from the content and a few handwritten words, the memorandum could have been written by no one but Trotsky. Natalia agreed.

Recently the Russian original of the memorandum was located in Trotsky's archives at Harvard. This enabled us not only to confirm the authorship but also the date it was written—May 12, 1939.

The article thus acquires fresh interest—it was written *after* Trotsky wrote the *Transitional Program*. It clearly follows the method of approach to the masses outlined in that document. Moreover, Trotsky applies that method to a concrete case not foreseen in the *Transitional Program*. We are thereby offered an opportunity to learn from Trotsky himself how to extend the *Transitional Program* to new developments in the class struggle.

It is dubious that Trotsky held the preliminary position that Treviño ascribes to him—"that García Treviño was wrong and the Communists were right, that such union control of an industry was 'anarcho-syndicalism' not Marxism." Trotsky's real consideration may have been the advisability of stating his views on this subject to Treviño, for they could be misinterpreted as intervening in Mexican affairs. On the other hand, he may have weighed the possibility of drawing Treviño, whom he considered to be a centrist, closer to

revolutionary Marxism.<sup>14</sup>

\* \* \*

Even in a long review, it is not possible to take up all the small points that are disputable. However, one should probably be mentioned. On the basis of information obtained from Octavio Fernández, Alexander asserts that the magazine *Clave* "was designed largely as a vehicle for Leon Trotsky himself. . . . *Clave's* main purpose was to be an organ through which Trotsky could present articles in Spanish, which later might be translated into other languages and published throughout the world."

Actually *Clave's* main purpose was to present the Trotskyist view in Spanish. With the entrenchment of a fascist regime in Spain, it of course became impossible to circulate Trotskyist material legally in that country. At the same time thousands of antifascist refugees from Spain were admitted to Mexico. Mexico City became a center for leftist political material that circulated throughout Latin America. For the Trotskyist movement the situation was both an opportunity and a challenge.

*Clave* was not a journal through which Trotsky could present articles in Spanish "which later might be translated into other languages and published throughout the world." Trotsky did not write in Spanish but in Russian. His articles were translated from that language. As a result his contributions generally first appeared in English or French, whether in the bourgeois press or in the journals of the Trotskyist movement.

Trotsky did write articles directly for *Clave*—but not in his own name. It is only recently that the authorship of these articles has been established by checking the original Russian manuscripts in the archives at Harvard.

#### Cuba

Among the founders of the Trotskyist movement in Cuba, Alexander notes, one name stands out—Sandalo Junco. As one of the Communist Party's major trade-union figures, he was the party's most important Black. "A powerful orator with a magnetic personality, Junco had become the International Secretary of the Communist-controlled Confederación Nacional Obrera de Cuba (CNOC)."

Junco went into exile in 1928 because of the growing persecution under Gerardo Machado's dictatorship. In Mexico he worked with the local Communists. A year later he visited Europe and the Soviet Union. He was already beginning to question the line of the Communist International. "One of the legends about him,

which may or may not be true, is that in an interview with Stalin he aroused the Soviet leader's wrath by expressing sympathy for Trotsky's position."

Upon returning to Cuba in 1932, Junco set about to establish a Communist opposition. Later in the year he either withdrew or was expelled from the Communist Party. His group took the name *Oposición Comunista*, which was later changed to the *Partido Bolchevique-Leninista*. The group adhered to the International Left Opposition. By the middle of 1934, the *Partido Bolchevique-Leninista* had more than 600 members.

In 1934 and early 1935, a movement was set afoot to oust Colonel Carlos Mendieta, whom Batista had put into power. The Trotskyists worked in this enterprise with *Joven Cuba*, an organization sponsored among students by Antonio Guiteras, who stood furthest to the left in the Grau San Martín regime that had been toppled by Batista.

The conspiracies against Mendieta culminated in a general strike in March 1935. The dictator met the strike with terror and the attempt to topple him failed.

The blow was a heavy one for the Trotskyists. In the resulting demoralization, most of the leaders joined *Joven Cuba*, including Sandalo Junco. Later they played a major role in the *Partido Auténtico*.

