

Behind the Wave of Bombings In the U.S.



Maoism:

Chingkang Foothills
of Canada

Ceylon:

What Port Workers
Strike Achieved

H. RAP BROWN: Target of political assassins? See p. 243.

The Oxford Women's Liberation Conference

'It's Unmistakable'

"The fastest-growing cause of death among New Yorkers is pulmonary emphysema, a mortality rate that has risen 500 per cent in the last 10 years," the *New York Times* reported March 12. The findings were made public by the New York Tuberculosis and Health Association. The reason is air pollution. New York ranks among the world's top three in this, the others being Tokyo and London.

"On the autopsy table it's unmistakable," a city medical examiner told the *Times*. "The person who spent his life in the Adirondacks has nice pink lungs. The city dweller's are black as coal."

It's not cigarettes. "The Public Health Service reports, for instance, that deaths from lung cancer occur in large metropolitan areas at twice the rural rate, even when allowance is made for differences in smoking habits."

There is no "air pollution disease" as such, but pollution causes or contributes to a number of potentially fatal conditions. As the *Times* put it, there is "overwhelming statistical evidence that air pollution sickens and kills . . ."

Dr. Robert Horton, chief of the Health Effects Research Program, run by the U. S. government, told the *New Yorker* magazine in an interview a year ago:

"The methods we have for detecting excess deaths are so crude that there has to be a pretty big excess for us to realize that it's there at all. What we do know is that people get killed by air pollution, and I don't see any excuse for there being enough air pollution to kill people. Do you?"

No we don't. But it is evident that the people who pay Dr. Horton's salary do. Like Johnson and those before him, Nixon puts profits ahead of lives. Even the derisory penalties for industrial pollution are not enforced. The same issue of the *Times* that reported the findings about emphysema also carried an account about a three-month investigation that "indicated that businessmen bribed air-pollution inspectors to overlook violations and falsely report, at times, that violations have been corrected."

In This Issue

		FEATURES
	242	On the Autopsy Table
		U. S. A.
Les Evans	243	Behind the Wave of Bombings
		MEXICO
Ricardo Ochoa	245	Why the Editor of "Por Que?" Was Put Behind Bars
		BOLIVIA
	247	Political Prisoners Deny Asking for Amnesty
	257	Peredo Analyzes Regimes in Bolivia, Chile, Peru
		JORDAN
Abou Saadoun	248	The Fedayeen Force King Hussein to Back Down
		TANZANIA
	249	Plight of Political Prisoners
		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC
	250	PRD Votes to Abstain in May Elections
		AUSTRALIA
	250	Burchett Makes It Home
		IRAQ
Gerry Foley	251	Settlement with Kurds Announced
		NEW ZEALAND
Harry North	252	Rising Militancy Among Unionists
		ISRAEL
	254	Israelis "Detain" Arabs Beyond Sentences
		CEYLON
P. Bala Tampoe	255	What the Port Workers' Strike Achieved
		GREAT BRITAIN
Antonia Gorton	258	The Oxford Women's Liberation Conference
		CANADA
Keith Locke	262	The "Canadian Communist Movement (M-L)"
		BOOKS
	253	Discuss Livio Maitan's Book on Cultural Revolution
		DOCUMENTS
	259	On Tactics in Europe [Statement of the Fourth International]
		DRAWINGS
Copain	241	H. Rap Brown; 248, King Hussein; 251, Mustafa al-Barzani; 252, Norman Kirk; 252, Keith J. Holyoake.

Intercontinental Press, Post Office Box 635, Madison Square Station, New York, N. Y. 10010

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, Ernest Mandel, George Novack.
MANAGING EDITOR: Les Evans.
TRANSLATIONS: Gerry Foley, George Saunders.
BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.

Published in New York each Monday except last in December and first in January; biweekly in July; not published in August.

Intercontinental Press specializes in political analysis and interpretation of events of particular interest to the labor, socialist, colonial independence, and black liberation movements.

Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of Intercontinental Press. Insofar as it reflects editorial opinion,

unsigned material expresses the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism.

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 95 rue du Faubourg Saint-Martin, Paris 10, France.

TO SUBSCRIBE: For one year send \$15 to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N. Y. 10010. Write for rates on first class and airmail. Special rates available for subscriptions to colonial and semicolonial countries.

Subscription correspondence should be addressed to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York 10010. Because of the continuing deterioration of the U. S. postal system, please allow five weeks for change of address. Include your old address as well as your new address, and, if possible, an address label from a recent issue.

Copyright © 1970 by Intercontinental Press.

Behind the Wave of Bombings in the U.S.

By Les Evans

On March 6 three persons, including a radical student leader, died in an explosion in a New York City town house. Three days later two Black activists were killed when their car blew up on a highway near Bel Air, Maryland. On March 13 explosions shook three skyscrapers in midtown Manhattan; a letter signed "Revolutionary Force 9" claimed the credit, but no one on the left had ever heard of this "group." Hundreds of anonymous bomb threats, many from obvious cranks and crackpots, sent bomb-squad detectives into New York office buildings March 13; many offices were temporarily evacuated.

The police were quick to attribute all of these events to "left-wing militants." The communications media and government officials opened all stops. The *New York Times*, for example, declared in a March 13 editorial: "The mad criminals who threaten and bomb must be recognized for what they are and prosecuted with the full force not only of the law but of the community they would rule and ruin."

Though the *Times* conceded that the explosions might be the work of "Old Right radical reactionaries," it devoted its main attack to the left: "The actual and threatened bombings of the past few days must not be glossed over as the actions of idealistic if misguided revolutionaries; they are the criminal acts of potential murderers."

The *Times*, of course, did not include in its outburst the "mad criminals" who dump bombs by the ton every day on the people of Vietnam and Laos. Nor did it engage in such language when Chicago police on December 4 shot to death Black Panther party leader Fred Hampton while asleep in bed, bringing to twenty-eight the number of Panther members who have died at the hands of the police in the last two years.

For all the talk about the "climate of violence" in America, the source of the violence and its real perpetrators—on a mammoth scale—are ignored.

As resistance to American domination abroad has grown, Wall Street

and its political representatives in Washington have escalated the use of violence to heights comparable to World War II, although concentrating this violence on small areas. Since 1965, when the daily bombing of North Vietnam was initiated and the dispatch of half a million U. S. troops to South Vietnam was begun, the spectacle of mass murder as a "routine" and "acceptable" feature of imperialist policy has sunk into the consciousness of a whole generation of youth around the world, including in the United States.

Who can forget the face of Private Paul David Meadlo as he told a television reporter last November how the women and children of Songmy begged to be spared? "And the mothers was hugging their children and, but they kept right on firing. Well, we kept right on firing. They was waving their arms and begging . . ."

What happened to the investigation of Songmy? Have the men who declared that village, along with much of Vietnam, a "free fire zone" been indicted? What effect has the whitewash of U. S. massacres in Vietnam had on sensitive American youths? Has it deepened their feelings of shock and outrage at what "their country" is doing?

The escalation of violence by the Pentagon abroad and the police at home has generated resistance, exemplified in the growing student radicalization, in the mass mobilizations against the Vietnam war, in the struggles of the Black, Puerto Rican, and Chicano peoples for human dignity and self-determination.

In using repression against these movements, the government has violated its own constitutional guarantees to free speech and association, the most recent example being the Chicago "conspiracy" trial which ended February 20. In ordering five-year prison sentences for public speeches made by the defendants—not to mention the long prison terms he handed out for "contempt" before the jury even reached a verdict—Judge Julius

J. Hoffman helped convince thousands of young people that the American judicial system is a farce, devoted to the punishment and suppression of dissent. The vindictiveness of the Chicago proceedings provoked a wave of anger that has yet to be fully measured in the United States.

It is hardly surprising that in confronting such a powerful, ruthless, and inhuman opponent, individuals succumb to frustration and seek shortcuts to ending the intolerable tension.

Undoubtedly there are some who believe that by resorting on a small scale to the violence that is the stock-in-trade of the ruling class, inspiration can be given to broader circles to follow their example.

Marxists have long contended that this is unrealistic. The key problem is to win the masses to the idea of changing the structure of society, to building a socialist society which eliminates the economic and social roots of oppression and violence. Terrorism committed by individuals or small groups does not achieve this. Instead, the police easily turn it to account in bolstering reaction. That is why the police are notorious for instigating terroristic acts through agents provocateurs.

* * *

If there are any surprises in the current events, it is that so few people have deserted the antiwar movement and other mass struggles to try their hand at individual terror. In czarist Russia the Narodniks were a powerful force on the left and it took the Marxists led by Lenin and Plekhanov long years to win leadership away from the terrorists. The Spanish anarchists represented a similar strong force for decades.

In the United States, on the other hand, there is no known leftist terrorist organization at all. It is possible that all or most of the explosions that have taken place are the direct work of right-wing groups, agents provocateurs, or the police.

The most sensational case was the

explosion in a New York town house March 6 that left at least three persons dead. The police claim to have found a large quantity of dynamite in a basement workshop, which, they speculate, was being used as a "bomb factory."

The only body that has been identified was that of Ted Gold, twenty-three, a leader of the Weatherman faction of the Students for a Democratic Society [SDS]. Gold was active in the Columbia University student strike in 1968, and visited Cuba in 1969.

Liberation News Service, the widely circulated "underground" radical press service, made the following critical observations in a March 11 tribute to Ted Gold:

"By September [1969], Weatherman consisted of 'disciplined cadre,' including Ted Gold, committed to the idea of organizing a 'red army.' The Weatherman Chicago 'national action' of Oct. 8-11 involved 400 helmeted, stick-bearing 'soldiers' in this army, not the promised and hoped-for masses of people.

"In the weeks before Ted Gold's death, Weatherman had even put aside the idea of a 'red army' and was promoting the idea that a small number of people could successfully use violence and chaos to disrupt and destroy U. S. imperialism.

"As most movement people were reaching the conclusion that Weatherman's approach was politically wrong and tactically suicidal, the Weathermen abandoned the national office of SDS in Chicago and ceased publishing *Fire*, their biweekly organ. Most of the people in Weatherman disappeared from public view."

Even if the Weathermen did not intend to put their ultraleft prescriptions into actual practice, their stance left them wide open to right-wing or police provocation. And in fact, in virtually every "bombing" case of recent years that has reached the stage of arrests and trial, the chief instigator has been shown to be a planted agent of the police or the FBI.

Five persons currently facing trial in New York on charges of throwing a bomb into a National Guard truck last November include one George Demmerle, a paid FBI informer.

In 1965 in the famous case of the alleged conspiracy to blow up the Statue of Liberty, one of the key "conspirators" was Raymond A. Wood, an agent

of the New York police department.

New York's Assistant District Attorney Joseph A. Philips recently admitted that five police agents participated in an alleged plot to bomb department stores for which thirteen Black Panther members have been jailed for nearly a year awaiting trial.

* * *

The death of two Black civil-rights activists when their car exploded on a deserted highway near Bel Air, Maryland, March 9, occurred under even more sinister circumstances. The victims, Ralph Featherstone and William Payne, were both longtime leaders of the Student National Coordinating Committee [SNCC—formerly the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee], and close friends of its chairman H. Rap Brown.

They were in Bel Air to attend preliminary hearings in Brown's upcoming trial on frame-up charges (inciting to riot and arson), stemming from a ghetto rebellion in July 1967 in Cambridge, Maryland.

The police claim that Featherstone and Payne were carrying a bomb in their car and that it went off accidentally.

Wide sections of the Black community say the police and FBI are covering up an assassination by the Ku Klux Klan or similar racist group active in the area.

The main target of the assassins is believed to have been H. Rap Brown, who reportedly left New York to drive to Bel Air the day before the explosion. Brown has now disappeared, and there is speculation that he has been murdered, although it is possible that he is staying out of sight for fear of losing his life.

FBI director J. Edgar Hoover, who has been notoriously hostile to the civil-rights movement, released a telegram March 14 suggesting that the explosion in Featherstone's car was a time bomb detonated inside the car on the floor of the right front seat, where it could not have been "concealed from view."

The March 11 *Washington Post*, however, interviewed two men "assigned to military explosive units." This was their assessment:

"One said that the force of the explosion apparently was so great that it would be extremely difficult to de-

termine where the device had been located in the car. . . .

"The second expert said it might be assumed that the missing section of floorboard was an indication that the bomb had been placed beneath it. From the information given him, he said, there was no way to conclude whether the device was inside or outside the car."

Even the Maryland police admitted a "loophole" in their "evidence." This was the possibility that William Payne, who was seated on the passenger side, "could have groped under his seat for a dropped cigarette or other item and accidentally discovered a concealed bomb, detonating it in some way by pulling it forward onto the floorboard." (March 15 *New York Times*.)

The day after the death of Ralph Featherstone and William Payne, an unidentified white woman allegedly planted a bomb in the Cambridge, Maryland, courthouse where H. Rap Brown's trial was originally scheduled to take place. It blew out the side of the building. The police had no quick "explanations" of that bombing.

