

REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

NEWSLETTER # 6

April 3, 1976

- Contents: 1. The IEC Meeting
2. The FBI, The SWP & The IT
3. IS
4. Literature
5. Local Reports

* * * * *

1. The IEC Meeting

We have not received a direct report or minutes of the recent IEC meeting. We were holding up the newsletter in the hope that authoritative, first hand information would be forthcoming. On March 25, 1976 we sent the following communication to the United Secretariat of the Fourth International:

"Dear comrades:

On October 27, 1975, following our national conference in Baltimore, we sent the following communication to the S.W.P./P.C.

'Dear comrades:

October 25, 26 representatives of the IT and of the BMG, SU and RMC met in Baltimore. On the basis of general agreement with the documents of the Tenth World Congress, the Building of a Revolutionary Party in Capitalist America, of the IT, and the IMT positions on Portugal, particularly "In Defense of the Portuguese Revolution", the IT decided to recruit members of the SU, BMG, and RMC, and to adopt the name Revolutionary Marxist Organizing Committee (RMOC).

It is the opinion of the RMOC that all Trotskyist Forces in the U.S. sympathetic to the Fourth International should be in a single organization. We therefore, request collective admission into the SWP.

If accepted, we would, of course, abide by party discipline. We would also exercise the full rights and responsibilities of an organized tendency or faction.

We are prepared to discuss these matters with you.

Comradely,
s/RMOC'

Five months have passed and we have not received a reply. We have learned indirectly, however, that our application was rejected on the basis of fallacious information received by the P.C. of the SWP, via the "New Faction" newsletter. From this misinformation the P.C. concluded that the RMOC is composed primarily of former members of the BMG, SU and RMC; and that the "RMOC decided not to collaborate with the SWP."

The Facts are as follows:

1) There was never any significant political difference between these local groups and the IT, and the IT itself formally eradicated the distinction. In a letter dated August 10, 1974, Bill Massey, then Organizational Secretary of the IT, speaking on behalf of the P.C., stated to a Baltimore comrade the following:

'Therefore, we are in a new situation where the former outside groups are no longer second class ITers, and therefore, assume all the rights and responsibilities of full members.'

2) The RMOC membership included a clear majority of former SWP ITers from the start, and at present, 40 out of its 53 members are former members of the SWP or YSA and the IT.

3) The statement that the "RMOC decided not to collaborate with the SWP" has absolutely no basis in fact. We have always sought to collaborate with the SWP in common activity recognizing that the Party deemed this necessary preparation for our integration into the SWP. The fact is, that in spite of the refusal to even reply to our application, our local groups have collaborated with the SWP branches in a number of cities, on solidarity actions, teach-ins, etc.

We know that the question of "reintegration" was on the agenda of the recent IEC meeting. Since a large majority of our group are former SWP members who were illegally expelled with the IT, and since our entire membership has applied for admission into the SWP, we think it appropriate that the decisions arrived at on this matter be conveyed to us. We would appreciate an authoritative report and clarification as to our status vis-a-vis the Fourth International. We understand, of course, that affiliation to the F.I. is precluded, since it is prohibited by the reactionary Voorhees act.

With comradely greetings,

s/ Judi S., Organizational Secretary, RMOC. "

Unfortunately, we have received no reply to date. We will, therefore, have to resort to an unofficial report, which goes like this:

"The LTF is falling apart. Right now it could only command about 9% of the vote in the International. Their Spanish section is horrified over the Angola position and may bolt soon. The PST is opportunistically moving close to the Majority and has officially left the LTF. They were going to vote with the IMT on Portugal, but shifted after conversations with Hansen, etc., and abstained on the question. There are efforts to unify with the Morenistas in Mexico. Only 50 LTF types remain in Mexico, and our group has gotten together with the Rojo group. Unification with the Morenistas would bring the present group up from 500 to 700, but the political shifts of the Morenistas (their electoral blocs with right-wingers, as outlined in IP, etc.) makes this problematical.

The motions on the IT expulsions were as follows: SWP: We have done everything we were supposed to do! IMT: All comrades who requested membership should have been taken in. They will continue to recognize all who were not as militants of the 4th (given Voorhis etc.), this presumably includes the RMOCers who were in the Party or YSA, but not those weren't. It means they can send us materials of the IMT and IEC, etc., and perhaps collaborate on other things. According to Langston-Barzman, this only includes the RMOC if it orients its work toward the SWP! Only the motion itself, which has not yet arrived, can answer the question for us, assuming its not too ambiguous."

A world congress has been called for early 1977.

2. The FBI, the SWP, and The IT

The SWP is basking in the extensive publicity resulting from the disclosure of the FBI burglaries. There are, however, other interesting ramifications to this affair. The national wire services have expressed a lively interest in the accusations that the IT was indeed "Terrorist" and was expelled for that reason. One of our supporters has been approached by the press with requests for interviews on this question. The SWP has let it be known that it would prefer that we refuse to talk to the press. It is our opinion, however, that the SWP never adequately defended the IT against the terrorist charge, and that we have the obligation to do that, and at the same time to give the Fourth Internationalist answer to the question of terrorism, in distinction from the

vulgar pacifist reply of the SWP. A statement on this matter is being drawn up by the New York comrades for distribution to the press, possibly through a press conference. This statement will be circulated to all local RMOC groups who should also distribute it to the local press in the most effective way possible. If press conferences can be arranged, comrades should try to enlist the participation of other former members of the SWP who want to collaborate with us in this.

