



CANADA'S PRIME MINISTER TRUDEAU: "All I can say is go on and bleed. . . ." See page 893.

Trudeau Imposes Police Rule in Canada

How Washington and Tel Aviv
Saved King Hussein

Solzhenitsyn's Nobel Prize

Hugo Blanco:

To Win, We Must Learn
How to Reach the Masses

Bolivia:

Another Revolution Like Santo Domingo?

Oceans Can't Take It

Dr. John H. Ryther of the Woods Hole (Massachusetts) Oceanographic Institution takes a bleak view of the possibilities of farming the seas to provide huge sources of protein.

In a telephone interview published in the October 4 *New York Times*, he said that on the basis of two decades of studies made on voyages by the institution's research vessels, 90 percent of the world's oceans must be proclaimed "a biological desert," and the remaining areas "are probably being fished to a maximum efficiency now."

Moreover, domestic waste "is being discharged at a fearful rate from urban areas into conveniently close marine dumping grounds."

This is "leading in extreme cases to the gradual but certain death of commercially useful marine animals, and leaving the waters undesirable if not repugnant."

A still more alarming report was made by Jacques Yves Cousteau, famed for his underwater films, upon stopping at Monaco at the end of September after studying almost all the oceans in a three-and-a-half-year, round-the-world cruise.

"Pollution has become so extensive," he said, "that we estimate that 40 percent of marine life has disappeared."

The researchers on the *Catypso*, which he commands, found that pollution is causing the disintegration of coral reefs, that entire species of aquatic animals are becoming extinct.

A striking fact, he cited, is that thousands of tuna die each year from swallowing metal bottle caps dumped in the ocean.

Landlord Requires Due Notice

When a resident of a municipal housing project in the English city of Wolverhampton died recently, the project's housing office sent her survivors a bill for one month's rent. Grounds for the claim, according to the London *Sunday Times* of October 4, were that the woman "had not given notice to quit her tenancy."

Better Than DDT?

Since 1967, 132 persons in the United States have been killed by the insecticide parathion.

In This Issue

		FEATURES
Hugo Blanco	890	Oceans Can't Take It
	905	To Win, We Must Learn How to Reach the Masses
Gerry Foley	891	BOLIVIA Another Revolution Like Santo Domingo?
Robert Dumont	893	CANADA Trudeau Imposes Police Rule
		CHINA
	897	Canada and China Establish Diplomatic Relations
	912	Good Harvests Reported in Many Areas
		JORDAN
Les Evans	898	Hussein Shells Four More Villages
	900	How Washington and Tel Aviv Saved King Hussein
	901	How the Press Reported Events in Irbid
		SOUTH AFRICA
	898	White Students Protest Apartheid Laws
Ranjan Roy	899	INDIA Police Mobilized Against Rebel Peasant Movement
George Saunders	903	SOVIET UNION Solzhenitsyn's Acceptance of Nobel Prize
		IRELAND
	904	Youths Battle Troops in Belfast, Derry City
	909	Interview with John McGregor
		CUBA
	907	That Mysterious "Submarine Base"
		U. S. A.
	911	Fresh Support in Mandel Case
		REVIEWS
	907	Israel and Nationalism
	908	Fateh's Case for a Democratic Palestine
		DOCUMENTS
	896	Canadian Trotskyist Statement on War Measures Act
		DRAWINGS
Copain	889	Pierre Elliott Trudeau; 891, Juan Jose Torres; 899, Indira Gandhi; 900, Golda Meir; 904, Eamonn McCann; 912, Mao Tsetung

Intercontinental Press, Post Office Box 635, Madison Square Station, 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.

Bolivia — Another Revolution Like Santo Domingo?

By Gerry Foley

"What has happened in Bolivia is, at least for the moment, rather like the revenge of the revolution smothered in Santo Domingo in 1965," Latin-American expert Marcel Niedergang wrote in the October 9 issue of *Le Monde*.

"It must be noted," Niedergang pointed out, "that the liberal officers are a definite minority in the Bolivian army. It is the alliance of these officers with the student organizations and the Workers Federation and not the number of tanks or military units which they control that enabled General Torres to win out. In the Dominican Republic in May 1965 the liberal officers were also only a small handful. The uprising and the support of the left parties had brought them to the verge of victory. They were stopped short by the intervention of some 40,000 soldiers sent by the United States to prevent the development of 'another Cuba.'"

The popular explosion touched off by an abortive rightist military coup October 4 might also be regarded as the "revenge" of the Bolivian revolution of 1952.

The recent events indicate that neither the betrayals of the reformist regime brought to power by the revolution nor the military dictatorships following the Barrientos coup in 1964 succeeded in effectively suppressing the process initiated eighteen years ago.

Reports in the international press indicate that the popular mobilization in Bolivia has equaled the one in the Dominican Republic in power and explosiveness, possibly exceeding it in scope. The Bolivian masses have mobilized not in just one city but in cities and towns throughout the country, including some tin-mining areas.

In the week following the defeat of the right-wing military faction headed by General Rogelio Miranda, several relatively small articles appeared in inconspicuous places in the *New York Times*, all of them slanted to portray "lawlessness" on the loose in the Andean country.

"Marxist students and urban guer-



TORRES: Is image 'leftist' enough to divert masses from moving forward?

rillas virtually have destroyed Bolivia's national police force during the last few days and are imposing a reign of terror on the nation," *New York Times* correspondent Malcolm Browne wired October 10 from La Paz.

"Students armed with rifles, pistols, and submachine guns have taken over civilian police headquarters throughout Bolivia, burning police files and forcing the resignation of high officials. . . . Terrorism and assassination have become routine."

A Reuters dispatch buried in the October 16 issue of the *Times* reported: "Left-wing workers seized the country's tin mines last night [October 14], expelled police guards and announced that they intended to reorganize the state mining corporation."

Furthermore, it appears so far that the "liberal" General Torres, swept to power by the mass mobilization, has made little progress in harnessing the popular forces. "General Torres, it seems, refuses to proceed hastily to purge the ranks of the armed forces or make the transfers which alone

could assure his survival in power," Philippe Labreveux wrote from La Paz in the October 11 issue of *Le Monde*. "The Bolivian Labor Federation, which has been denied the arms it demanded from Torres, fears that the president's vacillation will eventually throw him into the hands of the 'fascists.'"

"In fact, the federation and the forces grouped around it are not yet settled in their attitude toward the Torres government. They canceled a meeting for Friday [October 9] that had been scheduled to demonstrate their support."

The leadership of the mass mobilization that blocked the rightist coup was demanding a type of regime very different from the new "liberal" junta set up by Torres. In the October 13 *Le Monde*, Labreveux reported: "The popular forces were demanding first of all recognition of a 'political command' composed of workers, students, and left political parties, which have formed a 'popular parliament,' it is claimed. In short, they wanted to establish the 'dual power' demanded by the Bolivian Trotskyists. But this demand outraged all the officers so much that it could not be accepted."

The French correspondent indicated that two factors prevented the mobilized masses from going all the way to establishing their own government: (1) an as yet unresolved political struggle among the left forces; (2) the survival of the military machine.

With regard to the situation on the left, Labreveux wrote: "Forged in the fire of last week's events, the 'political command' is torn between the different forces that compose it—the Workers Federation, the student federation, the peasants of the Independent Bloc, the MNR [Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario — Revolutionary Nationalist Movement, the demagogic party that gained power as a result of the 1952 revolution], the Communists and the Trotskyists, a medley of opinions and shadings."

The opportunist elements of the left seemed to be lining up behind Torres

as the last bulwark against the developing revolutionary process. "The former president of the Revolutionary Nationalist Movement (reformist), Siles Suazo declared Saturday [October 10] that the country was still 'sitting on a powder keg.' Returning from exile to lead his movement, he nevertheless maintained his support for the government, which, he said, 'is the only possible immediate solution in view of the threat of a bloodbath.' That is also the opinion of Juan Lechín, general secretary of the Bolivian Workers Federation [Central Obrero Boliviana — COB]," according to Labreux.

On the other hand, although the army has withdrawn to its barracks in face of the mass mobilization, it apparently remains substantially intact. The threat of a new military coup serves as counterpressure to the demands of the popular forces.

"Of course the right-wing officers have lost their leader, General Rogelio Miranda, who took refuge in the Argentine embassy," Labreux commented in the October 11 issue of *Le Monde*. "But the 'putschists,' thwarted by the boldness of General Torres and the vigilance of the labor unions, still have forces in the capital and provinces whose importance is hard to evaluate. . . . In the provinces, with the exception of the Cochabamba garrison, the officers have not yet clearly defined their position."

In view of the threat of a right-wing countercoup and the fears of the reformists Labreux suggests, the left "reduced its demands to three points that they consider essential—raising the wages of the miners to the pre-1965 level; a general amnesty and repeal of the repressive laws, and finally a purge of the armed forces.

"This last demand assumes crucial importance in the eyes of the civilians. They generally distrust military men and remember the misadventures of General Ovando, who became 'the tool of the fascists.'"