It is suspicious indeed that the majority of victims of recent bombings have been student radicals and Black liberation fighters. Here and there a few "genuine" leftist terrorists may be seeking, in isolation from the meaningful movements for social change, to strike a "blow" against American imperialism. But if they did not exist, America's rulers have shown their willingness to invent them as a foil for their own criminal violence, and as an excuse to attack the radical movement.

Tel Aviv Blacklists Israeli Leftists

Israel's ministry for foreign affairs has issued its foreign embassies "a blacklist of Leftist Israelis to be denied consular services granted to all Israeli citizens," according to the February 22 issue of the Tel Aviv daily *Haaretz*.

The report, translated by the London pacifist weekly *Peace News*, said the Israeli consulate in London "has recently refused to provide forms required for Israelis abroad who wish to authorise a barrister in Israel. . . . In a number of other cases difficulties were encountered in formal requests such as transfer of currency. Recently the Israeli embassy in Paris refused to renew the passport of the Israeli painter Nissan Rilov, who has been living a number of years in Paris and London. Mr Rilov flew to London where he encountered a similar refusal to extend the validity of his passport."

Why the Editor of 'Por Que?' Was Put Behind Bars

By Ricardo Ochoa

Mexico City

The sensationalist evening papers announced February 14 that "the police have discovered a group of terrorist bombers."

The political nature of this "plot" became evident when the photograph of Mario Menéndez Rodríguez, the editor of the opposition weekly *Por Qué?*, appeared at the head of a row of mug shots of six alleged bombers. The other five were Ignacio González Ramírez, professor of biology at the University of Mexico; Raymundo López Carpio, a government employee; Demóstenes Onofre Valdovimos, a school teacher; Ponciano Luna Peralta, a worker; and Gabriel Peralta Zea, a student at the University of Mexico.

Everything suggested that the accusations against Menéndez Rodríguez resulted from a political vendetta. The weekly magazine he edits is immensely popular not only in Mexico City but throughout the republic. Since 1968 *Por Qué?* has been a sharp critic of all the arbitrary acts, abuses, and crimes committed by the Diaz Ordaz regime.

It is famous for its reportage of the July 26 repression that touched off the 1968 student movement and of the October 2, 1968, massacre that halted it. Hundreds of thousands of copies of those issues were sold.

In reporting the October 2 massacre, Menéndez Rodríguez published a series of pictures of teen-agers mowed down by machine-gun fire at the Plaza de las Tres Culturas. These pictures reappeared on the front pages of hundreds of papers around the world.

Menéndez Rodríguez won international fame in the sphere of revolutionary journalism for his interview with Douglas Bravo late in 1966, in which the guerrilla leader denounced the opportunistic tactics of the Venezuelan CP. Menéndez published other famous interviews with Fidel Castro and Fabio Vázquez, a Colombian guerrilla who was a comrade-in-arms of Camilo Torres.

Because of such scoops, anti-Communist gutter papers like *El Sol* have

tried to sell the public the idea that Menéndez's arrest resulted in the discovery of "a whole important continental guerrilla network directed by the Tricontinental in Havana."

Menéndez Rodríguez has flatly denied all the accusations lodged against him. According to the February 16 issue of the Mexico City daily *Excélsior*, he said: "You can read everything I think in my magazine *Por Qué?*"

The five arrested with Menéndez appear to be the Mexican police's typical "conspiratorial group," that is, they met for the first time in jail. They are accused of having constituted a "Comité de Lucha Revolucionaria" [Revolutionary Struggle Committee], an organization alleged to have been responsible for the dynamitings last September in the *El Sol* and *El Herald* buildings and in the Ministry of the Interior, as well as for the bomb placed in the TV center, which did not explode.

The bombing of the headquarters of the PAN [Partido de Acción Nacional — National Action party, the bourgeois opposition party] on February 9 is also attributed to this group.

The indications are that the PAN bombing was the principal motivation for this new roundup. From their statements, it seems that Ignacio González Ramírez, López de Carpio, and Luna Peralta were arrested a week ago [around February 9]. Menéndez Rodríguez was taken away at gunpoint on February 12, according to the statement of Roger Menéndez in the February 13 issue of *El Día*, by men who later turned out to be police.

This latest "conspiratorial group" is also alleged to be linked with the guerrilla group of Genaro Vázquez Rojas in the state of Guerrero. And by leveling this accusation the government has shown that the Mexican chief of state security, Major Joel Juárez Guzmán, lied on October 8, 1969, when he announced that Vázquez Rojas had been killed in March 1968 while escaping from the Iguala jail. Juárez

Guzmán said that "too many ill-informed peasants and professional agitators have taken to hoping that he [Vázquez Rojas] would become a new Castro. It became necessary to put an end to their illusions."

As usual, the venal press of the Federal District is trying to whip up its readers against "red subversives." The police accounts, supposedly based on "declarations" of the defendants, are shot through with contradictions. In their statements before the chief criminal judge of the Federal District, Eduardo Ferrer McGregor, all of the prisoners have complained that they were tortured by the secret police of the Federal Prosecutor's Office.

According to the February 15 issue of *Excélsior*, Professor González Ramírez said: "They [the police] handcuffed and blindfolded me. In some place, I don't know where, I was beaten by eight men. Someone even threatened to kill me. I heard them refer to each other as the 'Boinas Rojas' [Red Berets]. I was also tortured with an electric apparatus applied to my lower abdomen."

The professor showed the reporters the bruises made by the "apparatus."

All but two of the prisoners denied having any connection with the crimes they were charged with. However, according to those papers that have proved generally reliable in such cases, González Ramírez and Luna Peralta admitted partial responsibility for the acts of which they were accused.

Even partial admission of guilt by any of the defendants in recent cases is an entirely new development. Before now, as far as I can remember, not a single political prisoner has admitted the least responsibility for any of the "crimes" the government used as a pretext for putting them out of circulation.

Not even in the period of the worst repression in 1968 did any of the political prisoners fail to repudiate the forced "confessions" as soon as they were brought before a court.

Professor González Ramírez told the court that he had played a part in

the bombing of the PAN building and in the attempted bombing of the television center. According to the February 15 issue of *Excelsior*, he said: "My objective was not to topple the government or install another system but to put pressure on the authorities, the industrialists, and the merchants to treat the poor people and the people in general in a more humane way."

According to the same source, the worker Ponciano Luna Peralta said: "Professor González Ramírez was the one who sent me [to bomb the PAN building]. I did not know anything about it and he never told me that the objective was to overthrow the government."

When a man of Professor González Ramírez's moral integrity and status—he is a prominent biologist and a member of a respected family of outstanding scientists—admits responsibility in terrorist acts, it represents a very important landmark in the history of the revolutionary vanguard in this country.

The fact that not all of the persons arrested in this "plot" case are entirely innocent, as has been the pattern in previous operations of this sort, indicates two things. First of all, it suggests that the police are organizing their repressive campaign more carefully, trying to find some persons really implicated in terrorist acts rather than just seeking scapegoats. A reason for this might be that the authorities need a credible pretext for extensive and systematic arrests.

Secondly, it is obvious that the police provocation is exacerbating the anxiety and desperation that exist in a large section of the revolutionary vanguard, inducing some of them into dangerous adventures.

The threat implied in this new situation was rather clearly indicated in one of the Mexico City papers which reported alleged testimony by Professor González Ramírez:

"The next day he [the professor] learned that during the night of the same date, or September 17 of last year, when the deponent and Ramón [an allegedly missing accomplice—R. O.] planted two bombs [at *El Sol* and *El Heraldo*], two persons unknown to him planted [another] two bombs—one in the offices of the paper *Excelsior* and another at the magazine *Por Qué?* He also learned that it seemed that a

third bomb had been planted in the Ministry of the Interior. This bomb, which was found unexploded, was apparently placed in a stocking hung from a palm tree in the garden. It was of primitive construction, completely unlike those made by Ramón and the deponent. He saw the pictures of these bombs in the papers. He insists that he does not know those responsible for the second two bombings but that it is possible that another group existed because Ramón and the deponent would never have planted a bomb at *Por Qué?* since they were friendly with the managing editor, that is, *Mario Menéndez Rodríguez*. The professor thought that independently of the deponent's committee other groups or cells existed with the objective of overthrowing the government of Mexico by revolutionary means and which were working independently without their members knowing each other."

And some policemen, or police-agent journalists, did not fail to bring out the implications. Thus, under the headline "Police on the Track of 130 Accomplices," the February 16 issue of the gutter sheet *Avance* said:

"Agents of the Policía Judicial Federal [Federal Judicial Police] in all the states of the Republic are seeking the rest of those implicated in the Comité de Lucha Revolucionaria, which was headed by Mario Menéndez Rodríguez and Professor González Ramírez."

According to the communiqué published in the daily papers that same Saturday [February 14]: "The capture of the seven [sic] resulted from the fact that Ramón Campos Robles, who made the bomb that exploded in the PAN building, was surprised by the police in his radio-and-television-repair shop. In his fright, he detonated two bombs and was killed . . . This happened last Tuesday [February 10]. As a consequence of this raid, according to the Prosecutor's Office, and of other investigations carried out, the names of the other members of the group of terrorists and bombers were learned." (*Últimas Noticias*.)

Did the police "help" Campos Robles to "commit suicide"? The suspicious death of one of the "terrorists" in this case cannot help but call to mind another grim development in Durango. Three of the most important leaders of the student struggle that is going

on there still "cannot be found," despite the fact that their comrades have complained to the state and federal governments. Has the Díaz Ordaz government begun to liquidate its political enemies on the quiet instead of merely imprisoning them?

So a new wave of arrests is expected. And the indicated target is the revolutionary groups already forced to work in secret by the repression. President Díaz Ordaz has already singled out these groups for a special attack in his final report to the congress. He said: "It is absurd to try to break down an open door. Anyone who wants to defend his ideas while respecting those of others, exercise his rights without violating those of others, participate in real political activity and not subversive and criminal activity, does not need false names, darkness, dim catacombs. Why should you take refuge in clandestinity when you can fight for your ideals out in the open, organizing politically and operating under the protection of the law, which is your best shield and guarantee?"

The new roundup of political prisoners, apparently being prepared, seems to be intended to reach into the "clandestine groups" that Díaz Ordaz found disturbing enough to be worthy of mention before the highest forum in the country.

The threat of new roundups is all the more evident because Díaz Ordaz has chosen a period preceding a presidential election to launch his repression. Normally, with a presidential election upcoming, it would be in the government's interest to exercise greater caution and more flexibility. The facts indicate, however, that Díaz Ordaz is taking the opposite course.

The renewal of the repression comes at a time when the divisions that have split the bourgeoisie are about to appear in the government itself. It comes at a time, also, when the student movement is beginning to again raise its head, and not only in Mexico City this time but in the provinces—in Puebla, Yucatán, and Durango.

Why also did Díaz Ordaz choose this precise moment to imprison an oppositionist like Menéndez Rodríguez? A glance at the latest issues of *Por Qué?* may give us the key. On the two most important events in national politics in recent months, the Yucatán gubernatorial election, which

was stolen by the PRI, and the hunger strike of the political prisoners in Lecumberri, this magazine took a forthright revolutionary position.

Por Qué? had, to a large extent, served the interests of the revolutionary groups before this. However, in the recent period *Por Qué?* began to deepen its political analysis. It did not stop using its own peculiar muckraking style larded with adjectives, sometimes in very dubious taste. But before this the style represented the content and form of the magazine's political outlook.

Starting with the issue devoted to the results of the Yucatán elections, which were really won by the opposition candidate Correa Rachó of the PAN, Menéndez concentrated on showing that the regime was moving toward becoming an open dictatorship. The 20,000 copies of this issue sent to Yucatán were seized by the government. The editorial in this issue ended by saying that the people of Yucatán and of Mexico in general were facing a "new six years [the length of the president's term in Mexico] of systematic robbery and injustice which will end by making a mockery of the democracy the Mexican regime has boasted of in the past."

Por Qué? irrefutably proved and documented the scandalous electoral fraud perpetrated by the government in Yucatán with the help of bayonets. The magazine printed impressive pictures of the popular mobilization in favor of the opposition candidate. Finally, stunning revelations were made with regard to the scheduled presidential elections.

On the basis of the monstrous January 1 attack on the Lecumberri political prisoners, who were on a hunger strike, *Por Qué?* wrote in a now famous editorial entitled "President Díaz Ordaz, Where are You Leading Mexico?" that the Mexican government was moving toward fascism by leaps and bounds.

The editorial argued that actions like the January 1 attack had been committed only by fascist-type regimes. It said that Díaz Ordaz had carried his repression to the point of trying to physically liquidate the opposition en masse. This issue also published astonishing pictures taken inside Lecumberri prison which gave a powerful impression of the grim situation of the political prisoners.

It is possible, as I have said, that these increasingly sharp exposures of what Menéndez called "the assassination of democracy" prompted the arrest of this courageous journalist. It may be that the Díaz Ordaz government feared that Menéndez's weekly would begin to play the role of an organizer of the various vanguard groups that have sprung up in the different states of the republic.

