

**THE  
INDOCHINESE  
REVOLUTION  
&  
THE FOURTH  
INTERNATIONAL**



*THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL HAS – EVER SINCE THE START OF THE THIRD INDOCHINESE WAR – BEEN IN THE FOREFRONT OF THE SOLIDARITY MOVEMENT WITH THE VIETNAMESE REVOLUTION THROUGHOUT THE WORLD, AND, IN PARTICULAR, IN NORTH AMERICA AND WESTERN EUROPE AND JAPAN.*

*WE ARE REPRINTING THE MAJOR DECLARATIONS OF THE LEADING BODIES OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL IN RECENT MONTHS ON THE INDOCHINESE REVOLUTION FOR THE INFORMATION AND BENEFIT OF THE NEW MILITANTS WHO HAVE ONCE AGAIN STARTED MARCHING ON THE STREETS IN SOLIDARITY WITH THE INDOCHINESE REVOLUTIONARIES UNDER THE SLOGAN: SOLIDARITY UNTIL FINAL VICTORY.*

*IMG SECRETARIAT,  
10 FEBRUARY, 1973.*

SOCIALIST  
STUDENT

# On the Betrayal of the Vietnamese at the Moscow Summit Meeting

*[The following statement was issued by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International on May 31, 1972.]*

\* \* \*

The attitude assumed by the Kremlin in face of the May escalation of the U.S. imperialist aggression in Vietnam constitutes one of the most brazen and treacherous betrayals of the world revolution in the entire history of Stalinism. The depth of this betrayal must be grasped by the international revolutionary vanguard and all the friends and supporters of the Vietnamese revolution.

Having proved incapable of throwing back the Vietnamese in their heroic advances on the battlefields of South Vietnam, having been forced to withdraw the bulk of the U.S. ground troops because of the stiffening opposition to the war among the American people, having been unable to maintain the pretense of "Vietnamization" of the war because of the spreading disintegration of the armies of the Saigon puppet regime, Nixon decided in cold blood to escalate the war to a qualitatively higher intensity in order to force the Vietnamese people to bow to an unfavorable compromise despite their resounding military victories. On May 8 Nixon announced that he had ordered all the harbors of North Vietnam to be mined and all transportation lines to be bombed up to the border of China.

In the history of imperialist butchery, the destructive power unleashed on the Democratic Republic of Vietnam since May 8 is of unheard-of proportions. The bomb load released by four squadrons of B-52 bombers is equivalent in destructive blast to a Hiroshima-type atomic bomb. The number of bomb craters in Vietnam was recently estimated at 26,000,000. The cratering of the land destroys it for agricultural production. This loss is on top of the loss of vast areas subjected to defoliation and to crop-destroying chemicals.

Imperialism will not stop at anything in its efforts to drive home its message to the people of Vietnam and of the world: better to destroy a country than to see it break out of the "free world" of capitalist exploitation.

While these colossal crimes were being committed, subjecting one of the most courageous peoples in the world to genocide, the Kremlin chieftains clinked champagne glasses with war criminal Nixon, as if they were toasting his deeds in Vietnam. They pictured their summit conference with Nixon as a "great success," a big step toward "world peace," while Nixon, with the callousness of a professional executioner, continued the most ferocious and barbarous acts of aggression and violence ever to be vented on the workers and peasants of a small country.

The Democratic Republic of Vietnam is part of the so-called socialist camp, whose security and inviolability the masters of the Kremlin have so many times guaranteed in the most solemn terms. Claiming the existence of an imperialist threat against the Czechoslovak workers state (which they never bothered to try to prove), they sent 200,000 troops into that country in August 1968. Their real reason for the invasion, of course, was to suppress the efforts that had been begun there to replace Stalinist police rule with socialist democracy, a change that would have strengthened—not weakened—the Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia against any threat of capitalist restoration.

But in face of the unprecedented mass of napalm, antipersonnel bombs, and patterned bombing nearing the nuclear level that are being applied day after day on the cities and towns of North Vietnam, the masters of the Kremlin limited themselves to a few routine press releases—to be used by pro-Moscow Communist parties for face-saving needs—while they publicly toasted the imperialist aggressors!

It must be brought to the attention of the workers and peasants of the

world that Nixon is able to use obsolete B-52 bombers only because the Soviet bureaucrats refuse to arm the Democratic Republic of Vietnam with the modern fighter planes that could wipe the B-52s out of the sky. Yet they have sold such fighter planes to several bourgeois governments in Asia, beginning with the Sadat regime in Egypt.