The demand of the left forces to crush the right wing in the army strikes directly at the essential support of the bourgeois state in Bolivia. The military machine was painfully rebuilt, following its destruction in the 1952 revolution, by the U.S. "aid" establishment and native proimperialist forces. The bulk of the officer corps is "right wing." Torres himself played a leading role in the campaign against

the guerrillas led by Che Guevara, a U.S. supervised "counterinsurgency" operation.

For Torres, the still uncontrolled mass mobilization constitutes a mortal threat. His first problem is to overcome the divisions within the military and, as rapidly as possible, then rebuild its repressive capacities. On the other hand, after the experience of the past five years, even the most opportunistic sections of the left have little choice, if they hope to remain in popular favor, but to demand curbs on the military caste.

Despite the formidable pressures of the mobilized masses, Torres has resisted taking any decisive measures against the right wing of the army. On assuming power, Torres promised that General Rogelio Miranda would be given a "post commensurate with his military rank." The three generals composing the junta set up by Miranda have not been removed from their posts. Even former minister of the interior, Colonel Miguel Ayroa Montana, who continued to resist Torres's authority, has not been removed from the army. He is supposed to be "transferred" to another post.

Nevertheless, the reactionary ex-chief of the Bolivian repressive forces took refuge in the Uruguayan embassy. He may have believed that Torres could not protect him from the armed popular units reportedly still operating in La Paz.

Torres has "obviously not carried out the purge of the army desired by left political circles," Labreux noted.

The precedent of the April 1965 revolution in Santo Domingo has another aspect that should be noted. Washington intervened in Santo Domingo after the Constitutionalist officers facilitated arming the people. The Johnson administration sent in U.S. troops when it looked like the right-wing generals and, along with them, the entire military apparatus upholding the capitalist state appeared doomed. Perhaps Washington would not have intervened militarily if it had thought there was a possibility for the Dominican military caste to save itself.

In any case, in the current situation in Bolivia the State Department let it be known that it would continue to recognize the Bolivian government on the basis that the army was still in control. "Robert J. McCloskey, the State Department spokesman, said that the new administrator [General

Torres] had come into power through 'institutional action' by the Bolivian armed forces," the *New York Times* reported October 14.

The American authorities seemed to appreciate the difficulties of Torres's position, hence their readiness to give him considerable room for maneuver.

The *New York Times*, which speaks for a weighty sector of the American capitalist class, wrote in an editorial October 12: "This leftward thrust in South America, propelled in part by a powerful anti-Yankee sentiment, is certain to cause problems for the United States. They are not problems that can be solved or eased by intervention of any kind—direct or indirect, overt or covert, military or economic. Here will be a period in which the northern Big Brother, in his own long-run interest, must absorb unfair blows, resist the urge to retaliate, and maintain whatever ties are possible and such assistance as seems practical when it is requested."

Writing from La Paz October 16, Malcolm Browne described a new forbearance on the part of the imperialist authorities: "In the face of growing anti-American terrorism and assaults on United States property condoned by the La Paz Government, the United States has decided to turn the other cheek toward Bolivia."

There seemed to be two reasons for Washington's cautious approach: (1) the situation has deteriorated so far in Bolivia that it could only be retrieved by a full-scale occupation of the country; (2) present circumstances make massive intervention extremely difficult politically, if not impossible.

The failure of the U.S.-backed Miranda coup showed not only the ineffectiveness of indirect intervention in the present situation in Bolivia but its danger. This attempt, in fact, touched off the explosion. In the October 9 issue of *Le Monde*, Marcel Niedergang put the blame on U.S. ambassador to La Paz, Ernest V. Siracusa.

"In La Paz, with hundreds of American functionaries and 'advisers' at his command, Siracusa tried to bring the Ovando government back 'to the straight and narrow.' It must be admitted that he was very close to succeeding. But in wanting to press his advantages, win more quickly and completely, obtain the replacement of the indecisive General Ovando by a more resolutely pro-American general

like Lechin Suarez, Siracusa played the role of the sorcerer's apprentice. He indirectly brought the left-wing forces that had been on the defensive since May back to the fore."

In the *New York Times* "Week in Review" section, October 11, Malcolm Browne described the advanced state of decay of the capitalist system in Bolivia and the total failure of the local bourgeoisie to develop any firm base.

"Eighteen years ago, a polyglot mob of politicians, leftist militants, tin miners, students and Indians took up arms against the Bolivian army and ended by smashing it. In some respects history seemed to be repeating itself during the past week. Some kind of civilian revolution had taken place and some of its leaders were the same as in 1952. . . .

"There were fears that a period of anarchy and violence lay ahead in Bolivia, and fears too that the nation might end up as a Marxist state. But more disturbing to many Bolivians

was the thought that their country had basically accomplished nothing during the past decade, and remained as unstable as ever."

Time magazine indicated in its October 19 issue that Torres was pushed forward at the last minute to save the military caste from being overwhelmed by the popular mobilization and that his coup was only a token gesture: "After meeting with Ovando, General Torres sped to a military base outside La Paz and quickly rallied left support. When leftist air force pilots flying vintage Mustang fighters strafed the presidential palace — taking care to fire only into the air — it was all over."

The fact that the events in Bolivia have been so strikingly played down in the American press, in contrast to previous revolutionary developments in Latin America, indicates the political difficulties for Washington in intervening.

The upheaval in Bolivia coincides with Nixon's "peace" offensive and the

American elections. The development of the movement against the Vietnam war has created an entirely different situation on the home front from the one facing Lyndon Johnson in April 1965.

Furthermore, the countries surrounding Bolivia, especially Chile, are also moving leftward. The State Department may well have decided that it was tactically advisable to concentrate attention on the situation in Chile for the time being, making Bolivia second in priorities.

Still the question remains how much U.S. imperialism can concede in Bolivia if the mobilization continues and gains in energy. At what point will Wall Street decide that a showdown is inescapable?

"I hope the soft touch turns out to be worth it," the proprietor of a small, American-owned business said, "according to Malcolm Browne October 16. "It sure wasn't worth it in Cuba, and South America seems more like Cuba every day."

Resistance Spreads Against Witch-hunt

Trudeau Imposes Police Rule in Canada

By Robert Dumont

Toronto

OCTOBER 18—More than 300 people have been jailed in massive police raids across Quebec since the October 16 proclamation by the federal government of the War Measures Act. About 4,000 troops, backed up by 12,000 police, are occupying the province and the federal capital, Ottawa.

As we write, university campuses in Montreal and Quebec City have been closed down by students protesting the military occupation, and a campaign to free those who have been jailed is being mounted by Quebec civil liberties forces with the active help of key trade unions.

Among those arrested, who include a cross section of the political and trade-union leaders, writers, and artists in the left, are two leaders of the Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière [LSO—Socialist Workers League], the Quebec Trotskyist organization. The arrest of Arthur Young and Penny Simpson is a direct blow to the LSO's cam-

paign for the Montreal mayoralty in the October 25 civic election. Young and Simpson are official publicity agent and treasurer, respectively, of the LSO's candidate, Manon Léger. Also arrested are two candidates for Montreal city council representing the Front d'Action Politique [FRAP—Political Action Front], a trade-union-backed political party contesting the civic election for the first time.

Among the detainees are at least five officials of the Confederation of National Trade Unions [CNTU], including the president of the CNTU's Montreal Central Council, Michel Chartrand. At least thirty-five members of the Parti Québécois, the mass independentist party, are also believed to be detained. The authorities have released no lists of those arrested. No charges have been laid; no court appearances scheduled. The arrests are still continuing. At last reports, today, the police acknowledged a total of 596 separate raids so far.

This marks the beginning of a massive offensive by all levels of government in Canada against the growing nationalist movement for an independent Quebec.

The current crisis was sparked by the kidnapping October 5 of James Cross, the British trade commissioner in Montreal, by members of the Front de Libération du Québec [FLQ—Quebec Liberation Front], a terrorist organization which has been functioning intermittently since 1963. In recent years, self-professed members of the FLQ have been tried on criminal charges involving hundreds of bombings, arson, and a couple of killings. It is estimated that more than a hundred "Felquistes" [FLQers] are or have been serving jail terms for periods of up to life imprisonment.

The demands of Cross's kidnapers, communicated to the Quebec and federal governments via radio stations, included the immediate release of a number of political prisoners, later

determined at twenty-three, and their transport to either Cuba or Algeria; payment of a "voluntary tax" of \$500,000 in gold bullion; the immediate rehiring of 450 mail delivery truck drivers indirectly fired by the federal government last spring in a change of post-office contracts; and publication in the mass media of a "political Manifesto."

The FLQ Manifesto, reprinted within a few days in all the major newspapers in Quebec and Canada, is a stirring requisitory of the frustrations and resentments of the Québécois, this oppressed nation which constitutes one-third of the present population of Canada. The statement solidarizes with the massive struggle in recent years for a French unilingual Quebec; it denounces the bosses, both English Canadian and French Canadian, and the "Roman Capitalist Church," and it calls for "workers power," the "total independence of the Québécois united in a free society purged forever of its clique of voracious sharks, the big bosses and their vultures who have made Quebec their preserve of cheap labor and unscrupulous exploitation."