In Durango, for example, a student struggle has been going on for a month already but the papers in the capital have made only indirect references to the events there. The available information indicates that a provincial counterpart of the 1968 student movement in the capital is developing there. The students have been striking against the governor for more than a month; the university is besieged by the army; and there is mass support for the student action. Recently a demonstration called by the stu-

Bolivia

Political Prisoners Deny Asking for Amnesty

[The following are extracts from a statement issued recently by a group of Bolivian political prisoners in La Paz. It has been translated from the January issue of *Solidarité Pérou*, the publication of the Comité Français de Solidarité Avec les Victimes de La Répression au Pérou (French Committee of Solidarity with the Victims of the Repression in Peru).]
To Public Opinion:

In its December 28 issue, the newspaper *Hoy* published a report that the families of the political prisoners had appealed to the government to grant them an amnesty. We want to make the following clear:

At no time have we, the undersigned, authorized our families or relatives to make any approaches, entreaties, or appeals to the government for our release. We are perfectly aware of the fact that the main reason for our imprisonment lies in the open struggle which we, together with the Bolivian people, launched against Yankee imperialism and its native lackeys in our country. For the same reason we are also certain that we will remain in prison as long as the state apparatus

is manipulated from the American embassy. A truly revolutionary government would have decided to liberate us at once, thereby proving its independence of imperialism and the national reactionary groups. . . .

To a large extent, *Por Qué?* served the function of carrying reports of what was happening in one place or another throughout the country. Thus, it was from *Por Qué?* that the citizens of Baja California learned that their countrymen in Yucatán, at the opposite end of the country, suffered exactly the same fate that they had in 1968 when the PRI maintained itself in power in Tijuana and Mexicali by bayonets.

Of course the government has not yet said anything about banning *Por Qué?* but the jailing of its editor fore-shadows this.

Thus, the coming period promises great opportunities and great dangers. More than ever it is essential to maintain the coolest and most analytical attitude possible.

The omission of the names of Juan Rodriguez, Antonio Celas, and Luis Perez in the *Hoy* communiqué seems very suspicious to us. These three comrades are accused of participating in the execution of the traitor and informer Honorato Rojas. The state apparatus for the administration of "justice" has characterized this act as a common-law crime, thereby trying to obscure the fact that the Ejército de Liberación Nacional (ELN) [National Liberation Army] has publicly taken both political and moral responsibility for this act of justice.

Signed: José A. Moreno, O. Busch, Víctor Cordoba, B. Coronado, C. Demiguel, J. F. Melgara, Tomás Chambi, Roberto Moreira, E. Ortega, G. Oroza, Julio Dagnino, Jorge Pol, Juan Sánchez Rocabado, Jurgen Schutt, Felipe Vásquez.

Political prisoners in the San Pedro Prison, La Paz.

The Fedayeen Force King Hussein to Back Down

By Abou Saadoun

Amman

February 10: At 2:00 p.m. the Council of Ministers, in session since early morning under the chairmanship of King Hussein, issues a thirteen-point communiqué. Twelve of the points are addressed to the Palestinian resistance movement. This communiqué appears the day after King Hussein's return from Cairo, following the resounding failure of the conference of frontline countries, and five days after Hussein's meeting with the United States ambassador in Amman.

The communiqué is in fact a real ultimatum. At 8:00 p.m. all the Palestinian resistance organizations issue a communiqué in response to the government. It is a revolutionary manifesto. All of the Palestinian organizations form a united command in permanent session at an undisclosed center somewhere in Amman.

On the other side, the repressive forces were put on the alert four days before the royal government issued its ultimatum. Although the evening is calm, an acute state of tension persists. The fedayeen are patrolling the city and fraternizing with the population, explaining the meaning of the royal ultimatum.

February 11: Shots resound here and there, sporadically. Clashes are reported, but no real battles occur. The leaders of the resistance organizations remain masters of the situation.

The government erects checkpoints on the approaches to Amman. The Syrian, Lebanese, and Iraqi frontiers are under very tight surveillance. Armed fedayeen can neither enter nor leave the country. Everyone arriving in Amman is thoroughly searched. All travelers returning with weapons are forced to turn them over.

At Mafrak, a city on the road to Iraq, which has been declared a military zone and where the principal military airports are located, a cordon is established by the government encircling the town and blocking all the strategic points. Another blockade is set up between Jarrach and Irbid near



HUSSEIN: Troubled with the royal malady of looseness of the crown.

the Syrian border, another strategic point.

On the plateaus in the north, center, and south of the country a network of blockades and checkpoints is also set up by the forces of the regime. Although the south of the country is reputedly loyal to the king, the unrest there requires sending in units of the Arab Legion and the army.

Near Souleih, about twenty kilometers from Amman, an armed fedayeen getting out of a bus is upbraided by an army unit manning the roadblock. He is ordered to hand over his gun. He refuses and resists physically. He is beaten up and jailed, to be released in the evening.

United in a single command, the Palestinian organizations make decisions for the entire resistance movement. Late at night a meeting is held with representatives of the royal government. During this period, the government is applying its strategy of isolating Amman from the rest of the country, the primary objective being to cut off the command centers of the Palestinian organizations from their armed units, their camps, and their bases.

The United Command of the Palestinian resistance issues directives to the fedayeen—do not bow to intimidation, explain the meaning of the struggle, explain the counterrevolutionary objectives of the Jordanian regime, fraternize with the soldiers. The United Command orders the fedayeen to move through the blockades, arms in hand, and to answer any armed moves by the government. In the northern part of the country, the army fires on a Fateh supply vehicle and confiscates it. The driver, a fedayeen, is killed. Three members of the Saika [the Syrian-sponsored guerrilla movement] are jailed and later released.

At Jabal el-Taj a pitched battle breaks out between the fedayeen and the Arab Legion, lasting until nightfall. Several fedayeen are killed. The fedayeen seize a police station, arresting seven policemen. The army loses three armored vehicles in the engagement.

Late at night, during a meeting with the representatives of the Palestinian resistance held in the home of Prime Minister Talhouni (a sinister spokesman of reaction known for his pro-imperialist positions), Hussein makes the following clarification: "The communiqué published by the Council of Ministers yesterday is not aimed in any way at the Palestinian organizations but concerns respect for order in the country . . ." What is he up to all of a sudden?

February 12: The roadblocks are still up but the army and the police are gone from the center of Amman;

the civilian population fraternizes with the fedayeen, who are circulating freely through the city. With an acute consciousness of the gravity of the situation, the fedayeen display a high degree of revolutionary discipline.

At the Elwahdeth camp, a full-scale pitched battle begins late in the morning with the Bedouin forces barricaded in an outpost near their command center in Amman. The fedayeen lay siege to the post and try to take it. In Mafrak, in Jarach, in Irbid, on the great plateaus in the north, center, and the south, and in Ramthaa, the blockades are still in place. The Palestinian organizations demand that all the Arab governments that have not yet taken a stand make clear their attitude toward the aggressive attempts of the reactionary Jordanian regime.

In Cairo, in answer to the appeal of the Palestinian organizations, the radio announces: "King Hussein has postponed his trip to Abou-Dhabi and Pakistan because of unrest. The authorities are watching the evolution in Jordan very closely." The answer from Egypt is quite clear!

In Bagdad the radio announces that the Iraqi government has threatened to withdraw its troops from the front if tensions persist between the Palestinian resistance and the Jordanian authorities. It announces that "Tkriti, the deputy premier and minister of national defense, is due to arrive today in Amman to discuss the situation with the king . . ."

In Damascus, the radio lets it be known that the Syrian authorities would support the Palestinian resistance movement if the Jordanian government tries to suppress it and would send reinforcements to the Palestinians.

In Tripoli the radio announces that the Libyan government has reportedly threatened to withdraw the pledge of financial aid to Jordan made at the Arab summit meeting in Rabat if the royal authorities suppress the Palestinian resistance movement. But, continues the Tripoli radio, if the Palestinian resistance organizations do not unite, the Libyan government will be forced to reconsider its attitude toward them!

During these broadcasts, the battle of Elwahdeth continues. In Mafrak the resistance has succeeded in dislodging the armed forces from their positions and now occupies these positions itself. This permits the resis-

tance fighters to control the strategic route linking the central and northern parts of the country. Troop movements toward the north indicate that the authorities are sending reinforcements to the dislodged units. Motorized units are sent to Amman from Souleah.

A communiqué signed by the various political, trade-union, professional, student, women's, and other organizations castigates the Jordanian regime, blaming it for the clashes. The communiqué calls for the formation of a patriotic government that would support the Palestinian resistance and fight against Zionism and imperialism.

The discussions between the government and the resistance continue until late afternoon. The government proposes issuing a joint communiqué. The Palestinian organizations refuse because the proposed communiqué does not mention their demands, that is: (1) rescinding the ultimatum; and (2) restoring the situation that existed prior to 2:00 p.m. on February 10. Another meeting is set for 4:30 p.m. the next day.

After this initial failure, barricades appear in the streets of Amman and heavily armed fedayeen take up positions at different strategic points in the city. There are increasingly persistent rumors of tanks moving on Amman. Units of fedayeen circulate in

the city and its immediate periphery, setting up barricades.

An agreement is reached between the representatives of the resistance movement and the royal government. Despite this, the state of alert is maintained until morning. The agreement is not very clear but the Palestinians can interpret it as they choose and it is a product, above all, of a relationship of forces favorable to the Palestinian resistance. Nonetheless, it is clear to all that the outcome is no more than a standoff.

February 13: The United Command of the Palestinian Resistance issues a communiqué explaining to the Jordanian and Palestinian populations, to the Arab masses, and to the international workers movement how the Palestinian resistance interprets the agreement.

The situation slowly returns to "normal"; fedayeen still occupy some roofs; loudspeakers inform and advise the population massed on the sidewalks so as to avoid provocations. They issue calls for vigilance.

Extraordinary scenes occur. Fedayeen and police and soldiers of the royal army embrace each other. The policy of fraternization ordered by the leaders of the United Command has borne fruit. The Jordanian army privates have come to realize that in reality they are in the same boat as the fedayeen.

February 13.

Plight of Political Prisoners in Tanzania

The disclosure on February 13 that Tanzanian police have been holding thirty political prisoners incommunicado, and without filing charges, caused a sensation in Dar es Salaam. Sales of *The Standard*, the daily paper that printed the story of a released political detainee, Cornelius Ogunsanwo, shot up. The same issue published an appeal for help that Ogunsanwo had smuggled out of prison. It read as follows:

"To the United Nations.

"Mugove Z. Gonesse (writing). British Subject. Student. British Passport D 94-49.29. Locked up at Central Police Station, Dar-es-Salaam on 14/11/69 on arrival from Rhodesia. No reason given. Am in absolute innocence. Have hitherto been completely ignored. Humanity, please HELP!!!"

Ogunsanwo, a twenty-eight-year-old Nigerian student at the London School of Economics, came to Tanzania December 12, 1969, to do research on his Ph. D. thesis. He was arrested January 3

and kept in prison until February 9. Ogunsanwo told *The Standard* that the police had never told him why he was imprisoned. The reason apparently was that his request for permission to do research on Chinese policy in Tanzania had not been approved.

Ogunsanwo told *The Standard* that the group of prisoners with whom he had been held were classified as "siasa" (Swahili for "political") by the jail authorities.

The Nigerian student complained: "The treatment I received was animalistic and inhumane." According to the February 13 issue of *The Standard*: "He [Ogunsanwo] further alleged that he had seen two prisoners badly beaten by police officers while he was in detention. Conditions were appalling he said. One of his cellmates had several times been forced to urinate and excrete on the floor. They had not been allowed soap and tooth paste; there were no exercise periods; one sick prisoner had to wait four days before being taken for medical attention."

PRD Votes to Abstain in May Elections

Santo Domingo

The Partido Revolucionario Dominicano [Revolutionary Dominican party], headed by former President Juan Bosch, has decided to abstain in the elections scheduled for May 16.

At its sixth convention, which was attended by about 300 delegates, the PRD announced that it "will oppose the continuation of Balaguerism and any other nonrevolutionary response to the current situation."

President Joaquín Balaguer, who was imposed on the country during the U.S. occupation of Santo Domingo in 1966, was nominated by the Partido Reformista as its candidate for the May elections.

Under the Balaguer regime, more than 366 persons in the political opposition have been murdered or have disappeared. The military have staged raids on thousands of homes. The beating and torture of opponents of the regime are everyday occurrences.

A virtual curfew exists in many towns and villages.

There are more than 400,000 unemployed in the country, 10 percent of the total population.

When the PRD delegates decided that in view of the terror, the repression, Balaguer's determination to run again, and his "uncontrollable forces" (as the criminals on the government payroll are called here), they would abstain from participating in the elections, a tremendous shout of approbation went up.

"But this does not mean that we are standing aside, arms folded," they said, "because we will actively and militantly oppose what is nothing but a bloody and fraudulent farce."

The PRD is the only mass party in opposition to the government.

The convention decided that the PRD would mobilize the working masses, the peasants, students and unemployed on a national scale in pursuit of immediate demands.

This struggle, the participants at the convention declared, "will be aimed in addition against the May electoral farce and in favor of progressive, democratic, and nationalist measures."

The convention decided that the PRD

should announce its readiness to join with all the political, social, religious, and military forces willing to unite in opposition to the electoral process, to the continuation of Balaguerism, and in favor of making possible the birth of a revolutionary nationalist regime.