The same goes for various types of sophisticated weapons. The Soviet bureaucrats deny them to the Vietnamese people but freely distribute them to half a dozen bourgeois governments in various parts of the world.

Even the amount of ordinary weapons is kept down to a trickle by the Soviet bureaucrats. The deliveries made by all the governments of the "socialist camp" do not reach 10 percent of what they send annually to Egypt. The cost of the aid is under 1 percent of the total annual military expenditures made by the U.S. in Vietnam.

This provides an indication on a material level of the betrayal committed by the Stalinist bureaucrats against the Vietnamese revolution.

Brezhnev and his cohorts have even hidden from the Soviet people the fact—revealed by the Hanoi press—that Soviet seamen were killed by U.S. bombs in Haiphong even while Nixon, who ordered the bombing, was being wined and dined in Moscow.

Apologists of the Stalinist bureaucracy argue that the Kremlin had to act this way in order to avoid a dangerous escalation of tension and a confrontation between the U.S. and the Soviet Union that could lead to World War III. This argument is completely mendacious.

History has shown again and again that to concede to an aggressor does not lead to easing the situation in the long run; instead, it encourages the aggressor to engage in escalation. In the United States today the mood is such that the vast majority of the American people would never back the White House in gambling on a nuclear showdown. The American people are sick and tired of the war in Indochina. They would never agree to risk a global conflict for the sake of maintaining a military toehold in Indochina.

By standing firmly and telling Nixon that his new escalation of the war constituted an attack against the entire socialist camp and that persistence

in that attack would result in the Vietnamese army, navy, and air force being supplied with all the means necessary to turn it back, the Soviet leaders could have stopped Nixon in his tracks. By refusing to take any concrete steps to halt the aggressor, the Kremlin leaders fall into the position of accomplices in the crimes of imperialism against an allied workers state. They thereby lay the base for a still more explosive situation.

Once again the fatal logic of the policy of "peaceful coexistence," of "socialism in one country" stands out in the clearest way. In order to save the international status quo from unsettlement by a victorious revolution, the Kremlin bureaucrats cynically acquiesce in the massive bombing and genocidal destruction of North Vietnam. At bottom they consider that they are acting in their own self-interest, for a successful revolution in Vietnam could encourage the growing political opposition inside the Soviet Union and perhaps help detonate a revolutionary process that would sweep them from power and restore the socialist democracy that Lenin and Trotsky stood for.

As for the Maoist bureaucracy, it is unable to do more than issue feeble press releases protesting the bombing of North Vietnam. Having themselves accorded Nixon a royal reception last February, they cannot even take factional advantage of the betrayal committed by the Moscow revisionists. The truth is that by engaging in a "cordial" summit meeting with Nixon they helped make it easier for the Kremlin to abandon all restraint in groveling before the commander in chief of the U. S. war machine.

The complicity of the Chinese and Russian regimes in the Pentagon's crimes in Vietnam can arouse a sharp reaction among the masses of the Soviet Union and China. That would change many things. However, in face of the tight police control over the communications media it is not easy to spread the truth in either land.


Among the rank and file in the Communist parties in the capitalist countries the situation is different. They are not sealed off from the facts or from the influence of the vanguard that has been staging international demonstrations for withdrawal of the U. S. armed forces and free exercise by the Vietnamese people of the right of self-determination.

The Vietnamese are continuing their struggle with unparalleled courage and determination, and are still scoring successes on the battlefields. With the help of the laboring masses in other countries, they can still win their revolution despite all the fury of the imperialist beast.

The Fourth International calls upon all its members and sympathizers, upon all communists and socialists throughout the world, to devote the

utmost energy to helping to organize massive protest demonstrations against the imperialist aggression in Vietnam.

Bring the strongest possible pressure to bear on the Communist parties by spreading the truth about the latest Stalinist betrayals. Help pillory the Moscow and Peking regimes! Compel them to provide adequate material support to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and to the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam!



## No Truce in Support for the Vietnamese Revolution!

*[The following resolution was passed at a meeting of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International held 21st January, 1973.]*

\* \* \*

Once more it is reported that a cease-fire agreement is imminent in Vietnam. So we must stress again the vital role that the international movement in defense of the Vietnamese revolution is called upon to play, regardless of the results of the current negotiations. Every analysis of the present situation, all information available, points to the conclusion that the Vietnamese revolution will not come to a halt, no matter what the outcome of the cease-fire negotiations. There will be no truce in the struggle of the masses of Vietnamese workers and poor peasants for their national and social liberation.