Junco was assassinated by the Stalinists in 1942. At a meeting in Sancti Spiritus, a strong-arm squad burst into the hall and began firing at those on the platform, killing three:

The assassination of Junco aroused a wave of protest throughout the island. The Communists responded by accusing the *Auténticos* of having killed their own leader. However, within the Political Bureau, Joaquín Ordoqui, who had apparently been in general charge of the attack on the *Auténtico* meeting, was reported to have accused the leader of the Communist Party in Sancti Spiritus of having gone beyond his instructions by actually murdering Junco.

Alexander asks whether Julio Antonio Mella, one of the founders of the Communist Party of Cuba in 1925, was a Trotskyist or moving toward Trotskyism. The question is of interest since Mella is still regarded in Cuba as one of the martyrs of the Cuban revolution. He was deported by the Machado dictatorship, went to Guatemala and then to Mexico. There he became a member of the Central Committee and the editor of *El Libertador*, the organ of the All America Anti-Imperialist League:

There seems little question that during his last months, Mella had growing disagreements with the Communist Party of Mexico and with Stalinism. He was in contact with those Mexican Communists and fellow travelers who were inclining toward the Trotskyist opposition. He had a serious quarrel at a meeting of the Political Bureau of the Mexican Communist Party with the Italian Comintern agent Vittorio Vidali, who under the name of Carlos Contreras

14. For Trotsky's judgment of Treviño's political positions, see "A Contribution to Centrist Literature," *Writings of Leon Trotsky (1938-39)*, pp. 112-18.

was then one of the leaders of the Mexican party.

In January 1929, Mella was assassinated in the streets of Mexico City. Agents of the Machado regime are generally assumed to have been responsible. However, Alexander cites the opinion of Julián Gorkin that the murderer was a GPU agent.

It would probably be too much to argue that Julio Antonio Mella was the most distinguished Cuban recruit to the cause of Trotskyism. However, there is some reason to believe that before he died he had developed a certain sympathy for the positions of the outcast Soviet leader, and that this may have had much to do with his assassination.

Tracing the subsequent development of the Cuban Trotskyists, Alexander concentrates on the divisions between the Posadistas, the Healyites, and the United Secretariat of the Fourth International. He seeks to give a fair, if short, presentation of their positions. Besides that, he details the suppression of the Posadista press.

On Castro's attack against Trotskyism at the Tricontinental Conference January 15, 1966, Alexander quotes his worst characterizations, adding that Castro was not really speaking about Trotskyism in general but about the Posadistas.<sup>15</sup>

However, Alexander does not mention the considerable protest among leftist circles that strongly favored the Cuban revolution. They challenged Castro on his fulminations against Trotskyism. The evidence is quite strong that Castro based himself on material cooked up by leaders of the Stalinist wing of the Communist Party of Cuba.<sup>16</sup>

According to material unearthed by Alexander, Camilo Cienfuegos, who was one of the top leaders of the July 26 Movement along with Fidel Castro and Che Guevara, was "a sympathizer with the Trotskyists in his adolescent years, if not actually a member of the POR." On October 29, 1959, Cienfuegos disappeared at sea when his small plane was caught in a bad storm.

Alexander also notes, as have others, that Che Guevara took an interest in the Trotskyist movement.

A few facts can be added to this that Alexander may not have been aware of. About the time Castro established a training camp for guerrillas in Mexico, some of the Trotskyists in Havana, who were in opposition to the Posadas grouping, began participating in the actions of the July 26 Movement. With the victory, they became absorbed in tasks associated with the "interventions" of capitalist

15. For the full text of Castro's speech, see *World Outlook*, February 11, 1966, p. 20. A reply by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International was published in *World Outlook*, February 18, p. 22.

16. See my article "Trotskyism Versus Stalinism" in *World Outlook* May 27, 1966, p. 17.

enterprises and were eventually absorbed by the July 26 Movement.

In subsequent years, new recruits to Trotskyism appeared. They remained within the party formed by the fusion of the Popular Socialist Party, the Revolutionary Directorate, and the July 26 Movement, which in 1965 became the Communist Party of Cuba.

Inasmuch as internal groupings are banned in the CPC, it is difficult to determine what has happened to this Trotskyist current.