Until the last Quebec election, April 29, it says, the FLQ had "thought it worthwhile to support and work in the Parti Québécois"—a bourgeois party—but the victory of the Liberals under Robert Bourassa had convinced them that only the workers are capable of making the revolution. The Manifesto concluded with a rather vague call to the workers to take power: "don't wait for a miracle organization . . ."

As an eloquent denunciation of obvious and deeply felt injustices and national humiliations, the Manifesto is well-calculated to strike a responsive chord among many Québécois. However, the paucity of its program, the absence of any concrete proposal capable of mobilizing the workers in mass action, reveals the severe political limitations of the FLQ and its adventurist emphasis on individual terror.

The LSO has consistently opposed the FLQ's methods in the Quebec left, and counterposed its own program which projects politicalization of the workers through their class organizations, the trade unions, around the demand for a labor party.

From the beginning, the federal and Quebec governments took a hard

stand against any significant concessions to the FLQ demands. Instead, they launched a massive manhunt for the kidnappers and their hostages. Within five days more than fifty people had been arrested and detained for intensive questioning; among them a young lawyer, Robert Lemieux, who has been an active defender of Quebec's political prisoners and who was designated by the FLQ as their go-between with the authorities.

On October 10 events took a new turn with the FLQ's second kidnapping. This time the victim was a prominent Quebec politician, Labor Minister Pierre Laporte, a candidate earlier this year for the Liberal party leadership and the author this summer of an emergency bill that broke the strike of thousands of construction workers.

From his hidden incarceration, Laporte wrote to Premier Bourassa: "Decide—my life or my death . . . The success of this manhunt would be my death warrant."

The Quebec government responded by naming a negotiator October 12 to meet with Lemieux. But on the same day the federal government began to move troops into Ottawa, ostensibly to guard politicians and government buildings.

While authorities played for time, the crisis atmosphere was escalated dramatically. Montreal's mayor Jean Drapeau canceled all public appearances. John Robarts, the Conservative premier of Ontario, the neighboring and richest province, rumbled ominously: "It's war—total war . . . We have to stand and fight."

Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau denounced critics of his call-up of the military as "weak-kneed bleeding hearts," who "don't like the looks of an army." He was quoted as adding, "All I can say is go on and bleed."

On Thursday, October 15, Ottawa ordered troops into Montreal and Quebec City, the provincial capital. Trudeau canceled his scheduled state visit to the Soviet Union. Premier Bourassa made his "final" offer to the FLQ—the province would recommend parole for five of the twenty-three political prisoners and safe passage for the kidnappers to Cuba or Algeria. (Also Ottawa's External Affairs Minister Mitchell Sharp later revealed that the prisoners in question were eligible for parole anyway.)

Meanwhile, however, Quebec political opinion had begun to recover from its initial numbness in the face of these startling developments to which it had been a passive spectator.

As the troops rolled into Quebec's cities, leaders of the three big labor federations with a combined membership of 600,000, together with Parti Québécois leader René Lévesque, the head of the Quebec cooperative movement, and the leading newspaper publisher, issued an appeal to the governments to meet the FLQ demand for the release of the twenty-three political prisoners.

The CNTU's Montreal central council representing 60,000 workers passed a motion supporting the views of the FLQ Manifesto.

Media interviews with the man in the street revealed considerable support for the FLQ views. (An October 11 election rally of 1,000 supporters of the Front d'Action Politique had given a standing ovation to FRAP leader Paul Cliche when he said that insofar as the objectives of the FLQ are the taking of political and economic power by the Quebec workers, he supported the FLQ, and that the violence he condemned was that of the system.)

A tumultuous mass meeting on October 15 at the University of Montreal passed motions for a general student strike in support of the FLQ demands, endorsed the FLQ's Manifesto, and decided to launch "a public information campaign to extend the solidarity between the people and the 'patriotes' of the FLQ."

Following a similar meeting at the University of Quebec campus in Montreal, students occupied the administration offices and pledged to keep the campus shut until all the demands of the FLQ were met. Other meetings were scheduled for the next day at many of the forty junior colleges and in some high schools.

A showdown was shaping up. As the deadline for the government's "final" offer to the FLQ expired at 3:00 a.m. on Friday, October 16, Mayor Drapeau and Premier Bourassa, acting in accordance with obvious prearrangement, informed the government of an "apprehended insurrection." At 4:00 a.m., the federal cabinet invoked the War Measures Act, canceling the civil liberties of all Canadians until April 30, 1971. By the time par-

liament met at 11:00 a.m. to discuss this drastic measure, more than 150 persons had already been arrested, most of them in predawn raids; by midafternoon the number was 250.

A word about the War Measures Act. Hitherto only proclaimed in time of war, this act permits the cabinet to assume virtually unlimited civil and military powers on the sole basis of its belief that "war, invasion or insurrection, real or apprehended, exist . . ." These arbitrary powers include censorship, arrest, detention, exclusion and deportation, transport of persons and things, the disposal of property, etc. Violations of its provisions may involve fines of up to \$5,000 and/or imprisonment for five years.

Under this act thousands of Japanese Canadians were transported from the West Coast to concentration camps in the interior of Canada during the second world war and their property was expropriated. The first victim to be jailed under the act in 1939 was a leader of the Canadian Trotskyist movement.

But it is true to say that until October 16 few Canadians were aware that the government had at its disposal what one newspaper described as the most far-reaching emergency legislation of any western capitalist country. Commentators looking for parallels could cite only the British emergency laws employed against the Irish insurrection in 1920.

Accompanying the October 16 proclamation was a regulation banning the Front de Libération du Québec "or any group of persons or association that advocates the use of force or the commission of crime as a means of or aid in accomplishing governmental change in Canada."

The regulations provide that in any prosecution, evidence that a person ever attended a meeting of the banned organization or communicated its statements, is "in the absence of evidence to the contrary, proof that he is a member of the unlawful association." The regulations also endow police with virtually unlimited powers of arrest without warrant.

Detainees under the act can be held up to twenty-one days after arrest without knowing the charge against them, and up to ninety days without trial.

In a hysterical speech widely played up in the press, Manpower Minister Jean Marchand tried to justify this

Draconian legislation to the House of Commons on October 16. He referred to an alleged secret police report which claims that the FLQ, with admittedly slightly over 100 members, "are infiltrated in all the vital places of the province of Quebec, in all the key jobs where all the important decisions are made.

"If we had not acted, the separation of Quebec would have been a fact, a month or a year from today."

But Justice Minister John Turner indicated more precisely the nature of the "apprehended insurrection." He cited the kidnappings, a recent increase in bombings and dynamite threats, "and, more disturbing, a type of erosion of the public will and the feeling among some sincere people that an exchange of prisoners for the victims of the kidnappings would somehow ease the situation."

He continued: "I might say, too, that the recent call to public manifestation by men like [Charles] Gagnon, [Pierre] Vallières and [Michel] Chartrand established and escalated the whole coming together of an infiltration of FLQ doctrine in certain areas of society in Quebec—in the unions, among universities, in the media. . ."

It was the government's fear of this mass movement, beginning to develop against the repression and the military occupation, that led the government to invoke the War Measures Act.

The leaders of the New Democratic party [NDP—Canada's labor party] criticized the government for invoking the War Measures Act; instead, they say, it should have sought stronger criminal law from parliament. But they miss the point—the War Measures Act was used precisely because it enabled the government to bypass parliament, and thus gain the element of surprise. The immediate effect intended by the mass arrests has been to decapitate the mass movement, incapacitating those most likely to provide its leadership.

Attempts are now being made to use the October 17 shooting of Laporte by the FLQ to whip up a campaign against "revolutionary" groups in general. There is a danger that corresponding measures might be included in special enabling legislation that the government has promised to bring before parliament in the near future.

Some bourgeois spokesmen, among them former Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, have called for a bill similar to the old Section 98 of the criminal code passed during the 1919 Winnipeg general strike and until 1938, when it was repealed, used to outlaw the Communist party.

Because the arrests and other measures under the War Measures Act have so far been confined to Quebec and its immediate vicinity (Ottawa), public reaction in English Canada to this wholesale attack on civil liberties is still very muted. Outside Quebec, with the exception of minor incidents of police harassment, even the revolutionary left has so far been left unmolested. The government would seem to be trying to avoid provocations that could mobilize English Canadian opinion against it, and thereby inhibit the relatively free hand it enjoys against Quebec.

Sympathy for the Québécois independentist movement among English Canadians outside the radical left is almost nonexistent; the bureaucratic leadership of the trade unions and the NDP, linking their fate with that of the bourgeois state, are inveterate opponents of independentism. There is little understanding even of the Québécois right of self-determination.