The savage attacks perpetrated by the American air force in late December 1972 on the Hanoi and Haiphong regions, the unprecedented bombings of the liberated areas of South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, which are still continuing as of this writing, confirm the determination of the American imperialists to utilize all the means of terror at their disposal to prevent the collapse of the puppet regimes installed in Saigon, Pnompenh, and Vientiane. Considerable amounts of

arms and ammunition are still being sent to these puppets. Thousands of Thieu's U.S. "advisers" remain in South Vietnam. And even if the American troops are really withdrawn, powerful imperialist air and naval forces will remain on the alert in Thailand and off the Vietnamese coasts.

Moreover, maintaining the dictatorial Thieu regime in Saigon in the face of the combativity of the Vietnamese masses means that the revolutionary struggle will continue after the cease-fire agreement is signed, even if the general military confrontation between the two class camps halts for a time.

The hard-fought negotiations that took place between October 1972 and January 1973 were centered precisely on marking out the ground for these future revolutionary struggles in South Vietnam, with each camp seeking to gain the best possible position for waging its fight. This is why the negotiations dealt with questions such as the real nature of the demilitarized zone, the size and role of the international control commission, and similar issues. Any concessions that imperialism may have extracted from the Vietnamese fighters in this regard, as the result of inadequate international support for the Vietnamese revolution in the face

of large-scale aggression by U.S. imperialism, in no way undermine the capacity of the revolution to maintain its momentum in South Vietnam.

The puppet Thieu understands this very well. He is hastily setting up a system of semifascist repression, threatening to fire on every crowd of demonstrators, to murder every Communist, and to prevent any return of refugees to liberated villages. At the same time he is holding out the threat of slaughtering the hundreds of thousands of political prisoners in his hands.

The popular masses, for their part, are getting ready to take advantage of any military truce to resume their struggle to free the political prisoners, win democratic liberties, defend their material interests in the cities and countryside, bring about the disintegration of the army and regime of the puppet Thieu, and create and reinforce mass-based organs of power.

In these conditions, the signing of a cease-fire agreement will not mean a halt to the revolution in South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, or to the counterrevolutionary intervention by imperialism. These two processes will continue in temporarily modified forms, with the possibility of a new direct military intervention by U.S. imperialism remaining suspended like the sword of Damocles over the heads of the workers and poor peasants of Indochina.

In these conditions also, the masses of Indochina, confronted with the violence and the maneuvers of imperialism and the native exploiters, will have a still greater need for the active support of the international working class after the signing of the cease-fire agreement, just as they needed this help during the recent weeks of terror bombing by the U. S. Air Force.

The counterrevolutionary role of the bureaucrats of Moscow and Peking, who did not raise a finger to respond to Nixon's bombing of North Vietnam and who continue to refuse to supply the North Vietnamese workers' state with the more modern kinds of defensive weapons made available to bourgeois governments such as those in Egypt, Pakistan, India, or Bangladesh, cannot be condemned strongly enough. By arranging Nixon's visits to Moscow and Peking in 1972, these bureaucrats helped him to weaken the American antiwar movement in the crucial months of the past year. During the cease-fire negotiations they brought the maximum pressure on Hanoi to get the Vietnamese fighters to make concessions to imperialism. They put the crowning touch on this betrayal of the elementary interests of the workers of Vietnam and the entire world by remaining totally passive when Nixon unleashed against Hanoi and Haiphong the largest-scale and most barbarous acts of aggression that humanity has seen since the end of the second world war. The whole counterrevolutionary logic of their "peaceful coexistence" strategy has thus been starkly revealed.

But, for their part, the working masses of the world, after being deceived by the secret diplomatic maneuvers of Washington, Moscow, and Peking, were awakened by the shock and indignation aroused by Nixon's barbaric bombings. They have responded on an ever larger scale since December 1972. Leading up to the actions of January 20, 1973, the international demonstrations against the imperialist war of aggression have constantly broadened. In many countries, these

demonstrations reached new heights. What is more, in Australia, Italy, and Denmark, sectors of the organized workers' movement started, or issued appeals for starting, direct industrial action against the war, thereby pointing out the path for the most effective response to the imperialist barbarism.