The interest in the SWP-IT conflict stems from the reprint of SWP Internal documents, plus a commentary by the US Senate Judiciary Committee, in a volume entitled "Trotskyite Terrorist International". Comrades can secure copies of this free (?) through their congressman or senators.

These developments have just broken, and we will keep in close touch with the groups. Any developments in the localities should be reported promptly to us.

3. International Socialists

As a result of expulsions and resignations, independent study groups of former ISers have been formed in Los Angeles and San Francisco. Several of the SF group came to Los Angeles to confer with the local people, and also met with us. An informal gathering including RMOC members and former ISers was held. Discussions are under way regarding possible joint discussions.

We have documents published by the former ISers, but they are lengthy and limited entirely to organizational questions, so we have not duplicated them for circulation.

4. Literature

The total RMOC Inprecor bundle has risen slightly to 200 copies per issue. Sales appear to be holding very steady, and this is good, however, we believe there are ways to increase them. The comrades in Los Angeles have found that there is a great deal of interest in Inprecor to be found on the campuses among both students and professors. That by going through the economic, history, philosophy, Black studies, etc. departments, and talking to professors in their offices and students, a regular clientele can be built up (with important contacts being made at the same time). We urge comrades to try this approach, and report to the center their progress.

We again want to remind the comrades that having back issues of Inprecor is important not only from a sales standpoint, but also for use with contacts. We have found that all back issues can be sold no matter how many there are.

Payments are in general becoming regularized and this is excellent. At this time only San Francisco is significantly behind. We should like to especially commend Chicago, Baltimore, and Los Angeles for payment on receipt of their bundles. Lets keep up this record.

5. Local Reports

a) Baltimore, January-February Report

January-Since many comrades were away for all or part of the month, our overall level of activity was low.

1) Angola-We participated in the YAWF-initiated demo in New York. We also produced and distributed a brief "pamphlet" of 3 pages including the USec statement and a short analysis of our own.

2) In conjunction with a contact who is an ILGWU organizer, we initiated a discussion group on union organizing. The group includes both staff people and rank-and-file members. It meets once a month, alternating between Washington and Baltimore.

February, on the other hand, was very active.

1) Angola - In early February an article appeared in the Baltimore Sun (leading bourgeois paper) about the fact that CORE was beginning to recruit mercenaries in Baltimore. This new development concentrated attention on the Angola issue at a moment when an MPLA victory seemed very probable. We immediately called a meeting to organize a united front demonstration. Jumping the gun, YAWF announced its plans for an action of Feb. 21. Nonetheless, the meeting occurred, and was apparently a success. It was attended by NAM, Yawf, SWP, Socialist Union of Baltimore (SUB), BMG, and several independents. YAWF was adamant about making 'Victory to the MPLA' a major demand. We argued for 'Hands Off Angola' as the central demand, making clear, of course, that we supported victory to the MPLA. We lost; the SWP (whose representative didn't even defend their position) left. But the trap came when we all agreed to hold the demonstration on Feb. 21. After the initial meeting and many ensuing hassles, YAWF declared that they were the sole initiators and organizers of the demo, and the rest of us were only endorsers. This went counter to earlier decisions. The united front fell apart. NAM refused to participate at all. We felt that the action was necessary, and that YAWF's super sectarianism should spoil it as little as possible. Therefore we participated in the march but not in the "rally" which was completely dominated by YAWF speakers. YAWF's attitude cost us a great deal of local participation, and in effect ruined a rare opportunity for a united front on a major issue. But their mobilizing capacity (their people came from D.C., Richmond, Philadelphia, and even some from New York) provided the base for an action of some 70 demonstrators. Media coverage was fairly good.

2) University of Maryland - At the end of January it was announced that there would be faculty cuts throughout the University system. The cuts were the most severe at the Baltimore campus (UMBC). The student coalition there, which had previously concentrated on the tuition increase, now also began to work around this new issue. BMG comrades are influential in the coalition, and they took the initiative of contacting students on other campuses about organizing a state-wide response. At College Park (the central campus) the RSB had excluded the YSA from the "coalition". BMG comrades then intervened, and the exclusion was reversed. It was decided to hold demonstrations on the three university campuses on Feb. 25, a major step forward in coordination. In Baltimore this coincided with a visit to the campus by Joe Tydings. Tydings, aside from running again for the US Senate, is also a member of the Board of Regents and voted for the tuition increase. Some 250 people participated in a spirited picket line outside the lecture hall where Tydings was speaking. They then all marched in together and confronted Tydings with embarrassing questions and chants. The discussion helped to expose Tydings and bourgeois politics, and besides everyone had a good time.

The next action was a march on the state capital (Annapolis) on March 1. We pushed strongly for the march but then got trapped into the date. For various reasons, March 1 was much too soon. The demo drew 350 people. It was poorly organized, primarily because of a lack of time. The YSA played a bad role with their legalistic cretinism (for example, raising the specter of getting busted by non-existent cops.), and the action was further marred by the evident YSA-RSB jealousy. This jealousy helps to make people skeptical about political groups in general. On the other hand, through its consistent non-sectarian attitude and concentration on building the most successful actions, the BMG has done well in this movement. At UMBC we recruited the principal spokesperson for the coalition, and the coalition selected two BMG members (one student and one faculty) to speak for it in Annapolis.

Lots of different groups (welfare rights, state employees, people concerned about utility rates, etc.) have been marching in Annapolis, many for the first time. We need to take steps to coordinate these actions.

3) Hospital Workers Union - One comrade was fired from the union staff. The workers mobilized in his defense, and he was finally reinstated. An important victory.