Advocacy of a dictatorship backed by the people—as conceived by Bosch—in opposition to parliamentary democracy is to be proclaimed as an official party doctrine within a period of not more than a year, nor less than six months, provided that no exceptional situations compel modification of this general thesis.

The PRD delegates declared that the party will support only a government that puts into practice the following minimum program:

"1. Expropriation of the latifundios [big estates] and protection of small property holders who fulfill a useful social function; granting of state-held land to the peasants and initiation of a scientific agrarian reform, oriented, assisted, and financed by the state; fair and stable prices for agricultural products.

"2. Nationalization of foreign enterprises that go counter to the national interest; control of foreign investments on the basis of a policy of defending the national patrimony and independence.

"3. An adequate budget and a scientific program for the educational system, and the democratization of teaching.

"4. Repeal of austerity measures and a general increase in wages for all workers, employees, and the Dominican military personnel and police.

"5. Adequate measures aimed at providing guaranteed and well-paid jobs to the huge army of unemployed in the countryside as well as in the cities.

"6. Lowering of the prices of basic necessities, including medicine; improvement of hospital services for the people and a higher health budget; increase in wages for all medical personnel.

"7. Protection of indigenous capital that contributes to buttressing the na-

tional sovereignty and the maintenance and development of state capital.

"8. Freedom of association for all sectors of the popular masses and restoration of the right to strike.

"9. Effective measures to end the wave of crimes, terror, and repression now afflicting the country.

"10. Elimination of the infamous official extortion practiced against the Dominican professions and an end to discriminating against them in favor of foreigners.

"11. An end to persecuting and threatening priests and other progressive clergymen.

"12. The right of all citizens to complete freedom of association in political parties; absolute respect for freedom of ideas and freedom of expression.

"13. Establishment of commercial and diplomatic relations with all countries in the world.

"14. Policies aimed at gaining national independence and sovereignty."

The convention censured the Soviet Union for invading Czechoslovakia.

It also voted to support the Cuban revolution.

Burchett Makes It Home

After nineteen years, Wilfred G. Burchett, the internationally famous left-wing journalist finally made it back to Australia February 28.

The Australian government had persistently denied him a new passport because of his unfavorable reporting of the role of U.S. imperialism in the Korean and Vietnamese wars. Without a passport, he could not persuade any air or steamship line to book passage for him. He traveled on a variety of documents, including a Cuban passport and a North Vietnamese travel pass, but the Australian authorities would not issue him a visa on these papers.

A Melbourne newspaper, *The Sunday Observer*, chartered a Navajo Piper aircraft, and Burchett flew in this from Noumea, New Caledonia, to Brisbane.

He was greeted by a crowd of hundreds of persons. Some cheered and sang "The Internationale"; others booed and shouted, "Go home to Hanoi!"

The Australian government could not bar Burchett's entry once he had found a way of landing inside the country.

At Brisbane, Burchett said: "The Australian Government has violated my rights by refusing to register my children as Australian citizens. They are growing up now and it is important that they have these documents. And I want to bring my wife and children back to Australia to show them the country. I also want to pursue a libel case in Melbourne. If the Government refuses to grant my children Australian citizenship I'm prepared to challenge this in court."

Settlement with Kurds Announced

By Gerry Foley

General Ahmed Hassan El Bakr, the chief of the Bagdad regime, announced on Iraqi television March 11 that his government had reached a settlement with the leaders of the insurgent Kurdish population in the mountainous northwestern part of the country.

The present accord is the fourth attempt to negotiate a peace between the Kurds and the Iraqi central government since the insurrection began about nine years ago.

The previous attempts at a settlement of the dispute failed chiefly because of the Bagdad government's insistence that the Kurds give up their arms.

The most extensive concessions to the Kurds were offered by the government of Abdel Rahman Bazzaz on June 29, 1966. These reportedly constitute the base of the present agreement. In 1966, however, powerful anti-Kurd elements in the army opposed such concessions and forced Bazzaz out of the government.

The new agreement does not mention the demand of the insurgent nationality to maintain an independent armed force. An editorial in the March 13 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde* commented on this point:

"A passage in General Bakr's statement specifying that the Kurds would turn in their heavy weapons to the Iraqi authorities only at a later stage seems to indicate that, for the moment, the two sides have only postponed the settlement of this point of contention on which the Kurdish autonomists are not inclined to compromise."

In other respects the agreement conceded to the Kurds on a number of issues. "The national rights of the Kurds are recognized," General Bakr said. "The Kurds will be able to develop their own national identity within the context of the unity of the people, the nation, and Iraqi constitutional order."

The head of the Bagdad regime declared that the provisional constitution of the country had been revised to include a new section that would



BARZANI: Will he still insist on Kurds keeping their arms?

recognize the "autonomy of the Kurds in the framework of the Iraqi republic."

The vice-president of the republic is to be a Kurd. The Kurdish minority will be given proportional representation in parliament and in the public services.

With regard to the borders of the new autonomous region, important concessions were made. The district of Kirkuk, in which the Kurds are in a majority, will be included in the Kurdish region. This area had been in dispute.

A "high committee" is to be formed to oversee the application of the accord. This body will be responsible for setting up administrative units in the predominantly Kurdish areas "in such a way as to guarantee the exercise of autonomy by the Kurds."

The Kurdish language is to be taught in all the schools and a university is to be established in Sulaimaniya, the principal town of the

Kurdish region. Books and newspapers are to be printed in Kurdish. A radio and television station will broadcast programs in Kurdish. Formerly the use of the Kurdish language was prohibited in Iraq, as it still is in Turkey and Iran where sizable Kurdish minorities live.

Displaced persons and refugees will be allowed to return to their areas of origin, and housing will be provided where necessary. The Kurdish people will be compensated for the losses they have suffered in the past and will be exempt from all taxes imposed by the Iraqi government during the nine years of fighting.

On the other hand, the central government will retain exclusive control of the oil fields in the Kurdish area. According to General Bakr's statement: "Since Kurdish autonomy is to be in the framework of the Iraqi republic, the exploitation of natural resources falls into the republic's sphere of authority."

If applied, the Iraqi agreement would represent a rather advanced solution to the national minority problem.

It is, of course, too early to say whether these accords will prove durable. The experience of nine years of broken promises and military assaults and forays on the part of the central government seems a formidable obstacle.

However, it can hardly be doubted that achievement of a real peace in Iraq would be in the interests of the Arab struggle against imperialism and the imperialist-backed Zionist regime in Tel Aviv. The El Bakr government now has an opportunity to show in practice that it is capable of putting the struggle against imperialism above its own narrow interests.

During his broadcast March 11 General Bakr read a message from the Kurdish leader Mustafa al-Barzani which pledged that the autonomist party would work in close cooperation with the Iraqi government in applying "the letter and spirit" of the accord.

In his message Barzani assured General Bakr "that the Kurdish people support the just struggle the Arab nation is waging against its enemies. This is especially true in the present delicate phase in which the Arab nation must mobilize all its potential in its difficult struggle to achieve its legitimate objectives."

Rising Militancy Among New Zealand Unionists

By Harry North

Wellington

In November 1969 the Labour party lost the general parliamentary election by the relatively small margin of 12,000 votes. There was actually a small improvement in its share of the national vote (somewhat in excess of 2 percent). Distribution of seats in the House of Representatives (thirty-nine Labour party representatives as opposed to forty-five for the ruling National party), of course, reflects the normal built-in bonus in favour of conservative parties, but never was a Labour defeat more deserved than in this election.

Even in terms of capitalist electoral gimmickry, Norman Kirk and the rest of the Labour leadership missed every trick. They were determined from the outset to blur every issue on which there was an actual difference of policy till the ordinary voter was left with the choice between a "proven efficient" custodian of the capitalist order, and an "unproven" one. Premier Keith Holyoake thus won a thoroughly undeserved and, in some circles, unexpected victory.



KIRK: Missed every trick.

Moreover, two Labour party annual conferences had called for the withdrawal of New Zealand troops from Vietnam, but Kirk steadfastly refused to put a specific date on withdrawal in the event that Labour should become the government, and even went so far as to say in one speech that he wanted "to do the same as Mr Nixon was doing."

It is interesting and instructive that in Australia, where the general election took place some few weeks before the one in New Zealand, a specific commitment by the Australian Labor party leader to withdraw troops by June 1970 without conditions was a cardinal plank in a platform which netted an 8 percent swing in Labour's direction. Rotten equivocation by New Zealand's Labour leadership produced a swing of only one-fourth the size in circumstances that were otherwise at least as favourable overall.

Since the general election, a by-election in one electorate has produced a dramatic gain for the Labour party. A Tory majority of 2,000 was turned into a Labour majority of 1,000. This result partly reflects growing discontent among the working class and many "small capitalists" as a result of substantial price rises since the election.

Partly, too, it reflects public anxiety, cutting across class lines, about the proposal to ruin one of the world's most exquisite lakes in the interest of an electric power development needed by an international bauxite smelting consortium.

No doubt Labour's top men will take the results of the by-election as confirmation of the wisdom of their basic political prescription: Do nothing, promise everything, and wait for the Conservatives to make enough mistakes for the pendulum to swing back. Certainly the Kirkite leadership of the Labour party remains, as ever, cowardly and supine in its response to events.

When Agnew visited Auckland, a deliberate police assault on a group of



HOLYOAKE: Won by Labour's default.

nonviolent demonstrators produced a big public reaction. Prominent Auckland Labour figures quite justifiably called for a public enquiry into allegations of police brutality—in itself a mild enough gesture to suit the tamest of tame Social Democrats—but Labour's leader blandly announced that the Labour caucus in parliament felt that there was "not enough evidence" to support the call for an enquiry!

In the trade-union arena, militancy has risen almost uninterruptedly since the infamous NIL wage decision of the Court of Arbitration in mid-1968. Nowhere has this been more apparent than in the meat packers' union. This 27,000-strong organization, which has been involved in a series of local disputes, recently launched a general

slowdown in support of a wage claim for mutton slaughtermen.

For the first time since the 1951 government-directed union-smashing orgy, unionists in this industry have managed to unite in a national grouping to promote their own interests. Not all the national leaders of this union proved in practice to have the militant strength which the rank and file expected of them, but fortunately at an appropriate time, extra militancy on the job of one small group of thirty men in the Gear Freezing works near Wellington forced the company to capitulate, thus breaching the united front that had previously existed among the owners of the meat-packing plants.

A struggle involving the Seamen's Union appears on the surface to be chiefly an interunion conflict, but in

reality it concerns employee resistance to the erosion of job control gains already made.

In essence, ships' officers and engineers wish to take away from the seamen a rotary hiring system that has an element of workers control.

Whilst the employers ostensibly are not involved directly, they are naturally doing everything they can in an underhanded way to back up the Officers and Engineers' Guild. Up to date the seamen have won an important victory in the case of the steamship *Wainui*, and have even succeeded in drawing into their cause the leading right-wing trade-union bureaucrat, Tom Skinner.

At one stage in this dispute, ultra-left moves on the part of some Maoist forces threatened the seamen with isolation from the rest of the trade-

union movement, but the threat was overcome.

It is not without interest, too, that differences in policy among various groupings within the Maoist Communist party produced a serious split between the more ultraleft faction in Auckland and the Wellington group.

It was noteworthy that at least on two occasions the Wellington Maoists refused to sell the party's weekly newspaper, *People's Voice*, because in their view it contained a call for overly left policies in the seamen's dispute.

The radical upsurge in student and youth groups continues strongly, but all the strength and energy of the Trotskyist forces will be needed to provide an organizational form and program to create out of this amorphous development a socialist vanguard.

Italy

Discuss Livio Maitan's Book on Cultural Revolution

Rome

An important debate on the Chinese cultural revolution took place January 22 in the auditorium of the student center at the University of Rome. Several hundred students attended. They followed the three-hour discussion with the greatest interest. The meeting was organized by the Samonà e Savelli-LaNuova Sinistra publishing house to launch Livio Maitan's book* on the Chinese crisis of recent years.

Two commentators spoke. The first was Lucio Colletti, a former member of the PCI [Partito Comunista Italiano—Italian Communist party], editor of the monthly *La Sinistra* published in 1966-67, a professor at the University of Rome, and one of the best known Marxist theoreticians in Italy. The second was Aldo Natoli, a deputy in parliament and one of the leaders of the *Manifesto* group. He was recently expelled from the Communist party after thirty years of membership (he was a member of

the Central Committee when he was expelled and had been for decades).

Colletti gave a very favorable evaluation of the book. In his opinion, it was a detailed analytical study based on unusually extensive documentation. The reconstruction of the cultural revolution that emerged from this study seemed convincing to him, although he personally was not an expert on the subject. Moreover, in Colletti's opinion, the author had correctly applied criteria and categories essential to any Marxist analysis or generalization, especially in the latter part of the book.

As for his own views on China, Colletti said that he considered the following positions of the Chinese leaders positive: their criticism of the peaceful coexistence concept advocated by the Soviet CP; their criticism of the Soviet positions on the colonial revolution; their criticisms of the social stratification in the USSR; their reaffirmation of certain equalitarian themes; and their polemic against the bureaucratic ossification of the Communist parties. It seemed to him, moreover, that an attempt was taking form in China to avoid following the same

path as the one traveled by the USSR in the Stalin period.