It is the duty of the international working class to continue to extend this movement of solidarity, no matter what the outcome of the negotiations and the cease-fire agreement, until the complete and final victory of the Vietnamese revolution. There can be no halt, truce, or "cease-fire" in our solidarity with the Vietnamese revolution—this is the fundamental truth that we must constantly reiterate to the working masses of the five continents as this turn is taking place in Indochina.

The Fourth International issues a solemn appeal to all activists, to all anti-imperialist and anticapitalist organizations throughout the world. For more than two decades the Indochinese masses have fought with a heroism unparalleled and an energy and endurance unique in the history of this century for the cause of their emancipation and for socialism. They have fought for us all. The least that we can do in return for the great service they have done for the world revolution is to continue unceasingly our actions in solidarity with their revolution, which is also unrelenting.

The Fourth International calls on all working-class organizations to make defending the Vietnamese revolution against the terror of Washington and Thieu, whose blows continue and may escalate further, into the cause of millions and millions of workers in all countries.

It calls on all Communists, on all socialists, not to let themselves be duped by the diplomatic maneuvers of imperialism and by the cover that the bureaucratic betrayers in Moscow and Peking are continuing to provide for these maneuvers.

Our duty is clear. We must maintain, broaden, extend, and unify nationally and internationally the movement of active and militant solidarity with the heroic fighters and the peoples of Indochina until the final and complete victory of the Indochinese revolution. □



# The Vietnamese Revolution, Cease-fire Perspectives, and Tasks of International Revolutionary Movement

*[The following resolution was passed at a recent plenum of the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International.]*

\* \* \*

1. The opening of negotiations between the United States and the Vietnamese, and their subsequent evolution, can be correctly understood only in the complex framework of the existing balance of forces between the revolutionary and counterrevolutionary forces, both on a world scale and in Indochina itself.

The basic weakness of the Indochinese revolution lies in its relative international isolation. The main cause of this isolation is the conservative policy of peaceful coexistence followed by the Moscow and Peking bureaucracies and by the Communist parties they control on a world scale. This policy has enabled American imperialism to carry out a systematic escalation of its murderous attacks on the revolutionary forces in South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam without an adequate response in the least way from the bureaucracies in power in Moscow and Peking. What aid they have given the Vietnamese fighters has been doled out drop by drop and has at the same time increasingly been used as a means of putting political pressure on these fighters to "moderate" their struggle.

The relative isolation of the Vietnamese revolution, which was partially ameliorated only by the growth of the worldwide mass movement of struggle against the war of imperialist aggression, worsened after the announcement of Nixon's trips to Peking and Moscow. Nixon succeeded in demobilizing a significant part of the antiwar movement in the United States, enabling him to launch a new military escalation in Indochina. Under these conditions the Vietnamese revolution cannot win victory over imperialism on a purely military level. Hence the attempt to reach a negotiated solution in order to end imperialism's military intervention in Indochina.

The basic power of the Indochinese revolution lies in the unprecedented breadth and vigor of the revolutionary process initiated and developed in Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. Because of this, the imperialist intervention has experienced a series of strategic setbacks. First there was the failure of "special war," then of "local war," and today the props of the "Vietnamization" policy have been undermined.

The victories scored by the revolutionary forces in Cambodia (after Lon Nol's coup d'etat) and in Laos (after the battle of Bass Loo in February 1971) prevented the crushing of resistance in South Vietnam. The offensive unleashed in South Vietnam eight months ago destroyed the "pacification" program in the countryside and generally altered the relationship of forces in favor of the popular

revolutionary forces. The agrarian revolution and the formation of organs of revolutionary power have moved forward in vast rural areas of South Vietnam. The air attacks on the North and on the liberated zones of the three countries of Indochina did not succeed in breaking popular resistance or in preventing the revolutionary armed forces from continuing their offensive.

In this context, the Vietnamese Communist party's attempt to win through negotiations a withdrawal of imperialist troops from Vietnam does not necessarily imply a step backward for the Vietnamese revolution. The immediate prospects for the Vietnamese revolution can be laid out and the tasks of revolutionary Marxists in relation to it can be defined only through a correct analysis of the military, political, social, economic, and psychological effects that the possible cease-fire accords may have on the various South Vietnamese social classes and their major political expressions.