4. Spain - We ran a five session discussion series on the Spanish civil war. An average of 8-10 independents participated consistently. The common text was Morrow's Revolution and Counter-revolution in Spain, But we relied heavily on Broue, Temime, The Revolution and the Civil War in Spain. We stressed continually certain political points, e.g., permanent revolution and dual power. Our biggest crowd came to hear a speaker from the Lincoln Brigade, with whom we engaged in a low-key debate.

5. Johns Hopkins University - On Feb. 22, at the celebration of its centennial, Johns Hopkins awarded an honorary degree to Princess Ashraf, the sister of the Shah of Iran. The award was kept secret, but there was a leak. A picket line was organized by the Iranian Student Association. Inside the auditorium a few members (admission by ticket only) of the ISA, YAWF, and BMG shouted and unfurled banners at the moment of presentation. Five, including one BMG member, were arrested. The action was a success. The press and media coverage focused on the disruption and the reasons for it rather than on the "pomp and ceremony" of the event. The presence and participation of the SAVAK were also noticed by the press. There was a general expression of protest by students and faculty. A petition gathered 1200 signatures on an apathetic campus of some 3000 students, and there have been several protest letters from faculty. Clearly none of this would have occurred had the disruption not dramatized the event. An overwhelming majority sympathizes with the protesters and is demanding that the charges (disorderly conduct) be dropped. The problem will be keeping the issue alive. Our intervention is limited since we have no comrades on that campus. Two of our contacts, however, have taken important initiatives.

Copy of leaflet on Angola is attached at the end.

b) Excerpts from a letter from New York

Morale is low, partially due to our rotten financial condition. This money situation is grave and directly reflects our heavy student and unemployed composition, as well as the terribly high cost of living here. Out of 12 comrades, three are long-term unemployed, three are low-income full time students, one has left school and is job hunting, one has part-time work and many debts, one has a low-paying job and no place to live, one left to go back to Buffalo because of the living difficulties here, and I work full time and have heavy financial responsibilities (two kids, debts, etc.). Plus several have housing and health problems.

On the positive side, we have made sure that every comrade intervenes in some outside organization (MPLA support committee, P.R. Solidarity Committee, MEC, campus cut-backs committee, etc.). We are underway on an intensive educational campaign, and we are tightening up on Inprecor sales and attempting (belatedly) to go after subs. Our problem in an organizational one, caused by all of the subjective factors mentioned above.

The SWP is making (strictly organizationally) a big change in New York. They are breaking down their big branches and setting up bookstore headquarters in several neighborhoods instead--a crude way of looking bigger--but it still fools all but those who know the reality. Unfortunately (and disgracedly) they still appear to be the USA Trotskyists in the eyes of the vanguard, and they are beginning to attract more and more erstwhile social democrats who have no other home. The politics of the SWP are becoming more rottenly opportunist everyday--they are adhering almost exclusively to tactics that attract right wing radicals--cuddling up to the right in the cutbacks fight, the women's movement, etc., and ignoring the left-moving forces or labeling them ultraleft (reminiscent of the CP calling everyone fascist).

c) Report from Los Angeles

Both other participants in the debate on China's foreign policy backed out at the last minute (the Maoist and Namite). However, another independent Maoist was found two days before the debate. About 100 people participated. Attached are a compilation of factual material on China's foreign policy, and a statement about RMOC and the Fourth International that were distributed to the audience. The statement is based in part on an article on the F.I. in Africa In Struggle #1.

P.S. The large contribution that had been received and designated for advertisements for Inprecor, has been withdrawn. However, the NAC has decided to go ahead with a full page ad in the Monthly Review, at a cost of \$250. Over half of this has been raised by the Los Angeles local through voluntary contributions, and the rest will be put up by the NAC. We are now requesting voluntary contributions to be made toward reimbursing the treasury. This ad could be an important new source of readers for Inprecor. Send your donations to RMOC, P.O. Box 27783, Los Angeles, Calif. 90027.

THE ANGOLAN CIVIL WAR AND THE NEED TO SUPPORT THE MPLA

Many groups on the left have remained neutral on the civil war in Angola. They defend their neutrality in various ways.

One way used to be to deny that the FNLA and UNITA are fronts for U.S. imperialism. This argument was buried one moonless night after the U.S. government admitted that the CIA and State Department have poured tens of millions of dollars in aid into the FNLA and UNITA and that FNLA leader Holden Roberto has been on the CIA payroll since 1961.

Another way is to advocate self-determination for Angola and to demand an end to all foreign intervention or to all U.S. intervention.

We completely support the right of nations to self-determination. And our most important job in this country is to find ways to systematically educate, organize and mobilize as many people as possible against the U.S. intervention in Angola--for instance through forums like this one.

But to defend Angola's right to self-determination and stop at that is a massive evasion in the face of the war being waged in Angola. This abstract self-determination tries to deny that a victory by one side or the other makes any difference to the African and international workers' movement. But that's not true at all! On one side are tribalist, rabidly anti-communist and anti-working class organizations backed, for good reasons, by South African racists, U.S. imperialists, and a fascist international brigade of mercenaries operating out of Zaire. On the other side is an organization with deep roots in the Angolan working class and backed by the Soviet Union and Cuba, both workers' states with post-capitalist economies.

It's imperative to take a further position--support for the MPLA in the civil war. Workers' states such as the Soviet Union and Cuba have the duty to send as much aid as the MPLA needs to guarantee total victory over the imperialist forces. If China were to send aid to the MPLA instead of remaining "neutral" on the side of the FNLA and UNITA, we'd support that action too. And we in the U.S. must explain that the MPLA is fighting our enemy, that every blow it strikes weakens not only imperialist oppressors but also the exploiters of the U.S. working class, that the MPLA is fighting also for us.