Aside from this, Trotskyists associated with the United Secretariat of the Fourth International were free to visit Cuba and even give lectures up to the time of the OLAS Conference in 1967.

Of the various formations claiming to be Trotskyist, the "Fourth International of the United Secretariat has been the Trotskyist group which has been most enthusiastic to the Castro regime," Alexander observes. "It has regarded that government as a 'workers state,' and although it has been critical of Castro's vocal denunciation of Trotskyism, it has never wavered in its general support for his regime."

In the United States, the Socialist Workers Party, which maintains fraternal relations with the United Secretariat, was "the principal political group participating in the Free Cuba Committee, which rallied support for the Castro government during the first half of the 1960's." That was the *Fair Play for Cuba Committee*—otherwise the point is accurate.

In a final chapter, Alexander deals briefly with Trotskyism in Ecuador, Panama, Puerto Rico, Colombia, and Uruguay. Most of the material is on the Uruguayan Trotskyist movement with the emphasis on recent developments. Here is a bit of information that will no doubt prove of special interest to some of our readers:

Trotskyism appeared in Uruguay soon after it made its appearance as a worldwide schism in

international Communism. Esteban Kikich, a Yugoslav-Uruguayan, had corresponded since 1926 with James Cannon, who later became one of the principal leaders of the Trotskyist movement in the United States; he, another Yugoslav, and a Bulgarian withdrew from the Uruguayan Communist Party in 1929 at about the same time Cannon and his followers were expelled from the Communist Party of the United States. However, it was not until 1937 that a formal Trotskyist organization, the Liga Obrera Revolucionaria, was established in Uruguay. This delay was said to be due principally to the fact that Trotskyism found its principal supporters among the foreign-born workers in Uruguay.

### Conclusion

Alexander's study is part of a growing body of literature based on a rising interest in Trotskyism. As in the case of other writers, the fact that the author differs decidedly with the premises of Trotskyism testifies in its way to the attractiveness of the movement both as a body of thought and as a revolutionary organization that has proved to be irrepressible despite the most murderous efforts by dictatorial regimes to liquidate it once and for all.

As *Trotskyism in Latin America* shows rather graphically, this interest in the Trotskyist movement extends to its internal discussion and debates, and even to the positions of the split-off groups, some of which are obviously doomed to oblivion. The disputes, which sometimes break into hot factional contests, reflect the acute political problems faced by the masses in the twilight of capitalism. That is why they are instructive and even absorbing.

Despite its defects as seen from the standpoint of Trotskyism, the book is well worth studying. It contains information on the origin of Trotskyism in Latin America assembled here for the first time. Much of it is the result of painstaking original research, in which information was preserved that might otherwise have been lost. This feature will be especially appreciated by everyone who reads the book. □

**MEMO**

**to:**

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

**from:**

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Street \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Country \_\_\_\_\_

- \$24 enclosed for one-year subscription.
- \$12 enclosed for a six-month subscription.
- Send information about first-class and airmail rates.

## Túpac Amaru Bank Holdup in Peru

[The following editorial appeared under the title "Bank Holdup in Peru" in the *Militant* of August 13, 1962. We are republishing it in view of the references to the Túpac Amaru in Joseph Hansen's review of Prof. Alexander's book *Trotskyism in Latin America*, which appears elsewhere in this issue.

[The editorial indicates the position taken by the American Trotskyist movement on the Túpac Amaru guerrilla action, a point not discussed by Prof. Alexander.

[We are also publishing an accompanying letter mentioned in the editorial.]

\* \* \*

During the campaign preceding the recent election in Peru, which ended in an army coup, the public was stirred by an event which reflected another side of the political scene in this mediocally run area of the Andes. In Miraflores, a suburb of Lima, a group held up a bank and got away with 2,600,000 soles (26 to 27 soles = \$1).

The press reported this as the biggest robbery in the history of Peru. (They left out of consideration the robbery of the Incas committed by the Conquistador ancestors of today's bank owners.) However, much more sensational news was soon splashed on the front pages.