But, at the same time, he said, a number of other aspects must be noted: that the Chinese have come to the defense of Stalin and Stalinism, pleading the cause of Albania, the most bureaucratized country in East Europe; that they date the process of degeneration in the Soviet Union in an absolutely arbitrary way from Stalin's death; that they have adopted an opportunistic policy toward countries like Indonesia and Pakistan; that they have not even mentioned Che's heroic action; and that while praising the Paris Commune and its democratic norms, they have indulged in full-fledged obscurantism, making a dogma and cult of Mao's thought.

Aldo Natoli said that Maitan's study was unprecedented, at least in Italy, and that it was based on a detailed knowledge of the Chinese sources and all the contributions of those who have examined the problem. Particularly important in his opinion was the attempt to reconstruct the political personalities of Mao's opponents, of whose positions it is hard to get any precise idea.

However, Natoli felt that Livio Mai-

* Livio Maitan: *Partito, esercito e masse nella crisi cinese—Saggio di interpretazione marxista della rivoluzione culturale*. Samonà e Savelli, Lungotevere Altoviti 2, Roma. 1,900 lire (about US\$3.15). 282 pages.

tan had not kept the promise he made in his introduction to avoid ideological schematism. This was particularly true, he said, in the last part where the author drew conclusions that he considered incorrect. Natoli criticized especially the idea that bureaucratic deformations have developed in the Chinese CP as in all the other Communist parties. He rejected the analysis that a spontaneous mass movement developed in a power vacuum. And, above all, he disagreed that the structures had remained the same after the cultural revolution. In his opinion, there had been substantial changes, above all in the area of the relationship between the party and the masses. But in any case the fundamental question which must be answered clearly is the following: Does a dictatorship of the proletariat exist in China? His answer was affirmative.

Livio Maitan replied that the conclusions in his book flowed strictly from its analyses. Therefore, he said, if these conclusions were disputed, the analyses had to be challenged directly and specifically — which Natoli had not done. Moreover, Maitan said, it would be impossible to approach a subject like the development in China without employing some guidelines. The question is whether the criteria used were scientific ones and whether they were correctly applied, whether or not there were arbitrary extrapolations in reconstructing the facts.

Natoli's arguments, moreover, would require a whole discussion of the transitional period, which was impossible within the limits of the present meeting. As for the nature of the cultural revolution, Maitan said, his book made it clear that the crisis had begun at the top and that no one could seriously dispute this fact. The book pointed out, he continued, that the Mao tendency had made an appeal to the masses in the forms specified in the analysis and that finally the mass movement tended to develop according to its own dynamic. As for the question of whether or not a dictatorship of the proletariat existed in China, it could not be answered with a simple yes or no. If by dictatorship of the proletariat Natoli meant that the fundamental production relations were noncapitalist, then China is unquestionably a dictatorship of the proletariat. If by dictatorship of the pro-

letariat he meant a real socialist democracy where the masses effectively exercise power, then the answer is no.

After remarks by a number of persons in the audience who directed questions to Colletti and Natoli, these two took the floor again.

Colletti pointed out that most of the time people discuss the cultural revolution without knowing what is involved and that it is supported for reasons that have nothing to do with the developments in China. Ideologies are springing up which are trying to justify Maoism by in fact abandoning all Marxist criteria. Any justification based on postulates of Chinese exceptionalism especially must be rejected. The Chinese are not that different from us, and questions are being raised in China that we can and must discuss in terms valid for all. In conclusion, Colletti noted the international importance of the Chinese question, but he warned against a repetition of the Stalinist practice of the thirties, when the workers movement was strictly subordinated to the needs of the Soviet state.

Natoli said that in his opinion the importance of the cultural revolution lay in its polemic against Soviet revisionism, but that he in no way approved of either the cult of Mao or the defense of Stalinism. As for Maitan's book, he saw a contradiction in it between the passage that stressed the strengthening of the bureaucracy

and another that said the relationship of forces had shifted in favor of the masses.

Answering a question asked him about the significance of a representative of the *Manifesto* group and a leader of the Fourth International being present on the same platform, Natoli said that it was obvious that important differences existed between him and Maitan on the cultural revolution as well as other major questions. But, he added, there was a need for frank and fraternal discussion in the revolutionary left and that all sterile sectarianism must be ended.

Livio Maitan began by saying that he agreed entirely with Natoli's reply about the meaning of the debate that had taken place. After this, he pointed out that his book claimed that the political bureaucracy and not the bureaucracy in general had tended to gain from the cultural revolution, above all in opposition to the technocratic tendencies. This, he said, by no means contradicted the fact that at the same time, the relationship of forces had developed unfavorably for the bureaucracy as a whole.

More broadly speaking, Maitan said, some of the differences in evaluating the situation in China flowed logically from important differences on the conception of the transitional period and especially of the bureaucracy as a privileged social stratum.

Israelis 'Detain' Arabs Beyond Sentences

In a special dispatch from Nablus, in Occupied Jordan, Louis B. Fleming of the *Los Angeles Times* reported February 25 that Israeli occupation authorities "have refused to release some Arab prisoners who have completed their prison terms in security cases."

According to Fleming, "A small number of the prisoners have been informed that they will now be held under administrative detention because their release would endanger security on the West Bank of the Jordan . . ."

Israeli officials have confirmed that "a small number" of Arab security prisoners were being placed in administrative detention at the end of their prison terms.

"At the present time," again according to Fleming, "there are a few more than 3,000 Arabs being held in se-

curity cases. Half are serving court-imposed prison terms, about one-fourth are under interrogation or awaiting trial, and about one-fourth are under administrative detention."

In addition, "There have been numerous accusations of torture from prisoners in court and in private statements to their lawyers, but in only three cases has there been any physical evidence to give some credibility to the accusation.

"Some types of torture, however, including electric shock, do not necessarily leave any evidence."

Just the same, the evidence continues to mount concerning the methods used by the Israeli government. In the long run these will prove self-defeating, as they have in the case of similar tyrannical regimes in history.

What the Port Workers' Strike Achieved

By P. Bala Tampoe

[P. Bala Tampoe is the general secretary of the Ceylon Mercantile Union (CMU) and a leader of the Lanka Sama Samaja party (Revolutionary), the Ceylonese section of the Fourth International.]

* * *

Colombo

The historic strike against the Port (Cargo) Corporation in Colombo, that commenced on December 12 and ended two months later on February 12, was organized and led throughout by a joint front of seven port unions.¹

The overwhelming majority of the employees of the corporation in the port of Trincomalee also came out on strike on December 12 in solidarity with the strike in Colombo. They did so under the leadership of four unions that formed a joint front in that port.²

Similarly, when ships called at the infrequently used port of Galle during the strike, workers in solidarity with the action in the two main ports refused to load them.³

1. The Ceylon Harbour Workers' Union (Ceylon Federation of Trade Unions—led by the pro-Moscow Communist party); Sri Lanka National Independent Ports Employees' Union (Sri Lanka Independent Trade Union Federation—led by the Sri Lanka Freedom party); Ceylon Harbour Socialist Workers' Union (Ceylon Trade Union Federation—led by the pro-Maoist Communist party); All-Ceylon Harbour and Dock Workers' Union (Central Council of Ceylon Trade Unions—led by the progovernment Mahajana Eksath Peramuna [MEP]); Independent Harbour Workers' Union (International Transport Workers Federation); United Harbour Launch Workers' Union; and the Port (Cargo) Corporation branches of the Ceylon Mercantile Union [CMU].

2. Ceylon Harbour Socialist Workers' Union, Independent Harbour Workers' Union, Ilankai Thuraimuga Tholilalar Kalakam, and the Port (Cargo) Corporation branches of the CMU.

3. The unions involved included the CMU, Ceylon Harbour Socialist Workers' Union,

Before the strike began, the government refused to negotiate with the Joint Front in Colombo on its main demand for a revision of the wages and salaries of all port workers, with monthly pay for all those then paid on a daily basis. The pretext given by the government for its refusal to negotiate on this demand was that it was awaiting the report of the Select Committee, which was appointed on September 30, 1969, to make recommendations with regard to remuneration, amongst other matters, in all state corporations.

After the strike commenced on December 12, *the government persisted in its refusal to negotiate with the Joint Front*, even though the report of the Select Committee was made to the government on December 15, 1969. It is thus clear that the government had *no intention at any time* of reaching a settlement with the Joint Front of Port Unions *by negotiation* on its pay demands.

Prestrike Developments

Following the expiration of the ten-day ultimatum given by the Joint Front to the minister of nationalised services on November 18, for a satisfactory settlement of its demands, the corporation announced on the minister's behalf that the proposal for a scheme of monthly pay for daily-paid workers of the corporation had been accepted in principle, *provided that certain proposals with regard to reduction of gang strength, transferability of labour, and revision of the corporation's disciplinary rules, were put into effect along with this scheme*. On the demand for a revision of salaries and wages, all that was stated was that the question of a revision would receive the consideration of the minister after the report of the Special

All-Ceylon Harbour and Dock Workers' Union, and the Independent Harbour Workers' Union.

Committee examining salaries and conditions of service in state corporations was received. These announcements were made in a notification from the chairman of the corporation on December 2. That was the very day on which the Joint Front had decided to hold a mass meeting of portworkers after a general stoppage of work at 3:00 p.m.

It is obvious, therefore, that the chairman's notification was intended to stave off a strike, without any concrete concession being made in relation to the basic demands of the Joint Front. At the same time, and to the same end, it was stated that overtime arrears, which were legally due to the workers in respect of the so-called Interim and Devaluation allowances granted in 1967, would be paid, depending on the availability of funds.

In the circumstances, the Joint Front decided to give the port authorities a final opportunity to put forward a satisfactory basis for settlement on the main demands of the front, before an all-out strike was launched. Ten days' time was to be given, and it was decided that all overtime work in the port should be stopped in the meantime. This decision was unanimously approved by a joint meeting of port workers held in Colombo December 2.

After a discussion between representatives of the Joint Front and the chairman of the Port (Cargo) Corporation on December 7, the chairman notified all port workers that when a scheme of monthly wages was formulated, it would be made effective from January 1. He also notified them that the overtime arrears would be paid in three installments, the first of which would be paid with the wages and salaries for December.

The Joint Front replied to the chairman on December 10, pointing out that no indication had yet been given of the *basis* on which monthly wages would be paid, and as to whether or not they would only become pay-

able subject to the conditions mentioned in the chairman's previous notification of December 2. The Joint Front also pointed out that there was no indication as to *when* a monthly wage scheme would be formulated, and *whether there would be any revision of salaries and wages* at all. It was for these reasons that a mass meeting of several thousands of port workers, held on December 12 at Kochchikade, Colombo, unanimously decided to strike that day.

Strikebreaking Efforts

In the meantime, the government, with the active assistance of the UNP [the ruling bourgeois United National party] and LSSP [Lanka Sama Samaja party]⁴ unions in the ports, as well as the state radio and the capitalist press, made a determined effort to confuse and divide the workers by making it appear that their main demands had already been satisfactorily met by the government. Despite all these efforts, the strike in the ports of Colombo and Trincomalee was so overwhelmingly effective that the government decided to introduce regular and volunteer units of the army and navy into both ports the day after the strike began. This was to supplement the ineffective strikebreaking efforts of the LSSP and UNP-led unions, which were able to muster only about 2,000 persons for work on the first day of the strike.

During the first month of the strike, about 4,000 of the strikers in the ports of Colombo and Trincomalee returned to work. Despite their increasing economic hardships, however, more than 10,000 workers remained on strike under the leadership of the Joint Front at the end of that month.

In the expectation that more and more workers would return to work as the strike dragged on, the government persisted in using the armed forces for blacklegging in the ports,

without making any effort to settle the strike by negotiation, even though the continuance of the strike was causing increasingly heavy economic losses, and despite protests from various trade-union organizations in Ceylon as well as dock and transport workers organizations abroad.

Grant of Monthly Wages

On January 10, the Joint Front wrote to the prime minister requesting an interview with him, in view of a statement made by him in parliament the previous day, in the course of which he had strongly lamented the fact that the port workers had not suspended their strike even when serious floods had occurred in certain parts of the country, in order that military units that were working in the ports might have been released for flood relief work.

The prime minister met representatives of the Joint Front on January 13, in response to their request. They then pointed out that the government could well have withdrawn all military units from the ports for flood relief work, if the strike had been settled in its first month. Even at that stage, it was urged that the armed forces could be withdrawn, if the government decided to settle the strike by authorizing the Port (Cargo) Corporation to enter into immediate negotiations with the seven unions in the Joint Front on their demands. Instead of doing this, the prime minister directed the corporation to establish a scheme of monthly wages for port workers with effect from January 1 by merely abolishing standby rates of pay (lower rates paid on days when port workers reported for work but no jobs were available) and multiplying the existing daily rates by twenty-six.