The other reason given by some for not taking sides in Angola is that the MPLA leaders are "bourgeois." One humorous version of this argument has it that regardless of who wins, the result will be a victory for U.S. imperialism.

While the MPLA's leadership is heterogeneous and has a left wing, we agree that the top and middle cadres come mostly from the urban intelligentsia and that the MPLA's program is nationalist rather than revolutionary socialist. The MPLA seeks to build

a national democratic state with a mixed economy. This vague description can be and has been used to describe; 1. workers' states in the process of eliminating capitalism (for example South Viet Nam); 2. states headed by workers' and peasants' governments that would like to eliminate capitalism but face insurmountable objective obstacles (for example South Yemen), and 3. thoroughly bourgeois states with a strong state sector (for example Egypt under Nasser and Indonesia under Sukarno). The question, therefore, is which course the MPLA leaders will follow. While they reject extreme forms of neocolonialism like in Zaire, they are unclear about more sophisticated forms as in Tanzania. Moreover they have, in the past, while in a coalition government with the FNLA and UNITA, opposed independent mobilizations of workers in defense of their class interests as "ultraleft" and voted for the Mobilization Law permitting the conscription of strikers to send them back to work.

But we're talking about a life and death struggle without a third force. The MPLA is supported by an overwhelming majority of the Angolan working class, much of the poor peasantry, and the majority of the intelligentsia. The bourgeoisie and the commercial and administrative petty bourgeoisie support the FNLA and UNITA. The reality of the struggle forces a choice. Our support for the MPLA doesn't depend on the class character of its leadership until the war is over and the Angolan republic is out of military danger from the imperialist forces. Unconditional support doesn't mean we have no criticisms of the MPLA or agree with its program. But it does mean that we won't withdraw our support because of these criticisms. And it means that in addition to the indispensable task of building a broad, nonsectarian movement against U.S. intervention, we will also support demonstrations in favor of the victory of the MPLA-- and that criticism must be completely secondary to support, until the war is over.

U.S. HANDS OFF ANGOLA!

STOP THE FLOW OF AID AND MERCENARIES!

RECOGNIZE THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF ANGOLA!

TOTAL VICTORY TO THE MPLA!

Revolutionary Marxist Organizing Committee, Supporters of the
Fourth International, Box 7115, Waverly Station,
Baltimore, Maryland 21218

SOME FACTUAL INFORMATION CONCERNING CHINA'S FOREIGN POLICY SINCE 1971.

Since the time allotted to the speakers in tonight's debate is very limited, we are presenting the audience with the following relevant and documented information in written form.

I. ASIA

Pakistan:

The first clear sign of the new Chinese line came with the crisis in Pakistan in 1971. During the revolt of the Bengali people, oppressed by the reactionary and proimperialist military regime of Yahya Khan, China unhesitatingly supported the Pakistani government. While government troops were committing unheard-of massacres and atrocities against the worker, peasant, and student revolts in Chittagong, Dacca, and throughout East Bengal, Chou En-lai sent a message to dictator Yahya Khan (published in the Pakistan Times of March 13, 1971) that declared: "Your Excellency and the leaders of the various regions of Pakistan have accomplished great useful work (sic) in preserving the unity of Pakistan and preventing it from drifting toward secession."

Ceylon:

In April, 1971, in response to a police provocation, the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (JVP - People's Liberation Front), a revolutionary youth organization with a solid base among the peasantry, defended itself in the name of socialism against the bourgeois government of Bandaranaike (a government in which the pro-Moscow Communist party and the renegades from Trotskyism of the Lanka Sama Samaja party also participate).

The repression was brutal, with massacres and summary executions (8,000 of them, according to Rene Dumont) and 14,000 arrests. Ceylonese Lieutenant Colonel Cyril Ranatunga, trained at the Sandhurst military academy in Britain, justified the murder of prisoners with the following argument: "We have learned too many lessons from Vietnam and Malaysia. We have to destroy them completely." (International Herald Tribune, April 20, 1971.)

An unprecedented international "holy alliance" was formed around the bourgeois government of Ceylon in its war of extermination against the young revolutionaries: Supporting Bandaranaike and her army with helicopters, planes, ammunition, weapons, and money were the governments of the United States, the USSR, India, Pakistan, Yugoslavia, and China. (See Fred Halliday, "L'insurrection cinghalaise," in Les Temps Modernes, No. 306, January 1972. See also the article "Wijeweera Sentenced to Life Imprisonment," INPRECOR, No. 18, January 31, 1975.) At the end of April 1971, the government of People's China granted the Ceylonese government a no-interest loan of \$25 million. In order to make explicit the political meaning of this gesture, Chou En-lai sent Bandaranaike a letter stating: "We are happy to observe that thanks to the efforts of Your Excellency and the Ceylonese government, the chaotic situation provoked by a handful of individuals calling themselves 'Guevarists,' whose ranks have been infiltrated by foreign spies, has been mastered. . . . In the interest of friendship between China and Ceylon, and taking into consideration the needs of the Ceylonese government, the Chinese government has agreed to furnish a long-term, no-interest loan of 150 million rupees in convertible foreign currency. . . . As for any further material aid, please let us know if you are in need." (Published by the Ceylon Daily News, May 27, 1971.)