But crucial to English Canadian public reaction will be what happens in Quebec itself. The toleration of Ottawa's oppression of Quebec is largely based on a misapprehension that the current crisis is entirely the work of a small band of adventurists, unrepresentative of the Québécois feeling.

Yet as it becomes obvious that the new antinationalist offensive, far from checkmating the independentist movement, has given it a whole new thrust and perspective—and this is certain—opinion in English Canada as well will become increasingly polarized with respect to the Quebec question.

Some of the more astute observers in the bourgeois press are already uneasily drawing attention to the possible repercussions of the deep-going infuriation of Québécois at the federal military occupation and repression. Claude Arpin of the *Toronto Telegram* noted October 17 that Bourassa's calling in the army "will likely go down in history as his biggest blunder." In Arpin's view it "may have assured the eventual success in

this province of a separatist Parti Québécois."

Broadcaster-journalist Peter Desbarats noted in the *Toronto Star* the ambivalent feelings of some with respect to the new political situation ushered in by the kidnapping crisis:

"I have spoken to many Québécois this week who are torn between their humanitarian instincts [toward the hostages] and this subconscious pride in the final shattering of the old lamb-like image of Jean Baptiste [patron saint of French Canada]."

Moves to fight the repression are now underway. In Quebec a special meeting of the executives of the Free Labor Federation has denounced the military occupation and repression, and called a special plenary meeting of their supreme body in Quebec City for Wednesday, October 21, "to decide on means of action to save this democracy in Quebec." Civil liberties activists have formed a Front Commun de la Liberté [Common Front for Freedom]

with the active help of the CNTU. It may be contacted at 1001 Rue St-Denis, Montreal.

In English Canada protest demonstrations took place at a number of campuses on October 16 immediately following the proclamation of the War Measures Act. Other actions were held in many cities over the weekend—1,000 persons participated in Vancouver, 800 in Regina, 300 in Winnipeg, 500 in Toronto, 100 in Ottawa, 80 in Saskatoon. Mass meetings are scheduled in Edmonton, Fredrickton, London, and other centers. The perspective now is to build this developing opposition into a massive campaign for immediate repeal of the War Measures Act and all the repressive legislation, and for the immediate withdrawal of federal troops from Quebec.

The Canadian Trotskyists of the League for Socialist Action and the Young Socialists are in the forefront of these actions.

Speak out for French unilingualism and a workers government in these elections?

Who is to say that the victims of this act will be limited to those whose views may be described as revolutionary? Even prior to the application of the War Measures Act the officers of the Front d'Action Politique, the trade-union-backed party, were raided repeatedly, as much as three times in one day. Hundreds of persons have been arrested and held incommunicado. Lawyers' files have been seized. The daily press reports that "tons of literature" have been carted away.

The LSA/LSO does not advocate violence to achieve its aims. We do not agree with the methods employed by the Front de Libération du Québec. Socialism will not be brought about by kidnapping people or by killing ministers of the government. Socialism in Canada will only come through the intervention of the working class, conscious of the necessity of socialism. Far from educating or mobilizing the masses, individual terrorism confines them to the role of passive spectators while exposing its practitioners to victimization by the state which has a vast repressive apparatus at its disposal.

Prime Minister Trudeau has claimed that the FLQ kidnappings were "the opening play" in the current escalation of violence and counterviolence. But the roots of this crisis are to be found in the national oppression of the Québec nation—the violence that is visited upon the Québécois every day by the capitalist system in the form of unemployment, poverty, the constant violation of the most elementary democratic rights, including the right to work in one's own language.

Shock and grief are understandably expressed at the killing of Monsieur Pierre Laporte. But how much protest have we heard from the rulers of this country against the genocide of the Vietnamese people, or the recent bombings of Palestinian refugee camps in Jordan? The ruling class of Canada and Quebec are part and parcel of the same system of organized violence that is responsible for these atrocities. The present rulers of Quebec are guilty of mass violence in their opposition to the legitimate movement for national rights of the Québécois. They have passed laws to protect the language privileges of the English mi-

Canadian Trotskyist Statement

Repeal the War Measures Act!

[The following statement was issued October 18 by the League for Socialist Action/Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière, the Canadian Trotskyist organization.]

* * *

The League for Socialist Action/Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière, itself a victim of the sweeping, arbitrary provisions of the War Measures Act, calls for the immediate repeal of this and all similar repressive legislation. We protest in the strongest terms this brutal violation by the Trudeau cabinet of the democratic rights of all Canadians.

The act in effect suspends the operation of civil liberties throughout this country. In addition to the unrestricted power it gives the government and its police to censor publications, arrest persons, and otherwise restrict or abolish individual liberties, the act has already been interpreted by the combined Quebec police forces as a license to ban the distribution, even the possession, of tracts or other "political documents," and to arrest "anyone in

possession of posters, stickers, or pamphlets of a political nature" (*Toronto Star*, October 16).

The wide-ranging provisions of the act, according to unnamed "officials" cited in the press, could include the banning of not just the FLQ, but "any association which any policeman judges guilty of planning revolutionary change" (*Toronto Star*, October 16).

Already leading members of the Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière have been arrested and are being held incommunicado, including Arthur Young and Penny Simpson, respectively official publicity agent and campaign treasurer of Manon Léger, the candidate of the LSO and the Ligue des Jeunes Socialistes for the Montreal mayoralty.

We protest this crude attempt to deprive the people of Montreal of the right to acquaint themselves with a socialist program and a democratic alternative in the current civic elections. Manon Léger's campaign is based on the demand for an independent socialist Quebec. Is it a crime to

nority. Attempting to repress the growing mass movement, they have legislated severe restrictions on civil liberties, including bans on demonstrations, laws permitting search and arrest without warrant, etc.

In recent days it was becoming clear that wide layers of the Quebec population were beginning to mobilize once again against the police repression and in support of their national rights. Mass student meetings and leading figures in the trade-union movement expressed their sympathy with the nationalist and anticapitalist views in the FLQ Manifesto. To Messrs. Drapeau, Bourassa, and Trudeau, this constituted "apparent insurrection."

Through their mobilization of the military, mass arrests, and the suppression of all civil liberties, the authorities are engaging in counter-terror, the ultimate expression of their own political bankruptcy.

The wide range of persons arrested under the War Measures Act—trade-union leaders, professors, students, journalists, lawyers, even a popular singer—indicates how thoroughly the government seeks to suppress the

popular views of the Québécois, the actual and potential leadership of the nationalist movement. In a supreme irony, in the name of defending democracy, the authorities have erased our democratic rights.

But their attempt to intimidate the Québécois, to stop the growing tide of national revolt, shall not succeed.

All those interested in the defense of civil liberties must unite and rally to the defense of those victimized by the current repression in Quebec. We must defend all the political prisoners whose ranks are now swelled by hundreds arrested under Trudeau's proclamation.

Meetings, rallies, demonstrations should be held at every campus, and every trade union, in every constituency club of the New Democratic party, in community organizations, in the antiwar movement, to discuss this serious threat to our civil liberties. A massive campaign must be launched to:

Withdraw Federal Troops from Quebec!

Revoke and Abolish the War Measures Act and All the Repressive Laws!

tional Affairs Mitchell Sharp told the House of Commons:

"We have already indicated to the Chinese in our . . . discussions our interest in setting up cultural and educational exchanges, in expanding trade between our two countries, in reaching an understanding on consular matters and in settling a small number of problems left over from an earlier period."

With the predictable exception of Chiang Kai-shek's regime, the establishment of Chinese-Canadian relations aroused little comment from other governments. Terence Smith wrote that the Nixon administration accepted the decision with "resigned equanimity."

"This low-key reaction is in sharp contrast with the vigorous opposition of earlier years. Under the Eisenhower and Johnson Administrations, the United States took vehement objection to the idea of Canadian recognition of the Peking Government."

Although the Trudeau government tried to present the recognition of Peking as evidence of independence from Washington, it is likely that Nixon approved the move if he did not actively encourage it.

It must be increasingly obvious even to the most conservative of American capitalists that China is not going to disappear simply because Washington refuses to recognize reality. And it must be even more obvious to them that the markets in China now being supplied with Canadian goods could just as easily be filled by American products.

This was hinted at by at least one Canadian paper, the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, which commented: "White House officials probably see it [Canadian recognition of Peking] as a help in their own attempts to achieve a meaningful dialogue with China."

A stumbling block to U.S.—China diplomatic relations has been Washington's refusal to stop supporting the Chiang regime on Taiwan. Trudeau may well have been Nixon's proxy in an attempt to discover how much the Chinese leadership is willing to compromise on this question.

Contribution by Dow Chemical

For the past forty years, the Dow Chemical Company has dumped an average of 200 pounds of mercury a day into Lake St. Clair, which feeds into Lake Erie. The total amount of poison comes to 1,460 tons.

'Resigned Equanimity' in Washington

Canada and China Establish Relations

Canada and the People's Republic of China announced October 13 an agreement to establish diplomatic relations. In the communiqué, Canada acknowledged that the Communist regime is "the sole legal Government of China."