The *main concession* made to the point of view expressed by the representatives of the Joint Front to the prime minister was that the *monthly wage scheme was to be introduced straightaway, without any of the conditions required by the minister of nationalised services prior to the strike*. Since no pay revision was granted, however, a mass meeting of several thousands of workers on strike in the port of Colombo decided on January 16 to continue the strike till adequate pay revisions were granted to them.

Joint Token Strike and CMU Sympathy Strike

On *December 18*, a joint token strike, followed by a joint demonstration and mass rally at Hyde Park, Colombo, was organized by the parent organizations of five port unions in the Joint Front, in protest against the government's continued efforts to break the strike in the ports by the use of units of the armed forces for blacklegging, and in support of the demand of the Joint Front for a settlement of the strike by negotiation. The five parent organizations were the Ceylon Mercantile Union, the Ceylon Trade Union Federation, the Ceylon Federation of Trade Unions, the Sri Lanka Independent Trade Union Federation, and the Central Council of Ceylon Trade Unions.

On February 1 the CMU called a continuous strike of about 175 of its branches in the import-export trade, in state corporations, and in other establishments, in sympathy with the strike in the ports. *On the eve of the CMU strike, the corporation announced increases in the monthly rates of pay introduced for the daily-paid categories of workers* in the ports from January 1, of between 10 rupees [5.952 rupees equals US\$1] and 15 rupees, *together with increases in their annual increments of pay*. The question of a revision of the monthly rates of pay of the non-manual grades, however, was merely said to be under examination.

By this time, most of the lesser-paid manual categories of workers in the ports of Colombo and Trincomalee, together with a minority of the monthly-paid non-manual categories, had returned to work due to the prolongation of the strike for fifty days. Nevertheless, the Joint Front decided to continue the strike, because the clerical, supervisory, and other non-manual categories of workers had not been granted any pay revision whatsoever, whilst the increases granted to the manual categories were insufficient. *It was only on the sixtieth day of the strike, when the government announced a pay revision with increases in annual increments for all non-manual categories, that the Joint Front decided that it was expedient to call off the strike, having regard to the concessions gained and the hardships of the workers who were still*

4. The LSSP, the oldest and largest workers party in Ceylon, was expelled from the Fourth International in 1964 when the majority of its leadership abandoned their independent revolutionary perspective and joined a coalition government with the bourgeois Sri Lanka Freedom party and the pro-Moscow CP. The left wing of the LSSP refused to join the coalition and established the Lanka Sama Samaja party (Revolutionary), which is today the Ceylonese section of the Fourth International. — IP

on strike. So ended the two-month battle between the port workers and the combined forces of the capitalist government, the state radio, the capitalist press, and the stooge unions of the UNP and the LSSP.

The port workers who participated in the strike have every reason to regard their united struggle as having been a successful one, even though they were unable to secure a settlement on their demands. They have won monthly wages for all formerly daily-paid categories, at last, together with pay revisions for all categories, despite the efforts of the government

and its stooges to break the strike without making any concessions. More important than these economic gains, however, is the valuable political experience gained by the port workers, not only of the reactionary policy of the UNP government in relation to their struggle in defence of their living standards, but also of the class treachery of the LSSP. Most important of all is the establishment of a substantial degree of solidarity between workers of all categories in the ports, despite their sectional differences and despite the disunity that has prevailed amongst port workers for a long time,

due to their different union affiliations and political differences.

This solidarity will not only be of great value to the port workers in the immediate future, but will also benefit the working class as a whole, in view of the influence of the port workers amongst other sections of the working class, and the urgent need of the working class to unite all its forces to resist the onslaught of the capitalist class and the capitalist state upon the living standards and democratic rights of the masses of the people at the present time.

February 27.

Cites Hugo Blanco, Hector Bejar Cases

Peredo Analyzes Regimes in Bolivia, Chile, Peru

[The following article is from the March 15 issue of Prensa Latina's feature service *Direct from Cuba*.]

* * *

La Paz

Signed by Osvaldo "Chato" Peredo, the National Liberation Army (ELN) issued a communiqué which analyzes the governments of Bolivia, Peru, and Chile and compares them with the true revolutionary process being carried out by the ELN.

The communiqué is called "Fight reactionary lies with Revolutionary Truth" and relates different actions carried out by the ELN, including encounters with the army of General Alfredo Ovando's military regime.

"A revolution is not made with concessions," says the ELN referring to Ovando's "self-styled revolutionary government," which "jails, kills, and represses the most selfless and determined revolutionaries, who with a complete lack of self-interest are always ready to give their lives in the true anti-imperialist struggle.

"A revolution is not one or two decrees of expropriation. A revolution is not the dictating of a hundred decrees, which do not in the least improve the living standards of the great mass of suppressed people," continues the communiqué, referring to the Ovando regime.

It adds that "this so-called revolu-

tionary, anti-imperialist, and moralizing government pretends to make revolution by expelling only one obsolete, discredited and hated U. S. company, while on the other hand, behind the back of the people, it flirts with capital from not so well-known companies, which for the same reason are not as discredited as the Bolivian Gulf Oil Company, as if Gulf was not the same as any other company searching for an easy way to invest capital with the same disastrous results for the people.

"It is the same process that is going on in the much acclaimed 'Peruvian revolution' which keeps prisoner such revolutionary fighters as Hugo Blanco, Héctor Béjar, and many others. It is similar to Chile's famous 'revolution in liberty' and in all cases it is the same imperialism that continues to exploit and drain away our riches. The only difference is that the old methods have been discarded and new ones — 'Revolutionary' ones — have been devised. This is essentially U. S. policy towards Latin America."

The communiqué states that "we will continue our struggle together with the people until we achieve the only just price for all the generous lives: a socialist revolution.

"We have already said that this struggle will be not only long but also cruel, because this is the way the enemy wants it. We try as much as we can

to prevent inflicting suffering and pain on innocent victims. This is why we ask for the neutrality of those who do not understand the struggle because resistance against the members of the ELN in its operations means collaboration with the enemy."

The ELN then relates some of its actions and says: ". . . on Tuesday, December 30, 1969, members of the ELN confiscated the money of a U. S. bank (Bank of America) which for a long time has been making loans in our country, making juicy profits and exporting foreign exchange to the detriment of the economic well-being of the Bolivian people. Unfortunately, we had to mourn the death of one of our fighters and that of two bank clerks, who servilely defended U. S. money."

The document pointed out that it was Ivan Tejada Peredo who lost his life in that operation, "a selfless member of the ELN."

It continues to say that on December 31 there was an armed clash on Ecuador Street between members of the ELN and combined forces from the Office of Criminal Investigations and the army. These forces later searched a house in which Dario David Adriaola was staying. He is the legendary guerrilla fighter who fought in Nancahuazú, a mining leader, an honest revolutionary who dedicated his life to the true liberation of Bo-

livia. He was killed cowardly by members of the repressive forces of the "revolutionary government," which now wants to conceal his identity and the events leading to his death.

The ELN announces that those who took part in that repressive action will be executed because "justice is done sooner or later, but it is done." The ELN denies any participation in the

robbery of the Miraflores branch of the National Bank, saying that "our objectives are more political than economic."

The document ends with a personal declaration made by "Chato" Peredo: "Now I will explain a personal matter arising from circumstances, a matter that can no longer be kept under wraps: not due to merit but rather due

to a series of accidental events, I have been entrusted with the responsibility of leading the ELN, a responsibility which I do not refuse, but which, to give truth and justice its due, I did not earn in any battle. In any case my appointment is temporary, and true leaders will emerge from the revolutionary process. Leaders are not improvised."

Great Britain

The Oxford Women's Liberation Conference

By Antonia Gorton

Oxford

Some 600 persons, mainly women, discussed the problems and ideas of women's liberation here February 27 to March 1. It was the first conference of its kind in Britain and the size of the gathering made it a significant political event. A broad representation of women's groups attended, most of which have formed spontaneously during the last two years, with a variety of class and political backgrounds, purposes and outlooks.

Participants included housewives, students, political activists, a few trade unionists, professional women, and women from a number of other countries. The forty children present were taken care of by men.

Some of the topics discussed were: "Home and the Family," "Delinquency Among Women," "Women in Class Struggle," "Background to Women's Employment," "Women—the Myth of Inactivity," and "Equal Pay."

The conference was uneven. The quality and quantity of speakers was heartening, but political differences quickly came to the fore and, compounded by the terrible sectarianism of the British left groups, almost destroyed any attempts at unity.

The conference was essentially divided into two camps: the feminists who see men as their oppressors and approach the question from a very subjective viewpoint; and those who see the source of women's oppression as rooted in class society and who work for a revolutionary change to a socialist society.

The conference decided to form a coordinating body in London which would have the task of disseminating information on women's liberation activities, projects, etc. A film and a book are also planned. Under the circumstances this was as much as could be accomplished.

Although the women were united in their feelings of oppression, discrimination, isolation and humiliation, the *method* of liberation was the scattering point. This resulted in great feelings of frustration and anger that made some parts of the weekend seem near to physical confrontation between the contending elements.

No program was projected. To give an illustration of the discussion: The demand for equal pay was proposed by the National Women's Caucus of the International Marxist Group [IMG—the British section of the Fourth International] and by *Socialist Woman* (a revolutionary-socialist women's journal) as a transitional slogan capable of mobilizing tremendous support from working-class women, and unrealizable under capitalism. The Maoists, however, regarded this demand as "reformist," and the feminists saw it as "irrelevant."

One highlight of the conference was a speech by an editor of *Socialist Woman* on the women of nineteenth century Nottingham. She described the militancy and determination of the Female Political Unions, which had demonstrations of 12,000 in support of the Chartist struggles. This talk was in the framework of "writing women back into history," giving the lie to

the myth of female inactivity in political struggles.

The meeting took place a week after one of the most militant strikes involving women in the current strike wave. Over 20,000 women clothing workers in Leeds, a northern manufacturing town, went out in defiance of the companies—forty-four concerns were affected—despite opposition from the official (male) leadership of the National Union of Tailors and Garment Workers.

While the strike was on, there were street clashes between militant women workers and blacklegs. In one incident, 300 women entered a factory and physically dragged out the blacklegs. By the time the police arrived the blacklegs had agreed to go on strike and no charges were laid.

According to the February 22 London *Sunday Times*, ". . . there is no doubt that the strike is inspired and led by the women members, with whom the local officials appear to be hopelessly out of touch. The atmosphere is very nasty indeed."

However unlikely any real unity is between the two wings of the movement, the organizational framework is necessary until the issues become clearer through further discussion and experience. It can already be concluded that women have learned a lot from the international student and antiwar movements, and that a tremendous advance in female self-confidence has occurred. Political meetings will never be the same again; that is, the abstention of women is a thing of the past.

On Tactics in Europe

[The following statement was issued by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International in January. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

1. At the beginning of the fifties, the European sections of the Fourth International adopted in general the entryist orientation to accomplish their central strategic task—building mass revolutionary parties that can win away important sectors of the proletariat from the influence of the traditional reformist and Stalinist leaderships and lead these workers toward the overthrow of capitalism and the seizure of state power. The Trotskyist movement at the time was very weak numerically and unable to exert great influence on the development of the class struggle. In view of this fact, the entryist orientation flowed from the following considerations:

(a) Throughout the entire postwar revolutionary upsurge of 1944-48, the traditional bureaucracies maintained their control over the mass movements. These bureaucracies entered the new postwar period of European history—which opened with the end of reconstruction and with the upsurge of the colonial revolution—without having lost their dominant influence over the working class.

(b) Under these conditions, the most probable projection was that any new radicalization of the proletariat, any important growth of working-class combativity, would be expressed first inside the traditional organizations, increasing the differentiation within them and giving rise to important left currents of either a centrist or left centrist character.

(c) By promoting the organization of such currents and by striving to win political leadership of them, revolutionary Marxists could facilitate the breakup of the traditional organizations through large splits. Under the influence of a revolutionary Marxist nucleus, one or another of the groupings produced by such splits could develop toward becoming a mass revolutionary party.

(d) By limiting themselves to existing as independent groups, revolutionary Marxists would confine themselves to propaganda activities incapable of influencing the differentiation of larger currents inside the mass movement and incapable of influencing the actual course of the class struggle.

The so-called entryist orientation in constructing mass revolutionary parties did not signify abandonment whatsoever of the effort to build sections of the Fourth International. All the resolutions written in accordance with the decision to apply this orientation implied the maintenance of tightly organized and disciplined revolutionary Marxist nuclei, recruiting on the basis of their full program, and utilizing open Trotskyist publications for this purpose.

The decision to carry out a broad entryist turn in 1951-53 was accompanied by internal discussions and struggles on problems related to this turn but not identical with

its tactical content (for example, the imminence of a world war and its possible influence in bringing the Communist parties to make a turn to the left, the forms of the disintegration of Stalinism, the internal functioning of the International, etc.). The present resolution is not intended to draw a balance sheet on the history of these internal struggles, which led to a split in the movement, but merely to recall the reasons that led to adoption of the entryist tactic as such and the reasons and perspectives of the tactical turn which all the European sections have decided on at present.

2. An analysis of the fifteen years that have passed since the adoption of the entryist orientation at the tenth plenum of the International Executive Committee enables us to determine, in general terms, which aspects of this orientation were correct and which were faulty.