Three of the participants sent a letter, which was mailed from Rio de Janeiro, to the well-known Lima newspaper, *Expreso*, admitting the deed and explaining that it was a political act; the money was destined for guerrilla fighters. (See text of letter elsewhere on this page.) The three participants—Jorge Tamayo Flores, Oscar Joel Silva Espino and Fernando Lopez Aliaga Ledesma—were young engineering students with brilliant scholastic records. They said that they belonged to a revolutionary organization named Túpac Amaru in honor of the heroic Cuzco Indian who led a rebellion of 70,000 against the Spaniards in 1780. By the time their letter appeared, they added, they would be safe in Colombia.

However, it turned out that they were still in Peru and the police managed to locate them. In Cuzco, in the heart of the peasant area, the police also arrested others, charging them with involvement. Front-page stories said 424,000 soles were recovered when this group was taken into custody after a gun battle. Some of them had been known as prominent Peruvian Trotskyists, but they now adhered to the Túpac Amaru organization.

Those arrested included Alberto Pereyra

Pérez, an Argentinian who had previously been deported from Peru for revolutionary political activities, José Martorell Soto, a Spanish revolutionary who lives in Venezuela, Adalberto Fonkén, Victor Argote Sánchez, Raúl Rodríguez Luna, Juan Nuñez Marchand, Salustio Jiménez, Raúl Terzi Zegarra, and Leoncio Bueno Barantes, a Peruvian poet.

According to information received by *The Militant*, the police beat the young revolutionists upon arresting them and then, after throwing them into cells, used torture. No more money was recovered through such means, however. One of the students insisted that it had "all been spent."

Public opinion favored the daring young idealists who had launched their careers as guerrilla fighters in this spectacular way. *Expreso* noted this in an editorial in its April 20 issue: "The letter sent to our daily by the students who held up the Banco de Crédito, has produced a genuine commotion. It is natural this should be so since it is an exceptional deed, without precedent in Peru. A group of youths deliberately placed themselves outside the law and our moral code in dedicating themselves to their revolutionary ideal." *Expreso* drew the conclusion that the action showed how indispensable it was to "immediately initiate the transformation of the country."

While the bank holdup occurred as a political act during an election, the real background appears to be a certain rise in the peasant movement. In the past months

reports have appeared of land take-overs, one of them involving a skirmish in which Peruvian army forces had to abandon the area. How extensive and profound this movement is, we are unable to judge.

The Peruvian magazine *Vanguardia*, in its May 8 issue, sought to connect the bank affair with the peasant forces headed by Hugo Blanco. In noting such reports the June *Hispanic American Report*, published by Stanford University, said that the money was destined for Blanco's movement. It described Blanco as "a Peruvian Trotskyist who had studied in Argentina and who was reportedly operating in the valley of Convención in the department of Cuzco."

Although the Peruvian Trotskyist movement is split into various currents, all of them would probably agree with the attitude expressed by Ismael Frias, editor of *Obrero y Campesino*. In a statement published in the May 2 *Expreso*, he held that any action undertaken in isolation from the masses is an "adventure," but at the same time he offered his "full moral solidarity to those who act in accordance with revolutionary motives even though we reject their methods as mistaken."

Actions of this kind, in which anger at social injustice and fervor for change lead inexperienced fighters to attempt to bypass an unfavorable relation of forces, are bound to occur where objective conditions for revolution are as ripe as they are in Peru and where a powerful mass revolutionary-socialist party does not yet exist.

But the revolutionists will learn from their mistakes—costly as they may be—and turn more and more toward what is most essential: The construction of a party in which youthful enthusiasm and energy, the burning wish to win freedom, equality and the new world of socialism can find the means adequate to the task. □

## Peruvian Students Explain Bank Robbery

[Republished from the August 13, 1962, issue of the *Militant*.]

\* \* \*

Rio de Janeiro  
April 21, 1962

To the workers, *campesinos*, students of our country:  
To our dear and unforgettable comrades of the Engineering School:  
To our friends, parents, and brothers and sisters:

Having already accomplished the task which as revolutionary militants we set for ourselves, completely safe from persecution by the police, since when you receive this we shall already be in Colombia, we want to give you all the reasons for our attitude and for the creation of our organi-

zation.