The agreement followed twenty months of negotiation. The negotiations were protracted because of Ottawa's reluctance to recognize China's sovereignty over Taiwan. A compromise was finally reached by Prime Minister Trudeau's administration "noting" the Chinese claim without either approving or disapproving of it.

The agreement brought to fifty-three the number of countries that have recognized the government of one-fourth of the world's population. In the October 14 *New York Times*, Terence Smith wrote that U.S. administration officials had "conceded that the Canadian move might prompt other nations to recognize the Communist

Government." Belgium and Italy were considered two leading possibilities.

Over the past seven years, Canada has found a large and profitable export market in China, chiefly for wheat, of which Canada produces a surplus. Total Canadian exports to China in 1969 came to \$122,000,000. Trudeau clearly hoped that the recognition agreement would help prospects for expanded trade. The October 14 *New York Times* reported:

"Since 1963 Canada has sold more than 500 million bushels of wheat to China. The second three-year contract expired one year ago. This was followed by a supplemental one-year contract calling for sale of 86 million bushels, deliveries of which [are] now being completed. Last week a Canadian grain mission left for Peking to conclude new arrangements, and officials speculated that today's announcement of diplomatic relations might expedite the transaction."

Canadian Secretary of State for Ex-

Hussein Shells Four More Villages

Armed conflict flared again in northern Jordan October 17 as King Hussein's troops attacked Palestinian positions on the road from Irbid to the Syrian border in violation of the truce signed four days earlier by Hussein and Fateh commander Yasir Arafat.

According to the guerrillas, a force of sixty tanks shelled four villages between Irbid and Ramtha. The commandos fought back with mortars, machine guns, and rockets.

All the terms of the October 13 Hussein-Arafat pact have not yet been made public, but it appears that both sides made concessions, at least on paper. The king abandoned his demand for the disarming of the Palestinian militia. He won agreement, however, for the first time, that regular commando troops would not carry arms in any Jordanian city except for token units assigned to guard guerrilla offices or leaders.

Other provisions included recognition of the right of all commandos to be tried by Palestinian military courts, and the right of the Palestine Liberation Organization to operate its own broadcasting station and newspaper free from Jordanian censorship.

The agreement recognized only Fateh and the Palestine Liberation Organization among the Palestinian commando organizations. All other groups are outlawed, including the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine [PFLP] and the Democratic Popular Front [DPF]. Fateh spokesmen have said the ban is a dead letter and will not be enforced, but there is no indication that this is one of the terms of the agreement.

There are still prices on the heads of Popular Front leader George Habash and DPF spokesman Nayef Hawatmeh. Habash, who was reportedly out of the country during the civil war in September, was back in Amman October 12, according to an Associated Press dispatch.

Guerrilla control over the road to Syria, now contested by the army, was said to be part of a secret clause in the Arafat-Hussein agreement. The October 15 *Christian Science Monitor*, for example, reported:

"Though not spelled out in the published part of the accord, it is understood here [Cairo] that the guerrillas will continue secure use of two main supply routes.

"One runs from Dera in Syria to Irbid in northern Jordan. It is about 35 miles long. The other is the long overland route from Iraq, which can be used for Chinese and other arms reaching the Iraqi Persian Gulf port of Basra."

But such agreements in the past have been a prelude to new attacks on the Palestinians by the Hussein regime. Similar pacts—all promising the guerrillas more than the present one—were signed in November, 1968, and February and June of this year. The most recent agreement was reached on September 15, the day before Hussein declared martial law and began shelling the Palestinian refugee camps. Ten days later Arafat and Hussein signed the Cairo accord, ending the nine-day civil war.

White Students Protest Apartheid Laws

Thousands of white students in South Africa are continuing their support for nineteen Africans recently "banned" by the government of John Vorster.

The nineteen are part of a group of twenty-two whose continued imprisonment without trial produced widespread student protests last May. Those demonstrations forced Vorster to promise that the prisoners would either be tried or released.

Nineteen were acquitted in September. (One prisoner, Benjamin Ramotse, was convicted.) But following the trial, the defendants were banned. This action under South African law allows the government to restrict arbitrarily freedom of movement, attendance at meetings, place of residence, etc., of anyone it considers dangerous.

White students in Johannesburg responded to the government's action with a protest demonstration on October 8. The London *Observer's* cor-

Nayef Hawatmeh, in an interview granted in the north of Jordan to a correspondent of the Beirut newspaper *Al Nahar*, criticized the September 25 Cairo agreement:

"We accept the cease-fire and the end of the military regime," he was quoted as saying in the October 11 Paris daily *Le Monde*, "but we think that the clause concerning the return to civilian rule is not formulated clearly enough. We demand the formation of a national government inasmuch as the Cairo accord recognizes the continued rule of the Jordanian authorities who were responsible for the September massacre and who do not deserve the slightest confidence.

"The objective of the Jordanian authorities is clear: to put the fedayeen between the Israeli hammer and the Hashemite anvil.

"If the fedayeen leave the cities, the militia will keep its arms. This is a condition that the Central Committee will never abandon. The battle isn't over. We haven't been wiped out and we won't be wiped out.

"The liberation of Palestine requires a solid national base. Amman can become that base. Amman is the Hanoi of the Palestinian revolution."

respondent Stanley Uys estimated that 2,500 students participated.

At the university in Cape Town, the Students' Representative Council announced it was withdrawing its support for the annual rugby match between Cape Town and the Afrikaans-speaking University of Stellenbosch. The action was taken to protest the fact that only whites are permitted to play on the rugby teams.

Cape Town University has included Africans on other teams. Uys reported that on October 9 ". . . the annual inter-varsity sports derby between the medical schools of Cape Town and Stellenbosch universities was called off after Stellenbosch had announced that it could not field teams for certain events . . . in which Cape Town had included coloured players."

At least one English-language paper, the *Rand Daily Mail*, has given editorial support to the student protests.

Police Mobilized Against Rebel Peasant Movement

By Ranjan Roy

Calcutta

Since the imposition of president's rule after the fall of the United Front government in West Bengal in March, the police and military repression has become more intense. The central government under Indira Gandhi is now trying to break the back of the militant workers and peasants movements by the use of threats and torture.

To demoralize the cadres of the left parties, the Indira Gandhi regime has unleashed the armed CRP (Central Reserve Police), armed security police, and military forces in different industrial belts, cities, and rural areas where militant employees, workers, students, and poor peasants are resisting the onslaught of the mill owners, jotedars (big landlords), corrupt and oppressive university authorities, and government bureaucrats.

Under pretext of putting down Maoist ultraleft terroristic activities, the CRP are continuing a murderous campaign against young militant Maoist students who, in turn, have now adopted retaliatory measures against the police. At present the main targets of the bourgeois regime represented by Indira Gandhi's faction of the Congress party are the activists of the CPI(M) [Communist party of India (Marxist)], the Maoist CPI(ML) [Communist party of India (Marxist-Leninist)], and the Trotskyists of the Socialist Workers party [SWP—the Indian section of the Fourth International].

The Trotskyists in West Bengal are very few in number, but they have made an impact among the poor agricultural people in certain rural areas, particularly in the district of Bankura. In the village areas of that district, they have concentrated on organizing the poor and landless peasants into the Palli Shramik Krishak Sangh [PSKS—Village Workers and Tillers Union], which is led by Jagdish Jha and other cadres of the SWP.

Since 1969 the PSKS has led several movements for wage increases and has urged collective farming on the



INDIRA GANDHI: Ordered attack on Trotskyist peasant leaders in Bankura.

lands illegally held by the jotedars with the collaboration of corrupt administrative officials and the police.

Even before the fall of the reformist United Front ministry [in which the portfolios of home—i.e., police—and land and land-revenue belonged to the Stalinist CPI(M) leaders], the PSKS became the target of police repression. Since the imposition of president's rule this repression of the Bankura peasants has become worse.

Already 120 warrants have been issued against militants of the SWP and PSKS. Jagdish Jha has been arrested and released on bail several times.

The police are framing incredible charges against Jha and others associated with him. They oppose granting bail when these militants are brought to court, and if bail is granted they arrest them again on new charges.

The public reaction to this sort of repression has given the PSKS a tre-

mendous influence over the rural people. Whenever the police try to arrest a worker from the rural belt, they are resisted by the young men of the area.

To arrest Jha in the last week of August, the police had to take him in the middle of the night and transfer him to a faraway police station without letting anyone know of his arrest. [See *Intercontinental Press*, October 5, 1970, page 813.]

The latest attack on the rural movement occurred September 27 at Kalna, where members of the West Bengal unit of the SWP had gathered to discuss organizational problems. On that date for the first time armed Central Reserve Police forces entered the areas where the PSKS is a dominant organization. The central government thus indicated its fear of the accomplishments of the Trotskyists in the rural areas.

Intellectual as well as rural members of the SWP West Bengal unit have also become the target of the Indira Gandhi regime. On August 17 Upendranath Roy, a teacher at Matelli High School in Jalpaiguri district, was arrested. He was released on bail August 26, but has been excluded from Matelli and ordered to appear at the Jalpaiguri police station once a week.