Japan:

In the course of conversations with Takeo Kimura, an important personality of the conservative governmental party in Japan, and later with M. Nakasone, Japanese minister of industry, Chou En-lai insisted that in the present situation the maintenance of the Japanese-American security treaty was "inevitable" for Japan. He also declared that the American nuclear umbrella was necessary for Japan, not for defense against China, but for defense against the Soviet Union. (Le Monde, April 11, 1973.) It is needless to add that this Chinese maneuver, as Le Monde's Tokyo correspondent stressed, "seriously disconcerted" the opposition left parties in Japan, which were preparing to launch a hard offensive against the security treaty. It is also needless to add that U.S. imperialism, for which the treaty with Japan guarantees the principal bases of its air and naval potential in the Pacific, much appreciated this unexpected support.

Thailand:

The case of Thailand was more serious in that it closely affected problems of the Indochinese revolution. In a telegram to Bangkok the minister of foreign affairs of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam denounced the American presence in Thailand, and particularly the utilization of bases for the supply of arms to Saigon and Phnom Penh and the resupply of foreign mercenaries in Laos. In January 1975, Chou En-lai, receiving General Choo-haven, the Thai minister of foreign affairs, declared that China wanted the United States to maintain military strength in Thailand... because the USSR might step up its activities in the Indian Ocean! (Declaration, not denied, of the spokesman of the Thai Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Le Monde, January 16, 1975.) Moreover, the National Student Center of Thailand protested against "the Chinese support to the continuation of the U.S. military presence in Thailand under the pretext of containing Russian Military expansion in the region." (Voice of the Nation, Bangkok, January 20, 1975.)

Iran:

The regime of the shah is one of the most barbaric dictatorships in the world. SAVAK, its political police, organized and trained by American specialists, systematically arrests and tortures oppositionists. There are thousands of political prisoners, more than 200 of whom have been shot on orders from the shah. (On the atrocious torture of revolutionary militants, both male and female, see *Petrole et violence, terreur blanche et resistance en Iran*, Editions Anthropos, 1974.) The shah's foreign policy is that of gendarme of imperialism in charge of maintaining order in the region of the Gulf.

In fact, the shah proclaims this very explicitly and proudly. In an interview with Newsweek in May 1973, for example, His Imperial Majesty declared: "West Europe, the United States, and Japan consider the Persian Gulf as integral to their security, but they are not in position to guarantee this security. We do it for them." The same tone was struck by the Iranian prime minister in an interview with Eric Rouleau: "This maritime route is very important for you Westerners... In your interest and ours, we have offered our neighbors our support in case they should want to suppress subversive movements directed from abroad. At its request, the sultanate of Oman has extensively benefited from our military aid in repressing the rebellion in Dhofar." (Le Monde, October 7, 1973.)

A spectacular Sino-Iranian rapprochement began in 1971. In August 1971, a joint communique was published that declared: "The government of the People's Republic of China firmly supports the just struggle of the imperial government of Iran to safeguard its national independence and sovereignty and to protect its natural resources." (Le Monde, December 2, 1971.) During a banquet held in Tehran on June 16, 1973, Chi Peng-fei, then Chinese minister of foreign affairs, praised the "policy of independence" of the Iranian monarch and judged "necessary and understandable" the strengthening of Iranian military potential, which was destined, he said, to combat "subversion" and "expansionism" by the superpowers. Chi Peng-fei is said to have assured his interlocutors in private that

Peking approved of Iran's membership in the imperialist CENTO pact. (Le Monde, October 7, 1973.)

Thus, China and the United States both support the shah's role as "guardian of peace and equilibrium" as well as his struggle against "Soviet influence." It is needless to stress the concrete meaning of this "pacifying" role: The sending of thousands of Iranian soldiers, along with tanks and planes (bought from the United States) to defend the sultan of Oman against the red guerrillas of Dhofar.

Oman:

According to all the information, this turn has extremely concrete practical consequences: the halting of military and material support to the Front for the Liberation of Occupied Oman. According to Eric Rouleau, Chi Peng-fei declared during his trip to Tehran in 1973 that China was no longer supplying the rebels in Dhofar. (Le Monde, October 7, 1973.) Moreover, this is confirmed by an interview with the shah himself, in which he proclaimed with satisfaction that China had "completely" ceased aiding the Liberation Front. (Interview conducted by A. Fontaine, Le Monde, June 25, 1974.)

II. AFRICA

In Africa during the 1960s, People's China aided guerrilla movements against the proimperialist puppet regimes: Mulele's movement in the Congo, the UPC in the Cameroons, etc. Finally, in Angola, it supported the most progressive anticolonial movement, the MPLA. The 1970s brought a radical change.

Zaire:

There was the surprising reconciliation with Mobutu, the murderer of Lumumba and Mulele and U. S. imperialism's main man in Africa. In a welcoming speech delivered on the occasion of Mobutu's visit to Peking, Teng Hsiao-ping saluted the contribution of the president of Zaire "to the united struggle of the Third World against hegemonism" as well as his courage in "defying the despotism of the superpowers." (Pekin Information, No. 51, December 23, 1974.)

Cameroons:

As for Ahmadou Ahido, faithful instrument of French neocolonialism and assassin of Ouandje and thousands of revolutionaries in the Cameroons, he was also received triumphally in Peking by Chairman Mao and by Chou En-lai, who declared: "The Chinese people and government feel admiration for the success obtained by the government of the Cameroons in both foreign and domestic political matters." (Pekin Information, No. 13, April 2, 1973.)