Our people are among the most miserable and exploited of the entire world. Malnutrition, tuberculosis, inhuman exploitation, unemployment and illiteracy accompany the Peruvian from the cradle to the grave. The other side of the coin is the foreign and native bankers and businessmen who reap their harvest, winning riches and luxuries on the basis of exploiting our fellow workers.

The July 26 Movement in its time gave an example to all the peoples of America of how to rise against a regime that exploited the country. Fidel's uprising was carried out against all the opinion of the traditional left which held that it was necessary to wait until the masses rose and took up arms. Various peoples of America are already following Fidel's footsteps, "replacing the arms of criticism with the

criticism of arms." These are Venezuela, Colombia, Guatemala and Paraguay.

In our country the traditional left—Communists, Socialists, Trotskyists—with distinct variations, in whose ranks some of us have fought so that we gained close knowledge of their people and their line, continue to hold the same opinions as in Cuba before the defeat of Batista: now is not the time for action.

In order to propose passivity and coexistence in face of the regime, they advance various pretexts: the FLN [National Liberation Front of Peru] and the Communist Party say that objective conditions do not exist for the revolution.

The Socialists and the Social Progressives have a positive program. But in participating in the current election they bring doubts to mind. All those who utilize revolutionary declarations to win seats in parliament, are they revolutionists or opportunists?

The FIR [Left Revolutionary Front], the Trotskyists and the various workers parties, even having Trotskyist leaders, make brilliant and revolutionary analyses of the present regime but believe that you have to wait until the masses go into action by themselves while we, the revolutionists, stay with them and lead them. When will they realize that the masses of our country at the present time are not ready for struggle and that consequently they have to be given an example?

All these reasons brought us to the conviction that it was necessary to constitute a new organization which we have called TUPAC AMARU and whose first manifestation you already know.

Our next one will be to struggle with the guerrilla fighters of our Colombian and Venezuelan brothers in order to learn in action how to struggle and to die to liberate our dear Peruvian country and its working people. But, in order not to go with empty hands we have recuperated from the bankers—thieves and swindlers of the public—a bit of what they have stolen from us.

This money will be utilized to give an impulse to the revolutionary struggle of the Latin-American peoples.

Fellow patriots, heroic descendants of Túpac Amaru, if we should die in our enterprise, we are sure that we have blazed the trail which other students, workers and *campesinos* will follow—that of the definitive liberation of all the Peruvians and of our dear country.

Long live Peru! Long live the Peruvian Revolution! Death to imperialism! Down with the oligarchy, International Petroleum, the Cerro de Pasco Corporation and the bosses!

To the revolutionists and the exploited of Peru a fraternal embrace.

(signed)

Jorge Tamayo Flores

Oscar Joel Silva Espino

Fernando Lopez Aliaga Ledesma

## Australian CL and SWP Agree to Seek Unity

[The following statement has been issued jointly by the Political Committee of the Communist League and the Political Committee of the Socialist Workers Party. We have taken the text from the August 4 issue of *Direct Action*, a revolutionary socialist newsweekly published in Sydney, Australia.]

\* \* \*

The two sympathising organisations of the Fourth International in Australia, the Communist League and the Socialist Workers Party, have formally entered a process of fusion discussions, joint work, and joint elaboration of conference documents. The latter include an analysis of the crisis of Australian capitalism and the prospects for establishing an independent and united working-class response, and perspectives for a fused organisation.

In line with the orientation adopted at previous conferences of the CL and the SWP, which have both taken positions regarding each other as revolutionary and Trotskyist, the steps are being made on the basis of common agreement with the program of the Fourth International.

Joint public meetings, successfully initiated with the national forums on the "People's Economic Program," are planned, along with joint work in a range of areas. The extent of agreement and differences can thus be assessed in practice by the membership of both organizations. As well, joint membership discussion of international and national perspectives will take place leading up to a fusion conference in December.

Over the past few years the working class in Australia has suffered attacks on every aspect of its living conditions, which had been hard won by organised struggle. The ALP government had responded to the economic recession of 1974-75 by clamping down on workers struggles and using procapitalist policies to boost the private sector at the workers' expense. Political events took a decisive turn in November 1975, with the ousting of the Whitlam government by a constitutional coup. In its place came the Fraser government, which aimed even more stringent attacks against workers' interests.