Roy is an intellectual Hindi author and a regular contributor to *Larai*, the organ of the West Bengal SWP.

U.S. Censorship Plan

The U.S. government has a plan for imposition of press censorship when the president declares a national emergency, the *New York Times* reported October 9. The identity of the man who would head the censorship is itself a secret.

Under the plan, the press could not tell the American public that they were under nuclear attack without obtaining the censor's approval.

The *Times* said that President Kennedy had considered imposing censorship during the 1962 missile crisis and that Johnson had weighed the same move at the time of the invasion of the Dominican Republic in 1965.

Washington and Tel Aviv Saved King Hussein

The United States and Israeli governments agreed on a plan of joint military intervention in the Jordanian civil war to save the regime of King Hussein. The plan was worked out September 21 between President Nixon and the Israeli ambassador in telegraphic communication with Tel Aviv.

The facts were gathered by Benjamin Welles of the *New York Times*. He interviewed officials of the State Department, the Pentagon, "members of the domestic and foreign intelligence communities" in Washington, "Arab and Israeli diplomats," and "reports of correspondents of the New York Times with the Sixth Fleet, at the United Nations and in Beirut, Cairo, Jerusalem and Moscow." Welles assembled the information in a long article which was published in the October 8 issue of the *New York Times*.

According to Welles, the "plan envisioned an Israeli attack on the Syrian [throughout the article, Welles calls the Palestinian tank units Syrian] tank forces that had entered Jordan if it appeared that King Hussein's army was incapable of stopping them. In this event, the United States would have used Sixth Fleet and other units to safeguard Israel's rear and flanks from Egyptian or Soviet attacks from the Suez Canal area."

The overriding concern of both the Nixon and Golda Meir administrations was to keep Hussein's pro-American regime in power. Both "assumed he would be replaced [if the guerrillas won] by a regime closely linked to Moscow."

Welles does not say so, of course, but in reality the Moscow bureaucrats cooperated with Washington and Tel Aviv. The real fear of Nixon and Golda Meir was that Hussein would be toppled, unleashing revolutionary forces beyond the control of all of imperialism's agents, however "leftist" their posture might be.

For the Zionist state, Welles's sources frankly acknowledged that maintaining Hussein in power was a matter of national "defense."

The planned intervention "was defensive, it is stressed. At no time,



GOLDA MEIR: Planned to send troops to help keep Hussein on his throne.

sources here [in Washington] insist, did Israel contemplate attacking any targets except the two Syrian tank brigades that had crossed the Jordanian border and had occupied the Ramtha-Irbid-Jarash triangle. Israel would have attacked first by air; had this failed she would have used ground forces.

"None of the sources suggested that Israel's action would have been other than defensive—aimed, that is, at preventing the overthrow of King Hussein and his replacement by a militant government backed by Moscow."

Nixon himself "assumed personal direction of the intense diplomatic and military activity as the crisis approached its climax." When the Hashemite "Nero" launched his attack on the fedayeen September 17, Nixon even took a public stand that in itself constituted intervention in the internal affairs of the Middle East.

"On that same day President Nixon, talking to newspaper editors in Chicago, said that the United States might intervene if Syria or Iraq threatened King Hussein's Government. While the

President's words were supposedly off the record, The Chicago Sun-Times printed his warning, and later Mr. Nixon was said to have praised the paper for giving his warning world attention."

By Sunday, September 20, Hussein's regime was tottering. "A message from King Hussein that day," Welles wrote, "asked the United States and Britain to consider what quick military support they could send him. His appeal, which some officials here termed 'panicky,' was made over an open, non-confidential telephone line from the palace to the United States chancery in Amman, then ringed by armed Palestinian guerrillas." (Emphasis added.)

Nixon, however, began to run into objections to the proposed intervention from his European allies:

"On Monday, Sept. 21, the issue clearly was whether the United States should intervene to shore up King Hussein's government and, simultaneously, to try to rescue the hostages in guerrilla hands.

"The British Ambassador . . . called on Secretary [of State] Rogers that day to state that Britain would not intervene militarily and to express hopes that the United States would not do so either.

"It was evident also that other Western European governments would have opposed such United States action."

But if the objection of his allies restrained Nixon from a direct American invasion, the Israeli government was more than willing to substitute its forces. Welles continues:

"So, instead, the decision was taken to coordinate United States actions closely with those of the Israelis, who had already begun a partial mobilization and movements of tanks toward the northern part of the Jordan River Valley."

The agreement on an Israeli invasion, protected by the American Sixth Fleet, was reached the same day. Meanwhile Nixon continued what Welles called a "balance of public and private diplomacy—public rumors about Sixth Fleet reinforcements bal-

anced by private warnings to Moscow to 'lean on' the Syrians; publicized alerts of the 82d Airborne Division and private intimations to King Hussein that he had nothing to fear from Israel on his flank."

The "private warnings to Moscow" appear to have been among the most successful of Nixon's ploys:

"On Sunday alarming reports continued to arrive from Jordan and Israel, and Mr. Sisco [a U.S. assistant secretary of state] called in Mr. Vorontsov [the Soviet chargé d'affaires, who was substituting for the ambassador], to warn him of the danger of Syria's action. Mr. Sisco is said to

have implied that if the Syrians continued their invasion Israel would probably attack. The United States was calling on the Soviet Union to use its influence to persuade Syria to pull out."

Within a day, the Kremlin bureaucrats announced their compliance with Nixon's requests:

"On Monday evening, there was the first glimmer of Soviet cooperation. Mr. Vorontsov called on Mr. Sisco to repeat Soviet warnings against 'all' outside interference, to disclose that the Soviet Union was in touch with Syria and to urge the United States to restrain Israel from intervening."

The results are well known. Whether because of Soviet pressure or fear of Israeli attack, the Syrian regime failed to keep its pledge to aid the Palestinian regime. Assured of whatever American support he needed, and with his rear kept secure by the Israelis, Hussein sent his air force against the Palestinian tanks and forced them to retreat to Syria.

Further clashes between Hussein and the fedayeen seem inevitable. As long as the Soviet bureaucracy leaves Nixon on a free hand, he will be ready to intervene again—a move which could engulf the Middle East in war that might spread far beyond that region.

'The First Arab Soviet'

How the Press Reported Events in Irbid

By Les Evans

During the Jordanian civil war in September, a number of reports appeared in the Western press about Palestinian commando forces setting up popular councils in the north Jordanian city of Irbid. This development was widely described as "the first Arab soviet."

The most extensive coverage appeared in the September 28 issue of *Newsweek* magazine, published in New York. *Newsweek's* Loren Jenkins reported:

"To replace the city administration, the commandos set up on every street 'people's committees,' which in turn elected members to larger district committees. These groups, composed of commando commissars as well as leading residents of Irbid who support the Palestinian cause, held evening meetings to discuss such matters as the future organization of the city and preparations for its defense. Although they are similar in structure to the local soviets that the Bolsheviks formed in the early days of the Russian Revolution, the committees seemed to be a relatively spontaneous response to local events with no overt influence from Moscow or Peking."

Jenkins said that the seizure of power was carried out under the leadership of members of Fateh and of the Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine.

"This week you are seeing the birth of the first Arab liberated area," one commando leader told Jenkins. "You could call it—and I prefer to call it—the first Arab soviet."

The *Newsweek* article was quoted at length by the Paris daily *Le Monde* in its September 24 issue, but *Le Monde* did not offer any independent confirmation of Jenkins's observations.

Two of the earliest accounts of the developments in Irbid appeared in the *Los Angeles Times* and the *Manchester Guardian Weekly*. Both papers had reporters in Irbid on September 15, just before Hussein's declaration of martial law and his assault on the Palestinians.

Joe Alex Morris Jr., in a September 15 dispatch that appeared in the following day's *Los Angeles Times*, gave this description of the guerrilla takeover:

"The Palestinian liberation movement has seized control of this city, the third largest in Jordan. Fortifications are being hastily erected to bar any attempt by King Hussein's army to take the city back.

"Irbid is being reorganized politically by a Maoist who is the Jordan political commissar of Al Assifa, the military wing of the Al Fatah guerrilla organization. . . .

"Although life continues much as normal, the Palestinians have in effect established their own state within a state here. . . .

"The town is under our control,' said Abu Hassan, the 30-year-old political commissar for Al Assifa throughout Jordan. He said the takeover was the combined effort of all the guerrilla organizations with the exception of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, which was suspended from the central committee for blowing up three airliners last Saturday. . . .

"Abu Hassan said the army could be given transit rights if it stops harassing Palestinian units and turns its face to the Israeli enemy.

"We are in the civil war,' he added. 'We are the first free island in the Arab world. Irbid is the pioneer.

"The revolution is willing to coexist with King Hussein,' he said, 'if Hussein studies and profits from the experience of Prince Sihanouk in Cambodia.' . . .