Ethiopia:

In 1971, Mao received the Emperor Haile Selassie, the feudal despot of a bygone age, since deposed. The Chinese CP daily Renmin Ribao saluted the contribution of His Majesty "to the promotion of the cause of anti-imperialist unity in Asia and Africa." (Pekin Information, No. 42, October 20, 1971.) As if the now departed emperor of Ethiopia were not one of the surest allies of American imperialism in Africa.

In all these cases it was once again not simply a matter of empty words and diplomatic bows. All Chinese political, material, and military support to the UPC in the Cameroons and to the Eritrean Liberation Front was cut off beginning in 1971. (On the halting of support to the Eritrean fighters, see Le Monde, June 23, 1972.)

Sudan:

But the events most revealing of the Chinese turn in Africa were those in the Sudan

in 1971. Let us briefly recall what happened: In July 1971, there was an attempted coup by the left wing of the army, supported by the Sudanese CP (one of the most powerful CPs in Africa). The reactionary General Nimeiry (with the aid of Sadat's Egypt) succeeded in crushing the rebellion. Hundreds of communists were arrested and massacred. The principal leaders of the CP, among them General Secretary Mahgoub and Shafei el-Sheikh, general secretary of the Sudanese trade-union federation, were hanged in an atmosphere of white terror and witch-hunt.

The Chinese bureaucracy unconditionally supported the Nimeiry regime, denouncing the abortive July coup as a maneuver undertaken by the USSR "through the intermediary of its agents in the Sudan." (Le Monde, December 25, 1973.) During his visit to China in December 1971, General Hassan Abbas, vice-president of the Sudanese military regime, warmly thanked the Chinese government for its "economic and military support." And Chou En-lai proclaimed: "This year the Sudanese government and people have again victoriously smashed a foreign subversive plot." (Peking Review, December 24, 1971.) Nimeiry's staunch anticommunism quickly paid off. During 1971 Washington extended a credit of \$18 million to the Sudanese government, Britain provided a credit of \$25 million, the International Monetary Fund (controlled by the United States) gave \$40 million... and People's China gave a credit of \$80 million. (Le Monde, February 18, 1972.)

In reality, Mahgoub was far from being an "agent of Moscow." On several occasions he had demonstrated his (relative) independence of the bureaucratic Soviet leadership, refusing to dissolve the Sudanese CP (as the Egyptian CP was dissolved at Kremlin urging), criticizing the USSR's economic aid to the reactionary Abboud regime, etc. But for Chinese policy, this was a "secondary" feature. In face of the "Soviet danger", Peking rallied to the support of the butchers of Sudanese communism.

Angola:

The most recent example of the Sino-American "objective convergence" in Africa is provided by Angola. After supporting (together with the USSR) the left wing of Angolan nationalism, the MPLA, during the 1960s, China gradually changed its line, first aiding the UNITA of Jonas Savimbi, and then the Angola NLF of Holden Roberto. Holden, an intimate friend of Mobutu, has had close relations with U. S. imperialism since the beginning of the 1960s. "American advisers" have been discovered in his ranks, including officers who served in South Vietnam. Moreover, in a statement to a French journalist in 1970, he denounced the MPLA as "communist" and complained that "the Western countries" had "fallen into the trap" of this movement. (See Basil Davidson, L'Angola au coeur des tempetes, Maspero, 1972, p. 222 and 236.)

In December 1973 Holden Roberto was invited to China. Upon his return to Kinshasa he declared that a "cooperation agreement between the Chinese authorities and the Angola NLF has been established." (Le Monde, December 26, 1973.) Toward the end of 1974 some 200 Chinese instructors arrived in Zaire to train the ANLF's reserve army, stationed in Zaire, thus contributing to strengthening this pro-imperialist movement and placing an obstacle before the "Soviet influence" allegedly embodied in the MPLA.

III. LATIN AMERICA

Cuba:

Farroting the line of U. S. imperialism and the anti-Cuban Organization of American States, a February 3, 1974, Hsinhua article declared: "Militarily, after obtaining a naval and air base in the Caribbean which provides it with a foothold in Latin America, Soviet revisionism has been stepping up its military expansion in the Western hemisphere constituting a serious threat to the security of the Latin American countries."

Chile:

Peking's foreign policy in Latin America was strikingly manifested at the time of the overthrow of Allende in Chile. While denouncing the Pinochet coup (Chou En-lai's letter to Mrs. Allende, etc.), China, along with Rumania, was the only workers state that did not break diplomatic relations with the new regime. The Chinese authorities coldly discharged Allende's ambassador in China, "after receiving a note from the new government divesting him of his functions." (Le Monde, October 12, 1973.)

Furthermore, the Chinese Embassy in Santiago closed its doors and generally refused to admit persecuted militants seeking refuge.

In October 1973, several weeks after the military coup and the barbarous repression that had fallen on the Chilean people, the Executive Committee of UNESCO, unanimously adopted a resolution expressing its profound concern about the events in Chile. Two countries abstained on the vote on this resolution: the United States.....and China. (Le Monde, October 16, 1973.)

At a time when the Pinochet dictatorship's murderous repression of political opponents has isolated it internationally to the point that the blood-soaked regime is even a public embarrassment to the White House, help has arrived from the Maoist bureaucracy in Peking.

"The Chilean military junta, increasingly isolated and beleaguered at home and abroad, is seeking stronger ties with China, one of its few remaining friends," Hugh O'Shaughnessy reported in the November 23 issue of the Observer.

"Commandant Gaston Frez, head of Codelco, the Chilean State copper corporation," O'Shaughnessy continued, "announced in Santiago last week that China would increase its imports of Chilean copper from 8,000 tons this year to 34,000 tons in 1976."