2. In any event, withdrawal of the U.S. armed forces from Vietnam and cessation of the bombing of both the North and South would constitute a shift in the relationship of forces in favor of the Vietnamese revolution. This would reflect imperialism's inability to break the heroic resistance of the Vietnamese masses as well as its retreat before the strength of antiwar sentiment in the United States itself.

But in itself such a retreat does not guarantee the victory of the permanent revolution in South Vietnam. It only means that the revolutionary process will be able to develop with a reduced, but not eliminated, foreign interference. U.S. aid to the counterrevolutionary forces in South Vietnam will continue. The American fleet will remain in Indochinese waters, threatening the masses of these countries with a resumption of bombing should the revolution make fresh advances. The retention of U.S. bases in Thailand entails an analogous threat. Moscow and Peking's pressure on the Vietnamese CP will scarcely cease. The continuous rearming of the puppet army, the transformation of U.S. troops into "civilian advisers," the continuing financial and economic aid to the Thieu regime, the increase in Saigon's police terror, the sending of forces from an international control commission, which, inasmuch as it is composed of bourgeois armies will intervene in favor of the counterrevolutionary forces—all these factors show that U.S. imperialism will seize every opportunity offered it by the continuation of dual power after the possible signing of accords of the type proposed in October 1972.

Under these conditions, everything will depend on the development of revolutionary mass struggles both in the cities and in the countryside, on the policy followed by the Vietnamese CP, and on the interrelation of these two

factors and their impact on whatever counterrevolutionary military apparatuses Thieu's puppets will command.

3. The current situation in South Vietnam is one of dual power from top to bottom. On a countrywide level and on a provincial level, in countless villages and in various cities the workers and peasants' governmental structures and armed forces stand opposed to the governmental structures and armed forces of the counterrevolution, the big landlords and the comprador bourgeoisie, the puppets of imperialism. Some important regions have been completely liberated and are administered by revolutionary organs of power. But this dual power has yet to be extended to the country's principal cities. The success or failure of the revolutionary struggle of the masses in extending the formation of organs of revolutionary power and in destroying the bourgeois state apparatus—a struggle to be waged after the possible signing of a cease-fire agreement—will determine the outcome of the revolutionary process in Indochina.

It is in this context that the question of a "national coalition" government or structure must be approached. We must clearly explain that there is no possibility, in Vietnam or elsewhere, of "national concord" between the exploiting and exploited classes. The Fourth International remains opposed to coalition governments with the bourgeoisie, whatever the specific composition of these governments. Even when the bourgeois ministers are hostages of an already proletarian state power, their presence does not facilitate the consolidation of the revolutionary seizure of power and can only disorient the proletariat's class consciousness.

But this principled opposition to any coalition government with the bourgeoisie does not entitle us automatically to define all cases of such governments as popular-front regimes stabilizing and defending the economic rule and the state of the possessing classes. History offers us the example of France and Spain in 1936, France, Italy, Greece, Indonesia, and elsewhere at the end of the second world war, where this was the case. But it was not the case in Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and China, where the presence of bourgeois ministers in the central government did not prevent the socialist transformation of the revolutionary process from occurring. The decisive thing is the nature of the state, that is, the class character of those who control the armed forces. If the bourgeoisie is in reality disarmed, then the bourgeois ministers are hostages of the proletarian state (whether bureaucratically deformed or not). If the proletariat and poor peasantry are in reality disarmed, then the revolution has suffered defeat. If both the proletariat and the bourgeoisie retain their arms, then the "government" or structure of "national coalition" can only be an expression of dual power; that is, it represents but a momentary hiatus in an ongoing civil war that can be ended only by the victory of one or the other existing camp of class antagonists.

4. The revolutionary offensive of the South Vietnamese laboring masses will develop along already discernible lines that make any interruption in the political struggle less than likely:

(a) In the countryside, the deepening of the agrarian revolution—which in many areas has already reached the stage of forming cooperatives—and its extension to other regions, that is, its generalization throughout South

Vietnam; elimination of the landed proprietors, usurers, big traders, and the gangster-watchdogs of the Thieu regime, and implacable opposition to their returning to villages from which they have already been driven.

(b) In the cities, the struggle against the high cost of living, speculation, gambling, hoarding of vital goods and basic necessities, exploitation of the masses by the industrial, financial, and big commercial bourgeoisie.