"Meanwhile, a people's committee has been set up on every street of the town. District committees have been formed from this lowest base, and a meeting was scheduled today to set up a central committee of the revolutionary authority in Irbid.

"Abu Hassan declined to describe

the committees as people's Soviets and said the word smacked of foreign influence. 'We are building a new society,' he said."

David Hirst, who was also in Irbid September 15, had a different impression of Hassan's comments on the use of the word "soviet." Writing in the September 19 *Manchester Guardian Weekly*, Hirst reported:

"Abu Hassan the chief political officer of Al-Asifan, the military wing of the Al-Fatah guerrilla group, explained the revolutionary situation.

"'This week you may see the birth of the first Arab liberated zone. You could call it—and I prefer to call it—the first Arab Soviet,' he said."

Hirst described the city:

"Irbid, the kingdom's third town, is completely in the hands of the Palestinian guerrillas, there is not a soldier or policeman in sight, and the mayor and other leaders appear to have gone over to the guerrillas. The governor—who has not—is a prisoner with the chief of security in the police headquarters.

"When I visited him today, he and a group of officers were sitting disconsolately under faded pictures of King Hussein and his father, King Abdullah, who died at the hands of a Palestinian assassin.

"He put a brave front on things. 'Everything will be back to normal soon,' was his only, embarrassed answer to every question. It is difficult to see how. He and 30-odd policemen who have stayed in this loyalist redoubt are not under guard. There is no need, so complete is the guerrilla control. They cannot go out: they depend on the guerrillas for food and water."

"Today," Hirst added, "delegates representing about 200,000 people living in Irbid and its region were called to a 'Popular Congress' to debate the future of Irbid: self-governing institutions are in the making."

Apparently the mass committees that were established in Irbid were not set up in other towns controlled by the fedayeen. Eric Pace reported from Zerqa—Jordan's next-largest city after Irbid—in the September 17 *New York Times*:

"No collective government had been set up here lately, as is said to have been established in another important town, Irbid."

To our knowledge no Western cor-

respondents were in Irbid during the fighting. Eric Pace was one of two American reporters to enter the city on October 2, after the cease-fire. In a dispatch that appeared in the October 4 *New York Times* Pace reported:

"The city's streets were thick with roadblocks and armed fedayeen, despite the Amman radio's statement that commando leaders here in the north had agreed that their men should not carry arms in the towns. . . .

"A six-hour car trip to Irbid from Amman and back showed that King Hussein's forces controlled only short segments of the route. The commandos had men and roadblocks along much of the rest.

"'This is a liberated area now,' said Abu Khaled, who is in charge of Irbid's militia, or part-time fedayeen. Speaking to the travelers outside his heavily guarded office, he said his men would never abandon their arms."

According to Pace, Khaled "said Irbid was ruled now by a council 'representing the masses' but that fedayeen did not want day-to-day rule of Jordan. He said the commandos would rather fight Israel, but 'the army forces us to come to the towns to defend our masses.'"

The correspondent who accompanied Pace on this visit was William Tuohy of the *Los Angeles Times*. In a dispatch in the October 5 issue of that paper Tuohy reported:

"Khaled said that a 'people's committee' was running the city. As for the future, he said, 'it is up to the people to decide.'"

"'The king's army can come into this city but only as private citizens, not with their arms,' he declared."

In the period immediately after the cease-fire, the Palestinian leadership insisted that the agreement recognized their right to keep armed commandos in Irbid and several other northern cities. Joe Alex Morris Jr., in an undated dispatch from Beit Ras that appeared in the October 6 *Los Angeles Times*, reported:

"It would appear that Hussein's authority is not being restored in the areas which were under Palestinian control when peace broke out. Abou Sami [a Palestinian leader in Irbid] said this included Ramtha, Jerash, Mafrak and Ajloun in addition to Irbid.

"In other words, the duality of power continues. King Hussein might have

restored his authority in Amman, at great loss of innocent life, but the seeds remain there for another confrontation."

On October 5 Fateh leader Yasir Arafat agreed to a commando withdrawal from Irbid during a meeting with Colonel Abdul Latif Dahab, a Sudanese truce officer. The details were worked out October 6 in a three-hour meeting between the Palestinian leader and Tunisian Premier Bahi Ladgham held at Ramtha. The first Palestinian units left Irbid the same day.

Morris wrote from Ramtha in the October 7 *Los Angeles Times*:

"Irbid was a bizarre scene, with the Hittin Brigade [of the Palestine Liberation Army] preparing to move out. . . .

"PLA officers said they were pulling back to somewhere between Irbid and Deraa, the Syrian frontier town. But truce officers confirmed they were going all the way back to Syria. . . .

"The scene in Irbid was one of indescribable confusion. Guerrillas are still very much in evidence, but the army is back there too. . . .

"The situation was quite different deeper in the old Palestinian-held 'liberated triangle.' In the towns of Ajloun and Jerash, the rebels remained very much in control and the army was nowhere to be seen.

"At the same time, in both towns, some degree of civilian government had been restored. The 'Arab Soviet' set up in Irbid—and long since forgotten—had not been repeated here."

None of the published reports give an adequate picture of what actually happened in Irbid or the concrete nature of the mass organizations that were created there. It is to be hoped that some of the participants will provide such an account which would be read with great interest by revolutionists throughout the world.

The fact that mass councils were established even for a short time indicates the depth of the Palestinian resistance struggle and the direction in which it is moving.

London Rats Feel Right at Home

Rats and mice are moving into the new London stock exchange building, reported the October 4 *London Sunday Times*. They "have even been seen scurrying between the feet of milling brokers on the exchange floor."

The same article said that rodents have also been reported in the House of Commons.

Solzhenitsyn's Acceptance of Nobel Prize

By George Saunders

The awarding of the 1970 Nobel prize for literature to Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn opens a new chapter in the prolonged battle between the anti-Stalinist writer and the privileged bureaucrats of the Soviet Union.

It will undoubtedly be the occasion for another clash between the growing Soviet movement for socialist democracy—the "democratic movement," as many of its adherents call it—and the heirs of Stalin who wish to silence all challengers of their privileged position.

Solzhenitsyn has accepted the prize, stating that he regards it as "a tribute to Russian literature and to our arduous history." A group of thirty-seven Soviet oppositionists, including Pyotr Yakir and Zinaida Grigorenko, have hailed the award as an indication that "the civic inspiration, philosophic depth and high artistic craftsmanship of the works of Solzhenitsyn are recognized by the whole world." They declared that "the humanitarianism of the positions he has adopted and which he consistently and courageously defends . . . fully deserve an award of such high distinction."

"We are proud of our literature," they continued, "which, no matter what the barriers, produces such first-rank masters. In addition, we are prepared for the awarding of the prize to become another of those regular occasions for continuing the badgering which consistently takes place here against him and which we consider a national disgrace."

The regime was not long in "continuing the badgering." On October 9, the day after the award's announcement, *Izvestia* ran a statement by the Soviet Writers Union recalling that it had expelled Solzhenitsyn in November 1969 for "conduct unbecoming a Soviet writer."

"It is deplorable," the statement said, "that the Nobel committee allowed itself to be drawn into an unseemly game that was not started in the interests of the development of the spiritual values and traditions of literature but

was prompted by speculative political considerations."

The badgering continued October 14 when *Sovietskaya Rossiya* reported a speech by Sergei V. Mikhalkov, a Writers Union functionary who played a key role in Solzhenitsyn's expulsion.

After praising orthodox writers, Mikhalkov declared: "Unfortunately, there also exist other writers, diametrically opposed to the kind of which I speak. You know about the award of the Nobel prize to Solzhenitsyn . . . We Soviet literary workers view this as an international act of anti-Soviet nature."

Literaturnaya Gazeta, the Writers Union weekly, on the same day condemned the Nobel prize committee for referring to "the ethical force with which he has pursued the indispensable traditions of Russian literature."

"It is completely clear," said the weekly, "that in the given case, the members of the committee, under the expression 'ethical force,' had an anti-Soviet direction in mind."

Solzhenitsyn, as an eloquent defender of the common man trampled on by arrogant officialdom, has indeed carried on and developed the ethical traditions of Russian literature. The fact that the trampers nowadays are Thermidorian labor aristocrats rather than the grandees of bourgeois-czarist times does not eliminate the need for them to be exposed, nor does such exposure make Solzhenitsyn "anti-Soviet."

Just a few years ago, no less authoritative a pro-Moscow organ than *World Marxist Review* ran an entire article praising *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*. An international award for Solzhenitsyn then would undoubtedly have been hailed as a great achievement of Soviet culture.

Now the Kremlin bureaucrats have zigzagged back to defending the Stalin heritage, instead of halfheartedly criticizing it. But the international pro-Moscow current shows signs of difficulty in readjusting. The French CP in its organ *l'Humanité* October 10

stated: "The paltry advantages that the enemies of socialism will seek to gain from this affair will quickly evaporate: the work of Solzhenitsyn will endure." Whether or not one agrees with his views, *l'Humanité* concluded, there is no doubt of his stature as a writer deserving such an award.