Expanded unemployment, including mass layoffs, wage-cutting measures and slashing of government social spending, has been coupled with a concerted offensive against the elementary trade union and political rights of workers to organise in defence of their interests. Behind this concerted offensive by all right-wing forces lies the goal of the ruling class, nationally and internationally, of resolving the growing economic, social, and political crisis of capitalism at the expense of the working class.

Against this escalating attack, working people can only rely on their own resources and methods of struggle. What is urgently needed is a united and determined fight back by the whole of the working class and its allies.

But the traditional leadership of the mass of Australian workers is caving in under these attacks. The ALP parliamentary and trade union leaders are seeking to conciliate with the class enemy, Fraser and the employers. The Stalinists of the Socialist Party of Australia, the Communist Party of Australia, and the Maoist CPA(M-L) have shown themselves incapable of providing an alternative revolutionary leadership. Worse still, the People's Economic Program, sponsored primarily by the CPA with some SPA support, has been launched, openly proposing class collaboration between workers and "small and medium" employers and the use of the capitalist state against the "multinationals."

Against this capitulation by the traditional leaderships to the very forces at the heart of the capitalist offensive, an independent working-class struggle must be waged, out of which a mass revolutionary party can be built to lead the fight against the capitalist system. Its revolutionary goal must be to lead the working masses to take state power. Only such a working-class regime based on a system of workers councils and socialist democracy—in Marxist terms, the dictatorship of the proletariat—can begin the transition to socialism and planned production for the needs of the masses.

That alternative, a revolutionary party which has the support of the mass of the working class, does not yet exist in Australia—it remains to be built. That is precisely the aim of the Communist League and the Socialist Workers Party, which see the undertaking of this fusion process as an important step toward that goal.

Apart from the compelling reasons of the need for unity of the Fourth International and of the objective needs of the class struggle in Australia, a fusion course is facilitated by increased areas of common work. While political differences still exist between the two organizations, as has been the case since the split of the CL from the then Socialist Workers League in 1972, we recognise that these differences, largely of a tactical nature, can be encompassed within a single Leninist organization. In fact, such political differences can lead to a healthy internal life of political discussion and elaboration, disciplined by a single organisation's unity in action. In line with the democratic centralist principles of the Fourth International, differences will be either resolved or clarified, as they will in the fusion process itself, on the new

ground of the current class struggle and the objective needs of the masses.

The reunification process will also be projected publicly. We believe that this fusion process will be a demonstration in practice of the possibility and necessity for revolutionaries to regroup in a single revolutionary organisation, which in itself should lead to a qualitative strengthening of revolutionary forces.

On a world scale, only one organisation

exists which is capable, both by virtue of its political program and its international organisation, of acting as the nucleus of a mass revolutionary international—the Fourth International. We are convinced that in the international class upheavals to come, revolutionary regroupment can only take place around the Fourth International. It is thus to the fusion of the forces of the Fourth International in Australia that all serious revolutionary militants must address themselves. □

## Fraser on Collision Course With Labor Movement

### 50,000 Protest Uranium Mining in Australia

By Fred Murphy

Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser announced to the Australian Parliament August 25 that his government has decided to go full speed ahead with the mining and export of uranium.

The move sparked immediate protests. As Fraser spoke, more than 1,000 persons demonstrated against uranium mining on the lawn outside Parliament. On the following night the prime minister was met by 3,000 protesters as he arrived at a Chamber of Commerce dinner.

Fraser has decided to confront the growing opposition to uranium development head on. The scope of this confrontation has already been indicated by the massive protests organized by the Movement Against Uranium Mining across Australia on August 5 and 6.

On August 5, 25,000 persons marched in Melbourne. "Uranium—Like Hell!" was the theme of the action. Several trade-union leaders spoke at the rally following the march.

In Sydney, on August 6, more than 11,000 persons marched. The day before, 1,500 participated in a protest there.