(c) In the cities and the countryside, immediate struggle for the release of the 200,000 political prisoners, for political rights, and for complete freedom of action for all organizations illegalized by the Thieu regime.

(d) In both the cities and the countryside, dissolution of the puppet military and administrative apparatuses through the combined effects of the processes just described.

All indications are that the cadres of the NLF and the Vietnamese CP are systematically preparing the South Vietnamese population for this mass political struggle. The U.S. withdrawal, like the perspective of reunification with the North and the acceptance of the principle of free elections with the participation of all political parties today consigned to clandestinity, will inevitably stimulate mass struggles and will further tilt the balance of forces in favor of the revolution.

5. The Vietnamese Communist party and the NLF leadership enjoy such prestige and authority among the South Vietnamese laboring masses that their orientation will significantly affect the pace and breadth of the mass mobilizations. To evaluate all the actions of this leadership it would be necessary to know in detail the situation in South Vietnam, which for us is impossible at present. We can only make some general observations.

First of all, a capitulation of the CP leadership, which would entail the dissolution of the revolution's independent armed forces, seems very unlikely in light of what happened both to the cadres and to the South Vietnamese masses after the Geneva accords. Further, if the Stalinist training of the Vietnamese CP leaders implies the possibility of opportunist maneuvers—which are reflected in the written public program of the NLF—the balance of the last fifteen years clearly demonstrates this party's tenacious commitment to the overthrow of the bourgeois state in South Vietnam. Finally, the relationship between the CP and the South Vietnamese mass movement is not simply a function of the CP's political authority, but also of the unusual pressure of the revolutionary masses on a party which in its practical orientation has broken with Stalinism's classical Menshevik line in the colonial and semi-colonial countries and which is independent of the Moscow and Peking bureaucracies.

6. All opportunities for independent intervention in this process by revolutionary Marxists must be utilized to the fullest extent possible, with the principle aim of deepening the permanent revolution in South Vietnam and of helping it attain final victory. On the scene, this will involve action to strengthen the independent proletarian organizations in Saigon, in which our movement has a real tradition.

It is especially important to stress the role that devolves on us on an international scale, not only today, when imperialism's barbaric war is in full swing, but tomorrow as well, in the event a cease-fire agreement is signed. The

revolution will go on after the signing. International solidarity with this revolution will remain more than ever a vital necessity, the more so as the Communist parties around the world sink further into immobility, if not into open abandonment of the defense of the Vietnamese masses' fight to complete their revolution. Our responsibility in developing mass actions to support the Indochinese revolution will thus increase, and we will have to fight against any attempt to demobilize active international solidarity.

The main lines of our activity are clear: extension of the support actions now being waged by our sections, especially against any imperialist intervention continuing after the signing of the possible cease-fire accords (for the complete withdrawal of the U.S. fleet and of U.S. "civilian advisers," for the elimination of the air-naval bases in Thailand, against the sending of "international control forces" composed of bourgeois armies); the development of increased propaganda against the "peaceful coexistence" policies of the Soviet and Chinese bureaucracies, which substantially contributed to the deterioration of the international relationship of forces in which the Indochinese revolution is unfolding.

In case a cease-fire agreement is signed, our movement must explain that there must be no letup in support for

the Indochinese revolution. It is around the line of complete support for the Indochinese revolution until total victory—a line carried out through concrete slogans in each country in accordance with the concrete situation of the mass movement—that we must mobilize militants and continue our mass work of support to the Indochinese revolution.

Today an international campaign must be prepared demanding the immediate release of South Vietnamese political prisoners and against the terror unleashed by the Thieu regime—terror for which U.S. imperialism bears full responsibility. From now on, the American government's responsibility for any massacre of these prisoners must be sharply stressed. This campaign must be carried out in the most united fashion possible.

The development of the situation in Laos and Cambodia must be closely followed. It will also most probably necessitate many solidarity actions.

7. The importance of the questions raised by the future of the Indochinese revolution necessitate a continuing discussion in the framework of preparation for the tenth world congress (fourth since reunification) of the Fourth International.

December 6, 1972



## SUBSCRIBE!

I enclose £1.50/£3.00 for 6/12 months.

**RED MOLE**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Money Orders to *Red Mole*, 182 Pentonville Road, London N.1.

FOREIGN SUBS: Asia/Africa/Australia/N. & S. America: £6 per year (airmail); £4 per year (ordinary). Western Europe: £4 per year.