A substantial loan from Peking is reported to be part of the deal. In a recent interview with Pinochet, New York Times columnist C. L. Sulzberger asked if there were any truth to a rumor he had heard that "Chile was discussing with Peking a \$58 million loan to this tottering economy" as part of the copper negotiations.

"Much to my surprise," Sulzberger said in his November 29 column, "he confirmed this."

According to Sulzberger, Pinochet "said discussions with the Chinese had begun during the Allende era but were being continued now, after having been suspended. 'The matter remains open and the loan is still pending,' he added. "China has behaved well," he told Sulzberger.

Sulzberger, apparently still skeptical, sought verification of Pinochet's statement, with the following results:

"I confirmed this in conversation with the Chilean who has been a principal negotiating contact with Peking's ambassador, a man he describes as 'very, very patient.'"

Puerto Rico:

On August 20, a US led bloc, narrowly defeated a Cuban-sponsored resolution in the UN Decolonization committee, which called on the US government "to refrain from any measure which might obstruct or endanger" the "right of the people of Puerto Rico to self-determination and independence" and to cease the persecution of the independence movement. The Chinese delegation abstained! - New York Times, Aug. 21, 1975

IV. Europe

In a February 6, 1974 Hsinhua dispatch from Peking, "Soviet revisionists" were accused of undermining the US position in Western Europe and splitting Western Europe.

Greece:

In May 1973, Makarezos, vice-president of the Greece of the fascists colonels, visited China. During the classic diplomatic banquet, Li Hsien-nien, Chinese vice prime minister, greeted this visit, which had "increased our mutual understanding and our friendship." (Le Monde, May 25, 1973.) What was the meeting ground for this "friendship" and "mutual understanding"? According to Alain Bouc, Le Monde's "Sinophile" correspondent in Peking, "it is obvious that Greece occupies an unequalled strategic position to observe, and even to control, Soviet naval expansion in the Mediterranean. "

Spain:

Is it for the same "strategic" reason that China established diplomatic relations with Francoist Spain? Whether it is the case or not, on March 11, 1973, when these relations were established, Renmin Ribao published a historical sketch of Spain and "forgot" to mention the fascist character of the regime and even the civil war of 1936-39! Madrid-Peking relations are so cordial that when Carrero Blanco was executed by Basque revolutionaries, Foreign Minister Chi Peng-fei went to the Spanish Embassy in Peking to "express his sympathies" to the Francoist authorities! (Le Monde, December 24, 1973.)

V. EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES - NATO

We are now seeing a more and more pronounced drift toward the doctrine of a united Europe associated to the United States against "Russian social imperialism." In 1972 the Chinese leaders discreetly advised their European interlocutors to support the maintenance of American troops on the continent. Peking Information published without comment the "Atlanticist" declarations of a reactionary English lord: "Lord Chalfont criticized the idea that all military threat to Western Europe had disappeared and that consequently all the American troops could be withdrawn and NATO dismantled." (Peking Information, August 6, 1973, p. 21)

Peking's "European line" was further clarified by the invitations to China of Eduard Heath, then head of the British Tory party, and later of Franz Josef Strauss, the revanchist German nationalist, champion of the cold war, frenzied anti-communist, and advocate of "getting tough" with striking workers and dissident students. Received with full honors by Mao and ChouEn-lai, Strauss listened with pleasure to Chinese generals who explained that "the security of West Europe can be assured only by the military support of the United States." (Le Monde, January 15, 1975.)

Revolutionary Marxist Organizing Committee (RMOC) P.O. Box 27783, Los Angeles
Calif. 90027

March 12, 1976

THE REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST ORGANIZING COMMITTEE
AND THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

**

**

**

The Revolutionary Marxist Organizing Committee (RMOC) is a national grouping composed of supporters of the Fourth International. We are engaged in advancing the program of revolutionary Marxism through public forums, classes, and distribution of our international press. We also participate actively in trade-union work, and in support of struggles against all forms of oppression, everywhere.

While we always defend and seek to extend the gains won in these struggles, we recognize that real social change will only come about through a revolutionary transformation of this society. We therefore set, as our primary task, the building of a nucleus of a revolutionary party in this country, in political solidarity with the Fourth International.

The Fourth International

The Fourth International is an international revolutionary party based on the program and traditions of the Communist (Third) International founded in 1919 by the leaders of the Russian revolution. The Privileged Stalinist bureaucracy which destroyed the workers soviets, also scuttled the Third International. First they debased it, turning it into a docile instrument in the service of Russian national diplomacy, and then officially liquidated it in 1943, to prove its commitment to peaceful coexistence with imperialism.

Most of the cadres which remained loyal to the Leninist principled line of proletarian internationalism, were either exterminated in Stalin's campaign of political genocide, or corrupted--but not all. Trotsky (although eventually assassinated by an agent of the Kremlin) succeeded, against enormous odds, in regrouping genuine communists into a viable international current, thus maintaining the continuity of the world communist movement.

After five years of preparatory work, the Fourth International was founded in 1938 standing on the basic programmatic positions of the First four congresses of the Communist International. The Fourth International adopted a program of revolutionary transitional demands which applies Leninist strategy of world revolution to the special conditions of our epoch. This program is adapted by each national section of the international party to the requirements of its own unique circumstances.

The fourth International is larger and stronger than ever before and is growing. It has taken root among revolutionary militants in all parts of the world, and includes organized sections in more than 50 countries. Some of these (as in France and Spain) have developed a mass base and lead important struggles. The Fourth International publishes Inprecor (International Press Correspondence) the only international Marxist periodical.