(a) The prediction that any new radicalization of the proletariat would be expressed first by a differentiation within the traditional mass organizations of the workers movement has been completely borne out. The formation of the Bevan and Renard tendencies in the British and Belgian Social Democracies, the rupture in the Danish CP (the Larsen split), the formation one after another of left tendencies inside the Italian CP (the Young Communists, the Ingrao tendency), and the role played by struggle within the UEC [Union des Etudiants Communistes—Union of Communist Students] in the revival of the youth vanguard in France all confirm the analysis which led to the adoption of the entryist orientation. Even in Germany, which was the country in capitalist Europe where the radicalization was most limited during the period 1951-65, the only organization, *however small*, arising from what leftward movement there was—the SDS—was the product of a split from the Social Democracy.

(b) Throughout this period, no organization was able to score any significant success in trying to create a revolutionary party outside the traditional organizations. However, the adoption of the entryist orientation, in general, enabled the revolutionary Marxist nuclei to keep in better touch with the mass movement, to tie themselves intimately to it, and to better influence the development of the workers struggles.

(c) However, the long period of relative capitalist stabilization in Europe, which could not be foreseen at the time the International adopted the entryist orientation in Europe, severely limited the extent of the differentiation within the traditional mass organizations. Occurring apart from broad mass struggles, or only in their aftermath in the declining phase of these struggles, such differentiations could generally be contained essentially within the traditional apparatuses. Therefore, they led to the splitting off of small groups and marginal attrition rather than mass splits.

(d) It could have been otherwise if the revolutionary Marxist nuclei had forces within the left tendencies which arose in the traditional parties capable of organizing the

bulk of the members or sympathizers of these tendencies. But while the revolutionary Marxist nuclei generally gained strength in this period, the gains remained very modest. They were, therefore, confined to exercising a *political influence* within these tendencies, rather than consolidating them *organizationally*. This situation greatly facilitated the maneuvers of the left currents in the bureaucracies, through which, in the last analysis, they were able to reduce the magnitude of the splits. In adopting the entryist orientation, as it was formulated in 1951-52, the inevitable relationship between the size of our own forces and those which we could draw away from the mass parties was underestimated.

3. Toward the middle of the 1960s, the situation in the workers movement of capitalist Europe began to change under the influence of the following three factors:

(a) A slowdown in economic growth, higher unemployment rates, and a sequence of recessions (Italy, France, Great Britain, West Germany) all aggravated the class contradictions and progressively stimulated a revival of workers struggles.

(b) The composition of the working class changed significantly under the combined impact of the accelerated industrialization caused by technological changes (especially in Italy, France, Spain, the Netherlands, and Flanders), and the speedup on the assembly lines (an important factor in lowering the age level of the workers in big plants). A whole new sector of workers, youths in the main, has appeared which is much less subject to the control of the traditional apparatuses. This has favored a trend for much larger sections of the working class to get out of hand than in the 1944-48 period.

(c) A new youth vanguard developed on the basis primarily of identifying with the advancing sectors of the colonial revolution (Algeria, Cuba, Vietnam, Palestine). This vanguard at the same time turned toward agitation in the universities and high schools, thereby acquiring a social base that made it a real factor in the political life of a number of important capitalist countries (France, West Germany, Italy).

The characteristic feature of this change has been the great loss in influence wielded by the traditional organizations over this new young vanguard, resulting from the deep degeneration of the Social Democracy and the intensified crisis of Stalinism. Thus, for the first time since 1919-23, a rather broad vanguard independent of the bureaucratic apparatuses appeared in Europe. This vanguard has begun to alter the relationship of forces within the workers movement and this in turn can exercise a growing influence simultaneously on the combativity, orientation, and forms of struggle of significant sectors of the working class. The same change explains why in Great Britain the growing opposition of the workers and the unions to Wilson's policies since 1964 has not given rise to a sharp differentiation within the local sections of the increasingly sclerotic Labour party.

4. This essential change in the situation in the workers movement of capitalist Europe and the forms taken by the radicalization of successive layers of the workers and youth is the fundamental reason for the decision of the European sections of the Fourth International to change their orientation regarding the avenues of developing mass revolutionary parties today. In the new situation in the

working class and in the workers movement, it seemed most important not to lose the opportunity presented by the appearance of this new vanguard. This vanguard could not be left to founder between ultraleft spontanéism and reabsorption into the left wing of the traditional apparatuses, the inevitable alternative if no example were provided of at least a small revolutionary organization basing itself on the new wave of radicalization and aiming at consciously constructing a party of the Bolshevik type.

The content of the new orientation in working toward the construction of revolutionary parties which has been adopted by the European sections of the Fourth International can be defined as follows:

(a) Giving priority to winning political and organizational preponderance within the new vanguard with the aim of considerably strengthening our own organizations, and, if possible, qualitatively changing the relationship of forces vis-à-vis the bureaucracies in the working class.

(b) For this purpose, following a policy of taking the initiative in actions which will convince the new vanguard of the necessity of revolutionary Marxist organizations, not only on the theoretical and historical level but practically in the living struggle.

(c) Engaging in more extensive work among the rank-and-file workers in the factories and in the unions.

(d) Striving to build solid bases of support among the young workers from which confrontations with the bureaucracy can be mounted without risking elimination of the opposition nuclei from the unions and plants.

This orientation increases the importance of a widely distributed revolutionary Marxist press, of intense theoretical material in our theoretical journals, and numerous books and pamphlets giving solid support for our struggle to win preponderance within a new vanguard which is distinguished by a higher cultural and political level than similar vanguards in the past. At the same time, this orientation points up the need for our sections to function effectively and openly as real combat organizations capable of serving as poles of attraction for the best of the revolutionary youth who are repelled by Stalinism and reformism and for whom spontanéism has little attraction.

5. The change in orientation decided on by the European sections of the Fourth International does not mean that they underestimate the still decisive weight of the Stalinist and reformist apparatuses in the outcome of the great workers struggles which capitalist Europe is now experiencing and will yet experience in the years to come. Neither does it mean that they hold an exaggerated and utopian view of the possibilities for reducing this influence through the intervention of vanguard groups or youth organizations on the periphery of the organized workers movement proper.

The central strategic task of revolutionary Marxists remains that of building mass revolutionary parties. In countries where there is a long tradition of mass working-class political action, where the workers movement is still predominantly controlled by mass parties claiming to represent the workers, the achievement of this task is inconceivable without the occurrence of differentiations in these old organizations, including extensive ruptures and splits. It is clear that today our sections have much

greater possibilities for individual recruitment than ever and that these must be utilized to the full. But it would be just as sectarian today as in the past to insist solely on recruiting to a small group on an individual basis and to exclude the possibility of the party's progressing through regroupments and similar operations once this stage is reached and the necessary forces have been accumulated to engage in such tactics effectively.

We must also reject the illusion that because the vanguard has the capacity to outflank the traditional bureaucracies, even in determining the objectives and new forms of combat adopted in workers struggles, that these bureaucracies cannot regain control of the mass movement after a certain point in the confrontation. The recent experiences both in the limited strikes in France and in the powerful wave of strikes in Italy clearly prove the opposite.

However, this change in orientation involves the following:

(a) An understanding of the fact that the differentiation within the mass organizations today is less a result of the internal dialectic of ideological debates and factional struggles than of the repercussions within these organizations of the mass struggle and the actions of the vanguard itself. In this sense, orienting toward the new vanguards is essential even for the purpose of accelerating the outbreak of conflicts within the old parties (see the revival of struggle inside the Italian CP, the *Il Manifesto* group; and inside the German Social Democracy at the Munich congress of the *Jungsozialisten* [Young Socialists, the official Social Democratic youth organization], which very clearly resulted from the pressure of the vanguard from the outside).

(b) A realization that in choosing the correct tactic at each stage of their struggle to construct a new revolutionary leadership of the proletariat, revolutionary Marxists must not fail to take into account their own forces, which is also an element in estimating the prospects of any tactic.

In any case, the new orientation set by the European sections continues to require them to follow attentively all developments in the mass organizations of the working class, especially inside the trade unions but also inside the mass parties claiming to represent the workers. The need for continuing or beginning fraction work inside these organizations must be examined at each specific stage in the class struggle, taking into consideration the forces at our disposal, the opportunities, the perspectives for the class struggle in the short and medium term, and the differentiation within the working class.

6. The exact organizational forms by which this new orientation in building mass revolutionary parties should be implemented depends on the particular conditions in each country and no general formula can be given. Broadly speaking, nowhere are the revolutionary Marxists able at present to constitute a party in the Leninist sense of the term, that is, a party capable of leading a significant minority of the proletariat and the other exploited layers in a revolutionary struggle. At best, as in France, the revolutionary Marxists constitute only the initial nucleus of such a party. There are various ways revolutionary Marxists can try to improve their situation for establishing themselves as the preponderant force within the new

vanguard in the short run—giving priority to building a youth organization focused from the outset on the three areas of work (the universities, the factories, and the high schools); or giving priority to building an adult organization (where the vanguard movement has already passed a certain threshold or where the new vanguard is still in its incipient stages); or by a combination of the two. The precise form of the youth organization—whether it is an avowed revolutionary Marxist organization or a vanguard organization encompassing, besides a revolutionary Marxist nucleus, broader layers of youth developing toward revolutionary Marxism but not yet fully convinced—likewise depends on the specific conditions in each country. The Fourth International can maintain a great deal of tactical flexibility as to the precise organizational forms in each country, if it is well understood that the essential condition for carrying out the tasks of party building in the present stage is that the revolutionary Marxist nuclei show a public face, both through their publications and through practical work among the new vanguard and in the class struggle.

7. The main axes of political work by the sections of the Fourth International in the immediate future derive from: (1) a correct appreciation of the objective conditions which have arisen since 1965 and have been powerfully reinforced by May 1968 and the strike wave in Italy [see the editorial in the November 1969 issue of *Quatrième Internationale*, an English translation of which appeared in the December 15 issue of *Intercontinental Press* under the title "The Strike Wave in Europe"]; (2) a thorough understanding of the meaning of the turn taken by the revolutionary Marxists in the struggle to build mass revolutionary parties.

(a) The strategy of transitional demands continues to be the basis for propaganda, and, on occasion, agitation and active intervention in the struggle of the working class. This strategy centers more than ever around the themes of workers control.

(b) Propaganda for workers power and a more precise determination of the concrete implications of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Western Europe in our time assume growing importance in the present stage of rising workers struggles which have been accompanied by a succession of prerevolutionary and revolutionary crises (May 1968 in France, fall 1969 in Italy).

(c) A specific analysis must be made of the strategy for workers struggles in each country both as to the methods of struggle and the most appropriate organizational forms (action committees, strike committees, trade-union fractions, oppositional formations in the trade unions).

(d) The struggle for workers democracy assumes prime importance in this new phase where the relationship of forces between the union bureaucracy and the working masses is beginning to change, but it cannot be said for sure that the workers are capable of rapidly eliminating the bureaucrats. Defending and strengthening union democracy are not only ways of altering the relationship of strength between the bureaucracy and the masses, thus releasing greater forces for the fight against capitalism, but they are also essential means of combating the growing integration of the unions into the bourgeois state and everything that goes with this (wage restrictions,

limitations on the right to strike, prison sentences for wildcat strikes, etc.).

(e) The tendency toward a "strong state," the strengthening of the repressive apparatus, the reappearance of semifascist goon squads, and racist and xenophobic propaganda against immigrant workers all renew the vital importance of intransigently defending the workers' rights and civil liberties, and extending them to all the minorities which are excluded from these rights (foreigners, youth, soldiers), and consolidating them by building workers' self-defense groups.

(f) The crisis of bourgeois leadership, the crisis in the Common Market, and the sharpening interimperialist contradictions are creating a favorable climate for propagandizing for a Socialist United States of Europe as the overall solution for the problems afflicting and tormenting bourgeois society in Europe, that is, as a synonym for workers power on a European scale. The revival of proletarian internationalism, moreover, especially in the young generation, makes such propaganda more fruitful for the revolutionary vanguard. This campaign must be accompanied by an attempt to develop forms of international collaboration and coordination of struggles simultaneously among the revolutionary Marxist organizations, among the broader youth vanguards, and among certain sectors of the European working class where that becomes objectively possible.

(g) The appearance of university and high-school students as a distinct political force beginning in 1967 makes it necessary to formulate a definite strategy for revolutionary Marxists in this milieu so as to avoid the double trap of underestimating it (dismissing it as "petty bourgeois") or overestimating it (which is done primarily by the spontanéist tendencies who disregard its specific social strengths and weaknesses, its place in the productive process, the instability of its situation, and so forth). The

predominance in the student vanguard of tendencies favoring a "worker-student linkup" makes it more important than ever to reaffirm that a revolutionary Leninist organization is the only means of achieving this tie effectively and giving it an objectively revolutionary meaning.

(h) More attention must be paid to the specific demands and problems of young working men and women. These superexploited layers are more capable of suddenly breaking out of the bureaucratic crust. In addition to specific demands, special forms of action must be investigated for tying up with these groups.