Other actions during the weekend took place in Adelaide, where 7,000 persons marched; in Perth, 3,000; Brisbane, 1,000; and Hobart, 700. In all, about 50,000 persons demonstrated for leaving uranium in the ground—more than twice the number that participated in similar actions on April 1.

One of the groups that organized the Melbourne protest, the Congress for International Co-operation and Disarmament, had sought to take the focus off the ecological dangers of nuclear power, instead centering their publicity on the danger that "terrorists" might steal atomic bomb material. One of the ICID leaflets said: "... after recent events—the hijackings, the military coups, . . . the Munichs, the Idi Amins—nothing is too farfetched."

This approach was effectively answered in a leaflet distributed at the August 5

protest by the Palestine Australia Solidarity Committee: "All this talk about the possible theft of nuclear products by 'terrorists' obscures the real point that the capability of making nuclear weapons is already in the hands of the terrorists: people like US President Carter, South African Prime Minister Vorster, Israeli Prime Minister Begin and the Shah of Iran."

#### Rising Labor Opposition

Fraser's move is also a direct challenge to the Australian Labor Party. The ALP recently took the position that if it is returned to power it will repudiate all uranium contracts signed by the present government. Fraser stressed that contracts will be written to give "maximum security" against such a move.

ALP leader and former Prime Minister Gough Whitlam blasted Fraser in Parliament, saying the government had "jumped on the gravy train of a technology that will have a maximum life of 50 years and will produce toxic wastes that will endure for a quarter of a million years." He said that "on a global scale the approach is comparable to the marketing of thalidomide."

In the past, Whitlam has been much more equivocal on uranium mining. But pressure from the ranks of his own party, as well as from the antiuranium movement, no doubt forced the strong remarks. At the ALP's biennial conference July 7, delegates voted unanimously for the position of repudiating any Fraser contracts, and for an indefinite moratorium on uranium mining and export.

On July 22, the administrative committee of the Victoria state ALP adopted a motion reaffirming the national conference policy and stating the obligation of every Labor member to abide by it—"including the national president." This was aimed at ALP President Bob Hawke,

who supports uranium development, but Whitlam apparently got the message.

Trade-union opposition to uranium mining has continued to grow since the anti-uranium work stoppages by dock workers in Sydney and Melbourne in early July (see *Intercontinental Press*, July 25, p. 858).

On July 26 the federal council of the Transport Workers Union voted a recommendation that the 66,000 TWU members impose a ban on the handling of uranium. A program to educate the TWU membership on why uranium should be left in the ground is planned.

The Melbourne Waterside Workers Federation has voted to refuse to work on all ships carrying uranium, as have WWF branches in Port Kembla and Darwin. The Sydney Ship Painters and Dockers have declared that they will strike for twenty-four hours every time a uranium ship enters that port.

In the face of such growing militancy against the dangers of uranium mining and export, the Fraser government has made threats against the entire Australian Council of Trade Unions (ACTU). The Australian socialist weekly *Direct Action* reported July 14:

Federal Minister for Transport Peter Nixon stated on July 10 that the Federal government would have to find an "alternative to the ACTU if the union council could not settle industrial disputes over uranium exports. . . ."

Nixon warned the ACTU to whip the Waterside Workers Federation into line. . . . He made it clear that the government would intervene if unions impeded uranium exports. This would occur, he said, "at the point when it became apparent that any ship loaded with uranium ore ready for departure was unable to sail."

#### New Elections?

There has been speculation that Fraser will call a general election before the end of the year in hope of securing a quick victory before opposition to uranium mining grows even larger. He would seek to win votes on the basis of the supposed economic benefits of uranium development and thus try to forestall rising discontent with unemployment, inflation, and his government's austerity program.

In overturning the virtual ban on uranium mining and export that had been in effect since 1973, Fraser has painted a glowing picture of the windfall that will come from developing Australia's 20 percent of the capitalist world's known reserves. Net revenue from uranium sales, he says, will amount to \$15 billion (US\$16.5 billion) between 1981 and 2000.

Those most pleased with this prospect, however, are the owners of the deposits. Shares in Pan Continental Mining Company, which holds rights to the largest single deposit, jumped \$1.70 to \$10.70 on the Sydney Stock Exchange when rumors of the government decision were first floated August 15. □