The fundamental political positions of the Fourth International are:

FOR INTERNATIONAL REVOLUTION - AGAINST "SOCIALISM IN ONE COUNTRY". Socialist revolution in any country must be seen as part of an international process. For this reason, the international revolutionary party which seeks to centralise the experience and understanding of all its sections is a vital instrument for successful revolution. Since the modern world is an integrated economic, political and social entity, socialism cannot be built in one country. Attempts to achieve this have led to terrible deformations and compromises with imperialism. It is the "socialism in one country" strategy which is responsible for the "peaceful coexistence", "class collaborationist" policies of the Russian and Chinese leaderships, and leads to the anti-

democratic internal regimes. Socialism in all countries will be built as a part of a process of fighting for international revolution!

PERMANENT REVOLUTION - AGAINST "REVOLUTION BY STAGES". The Fourth international sees capitalism as a social and economic formation that is completely reactionary. It survives only by war, booms, slumps, crisis, and subjugation of workers and oppressed people. This means that capitalist forces cannot play a progressive role, nor can there be some progressive democratic (i.e., non-socialist, and therefor capitalist) stage of revolution. On the contrary, tasks which had historically been achieved by the revolutionary bourgeoisie, can today only be achieved as part of socialist revolution, which would, therefor, start the process of ending the misery of the mass of people.

FOR WORKING PEOPLE'S DEMOCRACY - AGAINST BUREAUCRACY AND ELITES.

The Fourth International traces its origins to a struggle in the Soviet Union which was inseparable from a fight for workers' democracy against bureaucratisation. It believes that a successful struggle against bureaucratic anti-democratic trends in the workers' and revolutionary movement is a prerequisite for successful and completed revolution. Therefore, the Fourth International stands for (1) Election and right of recall for all posts in the workers' movement; (2) The right to form tendencies in these organizations; (3) The right of pro-revolutionary tendencies in workers states to freely assemble, publish their views and organize political parties. Against single party monolithism. (4) The freedom of the trade unions from state control. (5) Mass involvement in decision making at all levels; and defense of all other democratic rights.

FOR TOTAL LIBERATION - AGAINST ALL OPPRESSION/EXPLOITATION. The Fourth International does not limit itself to purely economic demands. It fights all forms of oppression/exploitation; racism, oppression of women, super-exploitation of the peasantry, discrimination against gays and other minority groups. It opposes the bureaucrats and sectarians who refuse to take up these struggles. This is because the Fourth International considers the liberation of humanity to be a total process, and one based upon the self-activity of the masses. Without bringing the oppressed millions into the struggle, there will be no socialist revolution, and indeed, the imperialists recognize this in their use of the ideological backwardness on these questions to divide the working people.

AGAINST POPULAR FRONTS - FOR WORKERS' UNITED FRONT. The basis for unity of all the oppressed. By popular fronts, we essentially mean blocs which seek to 'unite' antagonistic class forces. Historically this has always meant a line of subordinating the working class to the bourgeoisie under the guise of 'national unity'. To the popular front, we counterpose the workers united front, by which we mean the unity of all workers' organizations around an action program to meet the immediate needs of the class struggle. This in turn acts as the leadership and nucleus of the unity of all the oppressed.

FOR THE REVOLUTIONARY ROAD TO POWER - AGAINST THE ILLUSIONS OF THE PEACEFUL ROAD. For the Fourth International the option of the revolutionary road is not that of preference but of scientific analysis. It is a lesson of history that the ruling classes do not give up without struggle, with the use of the state machinery, the army, etc. The apostles of the peaceful road leave the working class disarmed and at the mercy of the exploiter and reinforce what is a basic pillar of bourgeois power; its monopoly of violence, as Chile so tragically demonstrated.

AGAINST REFORMISM - FOR THE METHOD OF TRANSITIONAL DEMANDS. The Fourth International supports all struggles for demands which assist the working people but holds that a struggle for reforms alone is insufficient and self-defeating. To purely reformist demands (i. e. demands entirely within the framework of capitalism) we counterpose a series of demands which, while taking the working class forward, develops and deepens its consciousness. Our method of the transitional program flows from our understanding that revolution is not merely overthrowing the oppressor, it is also a process of transforming (by developing their political consciousness) the oppressed.

DEFENSE OF THE WORKERS' STATES. Despite our criticisms of the leaderships of the so-called communist countries, the Fourth International stands for their unconditional defense against imperialism. We call these states 'deformed' or 'degenerated' workers' states. Workers' states because despite their lack of democracy, the property relations they defend are of a socialist nature; deformed because they lack popular organs of workers' power and are ruled by bureaucratic elites. This principled position has nothing to do with the Maoist theory of the 'socialist imperialist' nature of the Soviet Union. This theory confuses the undoubtedly treacherous policies of the leadership of the Soviet Union with the state that they lead. If applied to trade unions, they should be against trade unions because they have an opportunist leadership! Despite their leaderships, destruction of the trade unions would be a crushing blow against the

working class; so the destruction of the Soviet Union be a crushing blow to the interest of world revolution.

FOR NATIONAL LIBERATION, FOR THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION. The Fourth International completely supports the struggle for national liberation and is against all forms of neo-colonialist exploitation. We strive in all countries to build solidarity in support of such struggles. However, we do not see this as an end of the process, but more as a part (a key part) of the process of total liberation. We believe that every national liberation struggle should combine its anti-colonial tasks with a struggle for socialist revolution.

* * * *

REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST ORGANIZING COMMITTEE (RMOC)

March 12, 1976

P. O. Box 27783, Los Angeles, Calif. 90027