(i) Anti-imperialist action and solidarity with the principal sectors of the colonial revolution now in motion (Vietnam, Palestine, Bolivia) have lost none of their value as themes around which to agitate and mobilize. This is still the area where the differentiation among the various currents appears most clearly. It is still where the organizational and theoretical superiority of the Fourth International over sectarian and ultraleft tendencies, such as the Lambertists and the Maoists and primitive or superproletarian tendencies like the spontanéists and the Mao-spontex [pro-Mao spontanéist] groups, is most obvious.

(j) Action in solidarity with the antibureaucratic communist opposition in East Europe and the USSR also assumes growing importance as a result of the increasing sensitivity of the youth vanguard to this question produced by the events in Czechoslovakia and the acute crisis of Stalinism; and as a result of the splits that have occurred in the Communist youth organizations in Austria, Switzerland, Sweden, Belgium, and elsewhere. Finally, the importance of this issue is magnified by the opportunity it offers to advance our ideas about democratic centralism and workers democracy—which are the keys to projecting an image of communism radically different from that which repels the great majority of young workers, students, and high-school youth in West Europe today.

Chingkang Foothills of Canada

The 'Canadian Communist Movement (M-L)'

By Keith Locke

[The following article appeared in the January 26 issue of the *Workers Vanguard*, a Toronto revolutionary-socialist biweekly. It is the third and last of a series on Canadian Maoism. For the first two installments, see the January 26 and March 9 issues of *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

It is indicative of the true nature of Maoism that the strongest Maoist group in Canada at this time is the one least in touch with political reality. This is the Canadian Communist Movement (Marxist-Leninist) [CCM] and its Québec counterpart, Les Intellectuels et Ouvriers Patriotes du Québec (Marxistes-Léninistes). It is the only cross-Canada Maoist organization, but it has no great strength in any one area.

In an apparent attempt to hide this weakness it operates through numerous other "organizations," all of which have the same basic program and none of which involve forces outside of the CCM. These "organizations," some of which put out occasional publications, include the Canadian Revolutionary Youth, the Canadian Student Movement, the Jeunesse Révolutionnaire Québécoise, the High School Student Movement, the Necessity for Change Institute of Ideological Studies, the Progressive Natural Sciences Study Group, the Two Lines in the Natural Sciences Study Group, the Indian Progressive Study Group, the Afro-Asian Youth Movement, the Toronto Support the NLF Committee, the Two World Outlooks Study Group, the Toronto Workers Action Committee and the Workers Defense Committee. Recently, they seem to have overextended their forces; their weekly newspaper, *Mass Line*,

has not appeared for well over a month.

The CCM is the recent successor to the Canadian Internationalists (Marxist-Leninist Youth and Student Movement), but although the activity of the leaders of the Internationalists spans a number of years it is only over the past two years, since they shifted their major forces from Vancouver to Montreal, that they have become a significant force. Their only relation to other Maoist currents has been the loose working relationship which they had until recently with the Vancouver-based Progressive Workers' Movement, the original Canadian Maoist group.

Of all the Maoist groups, the CCM is most explicit in its complete identification with the Mao regime in China. Their paper, *Mass Line*, features reprints from *Peking Review* of all the major statements of the Chinese and Albanian rulers, New China News Agency releases on international events (including North American events), punctuated with quotations from Chairman Mao. It can truthfully be said that half of their paper is written in Peking, and even the Canadian articles are written in Peking literary style using Chinese proverbial sayings and the most extreme and jargonistic words in the English vocabulary. What other Canadian publication would repeatedly hail China as "the Ching Kang mountain of the world revolution"?

Their program for Canada is an artificial transplant from writings of Mao and Stalin, and the experiences of China, an underdeveloped country. For example, they pick up the Mao-Stalin "two-stage" theory of revolution and try to apply it *in toto* to Canada. This theory postulates that before a country that is subject to imperialist domination can have a socialist revolution it must first have a national democratic anti-imperialist revolution which frees it from imperialism, but does not destroy capitalism.

This theory was clearly refuted by the march of events in Russia, Vietnam, Cuba . . . and China, where the only way for the revolution to survive, and to remove the country from the orbit of imperialism, was for it to go socialist.

Surely Canada, with its tightly organized ruling class working in harmony with the U.S. interests which own most of the industry, could not witness an anti-imperialist revolution which was not at the same time socialist. The Mao-Stalin theory, designed to cut across class lines to assist Communist parties like the Chinese in their wretched class-collaborationist maneuvering with bourgeois politicians such as Chiang Kai-shek, and more recently Sukarno and Ayub Khan, becomes absurd in the Canadian context.

The essence of the CCM orientation to Canadian politics and its utterly sectarian and dogmatic style is contained in this statement from its leader, Hardial S. Bains: "In the world today the main problem is U.S. imperialism. You can either agree or disagree with that statement. If a person agrees he must organize to fight imperialism, and if he disagrees, he is already working for imperialism."

Since the majority of Canadians are obviously not pro-imperialist, the logic of CCM's thought entails a totally false, idealized image of Canadian workers as an already consciously anti-imperialist class simply awaiting the call to arms for the democratic, anti-imperialist revolution. The most recent issue of *Mass Line* illustrates this incred-

ible blindness: "All over the province . . . the broad masses of the people, workers and poor small farmers, with anger and bitterness told members of the Workers Defense Committee that once more we are being bled dry to prop up the tottering economic apparatus of U.S. imperialism."

When Trudeau visited Toronto in August, the CCM sent a few of its members to wave their little Red Books of Mao Tsetung's Thoughts and to denounce him as a "U.S. Imperialist Puppet" and "Prince of Lackeys." *Mass Line* reported the outcome as follows:

"The immense pleasure of the broad masses found expression in untold number of discussions which sprang up on the street corners, sidewalks and factory gates throughout the working class districts of Toronto. Whenever the leaflets denouncing Trudeau were distributed or people had heard of the resolute action by the Canadian patriots, they heartily approved of the action." You can almost hear the cheering in Peking.

In reality, of course, the strange, adventurist character of this action meant that it was totally ineffectual, and incomprehensible to Canadian workers. It certainly failed to expose Trudeau.

The CCM sees Canada, and the world generally, as being in an immediate revolutionary situation. The task for them is not mass actions around popular and defensively formulated demands which are designed to raise consciousness, but supermilitant confrontations and violence by a small group to propel the awaiting revolutionary masses out onto the streets behind the bright red banner of "Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung Thought" and the Canadian Communist Movement. But the working people of Canada see absolutely no connection between the Maoist propaganda and their immediate needs.

This inability to relate to the real concerns of the Canadian people is vividly demonstrated in their attitude to the mass antiwar movement. Rather than participate in the antiwar coalition the Maoists tell us "the slogans . . . 'Withdraw U.S. Troops Now' and 'End Canada's Complicity' are completely haywire" because the Canadian bourgeoisie "has no freedom to cut loose from Imperialism." We must cut loose from imperialism, they say, raising the slogan "Escalate People's War." They never explain how we should conduct "People's War" in Canada at this time. As yet their "war" has got no further than throwing rocks at the U.S. consulate in Toronto and beating up other leftists.

When thousands of Ontario workers marched recently to transform the Tory government's medical plan (OHSIP) into a system of real medicare, the CCM (in the guise of the Workers Defense Committee) turned up to distribute leaflets headed "SMASH OHSIP—Tool of U.S. Imperialism" containing an anecdote attempting to show that workers know more about medicine than doctors.

Science is not CCM's strong point. They still hail the totally false "theory of acquired characteristics" put forward by the Soviet biologist Lysenko during the Stalin period. This absurd theory, running completely counter to the whole science of genetics as it has developed over the past hundred years, and which seriously set back Soviet biology, was favored by Stalin because he thought it was in harmony with his own warped version of Marxism. Lysenko is just a bad joke among scientists today.

"Class Struggle in the Classroom" is their slogan for

the university, but it amounts to little more than the mouthing of a "Marxism" reduced to a few clichés, and small sectarian demonstrations to "defend" those of their members who are persecuted in the course of their often adventurist political activity.

The corollary of CCM's idealization of the revolutionary mood of Canadian workers is its conviction that class tensions are already so fierce that fascism is imminent if not already with us. "The real issue is fascism and the fight against it—nothing else," CCMers proclaim. To them, every arrest, every anti-Mao film or article is evidence, not of Canadian capitalism operating as usual, but of growing fascism.

They completely fail to understand the Marxist analysis that fascism is not ordinary capitalist repression, but a dictatorial form of rule, reverted to by the bourgeoisie in a situation of acute social tension to destroy a revolutionary movement which threatens to take power. Fascism destroys all civil rights and independent working-class organization. In Canada at this time there is not even a visible fascist movement.

Seen through the deep red spectacles of the CCMers, society is tottering between anti-imperialist revolution and imperialist fascism and you have to take sides right now. Other working-class and student tendencies who, unlike the "broad masses," do not agree with the CCM analysis and tactics in this "revolutionary situation" are deemed to "serve imperialism." Here are some incredible but typically sectarian and ignorant formulations from *Mass Line*:

"The 'international' unions controlled from Washington are nothing but the tools of U. S. domination of Canada." "The 'New Left' is the mortal enemy of the working class in this country as well as in the United States." "CUS [Canadian Union of Students] in the past has aided imperialist interests by negotiating student loans, student flight plans, life insurance, etc." The NDP [New Democratic party—Canada's labor party] is a "pillar of imperialism."

Anyone who stands in their way gets a similar treatment. This is how *Mass Line* reported the reply of their salesman when the manager of the Winnipeg Union Center refused his permission to sell papers in the building: "You will be dragged from your comfortable office and hanged by the workers for your sins against the people while in the service of your U. S. bosses."

Their own "public" meetings are conducted in the same intimidating atmosphere. They inform us: "There are two rules at mass democracy meetings: no investigation, no right to speak and no sophistry or rhetoric." On a number of occasions radicals who have deviated from these declared "rules"—by speaking against a Maoist political position, for example—have been physically attacked. This sectarianism and thuggery of the CCM towards other tendencies flows naturally from its Stalinist political heritage.

In Québec, the very place where in fact social tensions are quite acute, and where there is a mass national liberation struggle, the CCM dismisses the very forces leading this struggle as fascist. The Québécois are fighting for the survival of their language through such demands as a unilingual French educational system, but all the Maoists see in this is French-Canadian "national chauvinism" which, they say, leads to fascism. In a futile at-

tempt to explain the mass conflict in Québec they state that Anglo-Canadian colonialism rules Québec but is opposed by a rising French-Canadian bourgeoisie whose interests lie even more closely with American imperialism.

All nationalist groups other than the Maoists, from Lévesque's Parti Québécois through to the Ligue pour l'Intégration Scolaire are declared to be connected to this supposedly "national chauvinist" pro-imperialist bloc of the rising French-Canadian bourgeoisie. And "once the struggle between the Anglo-Canadian colonialists and the Quebec compradors is decided, then the winner will attempt to impose full blown fascism on the Quebec people."

But how can they describe every single Québec nationalist organization as "national chauvinist" and still declare that they will rally "all the anti-imperialist, democratic elements in Quebec, the small farmers, small businessmen, oppressed students and others around the banner of New Democracy, antifascism and national liberation"? How do they explain away the clear evidence that French-Canadian capitalists, far from "rising," are continually being taken over or bankrupted by Anglo-Canadian and U. S. monopoly capital?

Isn't this just the ultimate cop-out—that behind all its ultraleft phrases, the CCM is really opposed to any mass movement that goes beyond the rigid mechanistic schema of the "democratic" revolution to anticapitalist conclusions? The revolutionary significance of Québec's national struggle is precisely that it is not based on a rising capitalist class, but reflects in the first place the developing political consciousness of the French-Canadian working class. To recognize this, however, would be inconsistent with CCM's "two-stage" theory of revolution.

The CCM parallels Mao's sectarian line towards the Cuban revolution. Far from defending Cuba as a workers' state, they have seen it as their duty to hold widely publicized meetings across the country "exposing" Castroism as "liberal-bourgeois" ideology.

These Maoists are unable to see any further than their clichés about U. S. imperialism, fascism and Anglo-Canadian colonialism. Not only do they withdraw from those real struggles which are raising the consciousness of the Canadian people, such as the antiwar struggle and the language struggle in Québec, but they denounce them as pro-imperialist "single issue" squabbles. Ultraleftism and sectarian adventurism are their sole theoretical baggage.

These traits, accompanied by Stalinist strong-arm tactics against political opponents on the left, are common to a greater or lesser degree to all the Maoist groups in Canada. For all of them, ultraleft phrasemongering is a substitute for a serious Marxist analysis of the real mass movement, and involvement in the ongoing struggles of Canadian workers.

The politics of these groups, acting as the Canadian arm of the bureaucratic caste which rules the Chinese workers state, demonstrates clearly the harmful role of Maoism as an international tendency. Its sectarianism, ultraleftism, adventurism and phrasemongering—and its opportunist opposition in practice to real anticapitalist movements—can only result in demoralizing the radicalized students and worker youth who embrace Maoism in the tragically mistaken belief that it represents the authentic voice of Marxism and revolutionary socialism in our time.