The American CP was unambiguous in its adherence to the Kremlin's line on this issue. Phillip Bonosky in the October 13 *Daily World* not only saw the award as "an obvious political provocation in the spirit of the Cold War," but added: "The quality of Solzhenitsyn's works, judged solely from a literary standard, does not warrant such august recognition."

What particularly infuriated this Stalinist spokesman was that the secretary of the Swedish Academy described Solzhenitsyn as "a son of the Russian October Revolution, Lenin's revolution, and [he] has never abandoned this spiritual paternity—it is an essential part of his heritage and character."

Bonosky termed this simple truth a "blatant political provocation." "Thus," he blustered, "those opposed to Solzhenitsyn's ideas—which are anything but Leninist—are declared anti-Leninist. This of course is impudence, but it also represents a distinct political line—one that operated in Czechoslovakia lately."

Now it becomes clear. It is the echo of the Czechoslovak democratization implicit in Solzhenitsyn's work, and in the Soviet democratic movement of which he is a part, that disturbs the American CP apparatus. In this concern they mirror the feelings of the Soviet bureaucratic caste, for whom they still nurture such a sick, blind loyalty.

The Swedish Academy, of course, has not been won over to the cause of "socialism with a human face," though it is symptomatic that it gives lip service in that direction.

The point is: to the extent that political speculation is involved, the opportunity to engage in it was handed to the bourgeois propagandists on a silver platter by the Kremlin and its supporters themselves. If the greatest living Soviet author had not been persecuted and his works banned in his own country, would international recognition of his merit have been harmful to the Soviet leadership?

Youths Battle Troops in Belfast, Derry City

Seething unrest in Northern Ireland boiled over again into major clashes September 26-28 in Belfast and October 10-11 in Derry City. British troops occupying the six-county enclave fought pitched battles against discontented youths of both the Catholic and Protestant communities.

The fighting in Derry City was touched off by an ultrarightist Protestant Unionist (Paisleyite) street meeting in the Diamond area, which is at the top of the hill in the predominantly Protestant walled city.

The battle started with an exchange of stones between a Protestant crowd moving toward the Diamond and a Catholic crowd coming up from the Bogside, according to the *Irish Times* of October 12. British troops intervened and began pushing the Catholics back toward the Bogside.

"Mr. Eamonn McCann, chairman of Derry's Labour Party, made an attempt to persuade the people to go home, but instead they moved down Waterloo street, just outside the Walls, toward Waterloo place in the city centre, and then into William street, which leads from the city centre to Bogside," the *Irish Times* reported. "There they began stoning an Army command post in Waterloo place, and soldiers on an upper floor of a building in Waterloo street."

The troops tried to contain the outburst by sealing off the Bogside as a wave of popular hatred washed against them. "During the first five hours of the rioting," the *Irish Times* continued, "the troops were largely immobile. At one street junction they stood behind riot shields while young people, sometimes children of 12 and 13 years stoned them continually."

After midnight the troops charged up William Street into the Bogside. "Altogether two companies totaling about 170 men . . . advanced up William street behind a wall-to-wall fence of riot shields. The shields took a battering from bricks, stones, bottles and then petrol bombs. The rioters' missiles included lengths of lead and iron piping, bits of wood and planks, which were taken from a building site.

"The amount and variety of missiles



EAMONN McCANN

was the biggest since the Bogside battle of August 1969 . . ."

The insurgent ghetto dwellers reportedly hurled sixty Molotov cocktails at the troops. Forty soldiers were injured, two seriously. There were six casualties among the police and four among the civilians.

In the early morning of October 11 a powerful bomb exploded in the gasworks building near the Bogside. The concussion rocked the ghetto, but fortunately the 800,000 cubic feet of gas stored there did not explode.

The fighting in Belfast, two weeks before the outbreak in Derry, began when the British troops intervened to halt provocative demonstrations by Protestant crowds returning from a football match. Tear-gas grenades fired by the troops were met with Molotov cocktails. Clashes continued into the early morning of Sunday, September 27. The troops gained control of the situation only after the intervention of elite paratrooper units.

Seventy-seven soldiers were reported injured and forty-seven civilians arrested in Saturday's clashes.

Fighting resumed later in the day Sunday when Protestant crowds attacked a military post in the Snugville Street area off the Shankill Road. *Irish Times* correspondent Henry Kelly gave this description September 29 of the scene following the battle: "The tiny side streets around Snugville street were under virtual state of siege and every one of them was blocked by Army barbed wire, with troops stationed every ten yards."

The massive military repression exacerbated the frustration and bitterness of the Protestant population. Crowds gathered in Snugville Street early Monday afternoon as barricades went up at other places on the Shankill Road.

"At about 3 p.m. copies of the *Belfast Telegraph* were available on the Shankill road with a report saying that C.S. gas had been fired by the Army shortly after 1 o'clock," Henry Kelly reported. "This was inaccurate and had sprung from a misunderstanding of a message from Army public relations, but it caused a crowd of about 3,000 to gather on the Shankill road, and very rapidly the situation worsened. At 3.25 p.m. the Army opened fire with C.S. gas on a crowd of about 1,000 at Howard street . . . At about 5 o'clock the Shankill road looked like a battle field. . . . One barricade was blazing and there was a line of troops stretched across the road."

The seemingly uncontrollable rage of the Protestant slum dwellers along the Shankill road alarmed the Unionist establishment, which depends both on British backing and the support of the historically dominant Protestant caste.

"What are the people in the rest of this United Kingdom to think when they see their Army—which is also *our* Army—viciously attacked and numerous soldiers injured?" Unionist Prime Minister Chichester-Clark demanded September 28. If such incidents continued, he said, British public opinion would begin to ask "Where are the friends of the Army and the upholders of law and order in this community?"

Washington Polluters Untouched

Although there have been 1,600 complaints filed charging violations of Washington, D.C.'s law against air pollution, no violator has ever been brought to trial.

To Win, We Must Learn How to Reach the Masses

By Hugo Blanco

[Under the title, "Hugo Blanco Analyzes the Crisis in the Revolution," the following article appeared in the September 21 issue of *Veja y Lea*, a widely circulated weekly magazine published in Venezuela.

[The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

As an outcome to the failure of many guerrilla campaigns to achieve their objectives, Latin America is going through a welcome stage of discussing the best roads to liberation.

But the lines being discussed are not new. No matter in what novel forms they are clothed, we can still recognize the old positions of left movements throughout the world.

One line is *reformism*. This is represented by the pro-Moscow Communist parties and like-minded groupings. They hold the positions that distinguished the reformism of the Second International and of all periods.

The reformists' method for changing society is based on making choices within the bourgeois system in order to obtain reforms which, as they see it, will lead to our liberation. The axis of their activity is not mobilizing the masses, but supporting sectors of the bourgeoisie that they consider "progressive."

The reformists' participation in elections as well as their capitulation to regimes like the present military junta in Peru are based on their confidence that if properly supported these sections of the bourgeoisie will carry out increasingly deep-cutting reforms that will lead to socialism.

The reformists sometimes make use of mass mobilizations. However, they do not stimulate the masses toward independent action but toward support or reinforcement of some sector of the bourgeoisie, some opportunist candidate, or some "progressive" military officer.

They promote illusions in parliamentary democracy. Their participation in elections does not differ essentially from that of bourgeois candidates. They give the masses the idea that by voting for the candidates they

list, the people can solve all their problems.

As the reformists see it, hiding the truth is an "intelligent tactic." They think that by doing this they are fooling the enemy, while in reality it is the masses they are deceiving.

In the recent period the failures of the guerrillas and the reformist measures taken by governments like the one in Peru have served to reinforce the reformist current somewhat. Unfortunately, Compañero Fidel has helped to strengthen it by his support to the military junta currently entrusted with defending the capitalist system in Peru.

Another recognizable line is *ultra-leftism*. This takes the form of glorification of urban or rural guerrilla warfare (*guerrillismo*) and various types of terrorism. The ultraleftists engage in all these activities without any regard for the mass movement.

A false interpretation of the Cuban revolution, the discrediting of reformism, and the weakness or absence of Marxist parties were the causes that gave rise to this current. Its essential social base is the middle class, especially desperate student elements.

The ultraleftists have a profound contempt for the mass movement. Because they have arrived at revolutionary conceptions they consider themselves far above the rest of the people; they see themselves as the saviors, as the messiahs of the people.

The third line is *our road*. It is not a novelty (the other two are not either). Our line is a development of the old Marxist conception that "the emancipation of the workers will be the achievement of the workers themselves." We do not believe that the emancipation of the workers will be the achievement of "progressive" elements of the bourgeoisie, or members of parliament, or military officers reforming the system.

Nor do we believe that the workers will be emancipated by a group of courageous fighters making the revolution for the people, whose only role would be to "support" or "rein-

force" the revolutionary action of a group of supermen. We believe that the masses will emancipate themselves.

We know that the masses are now at a low level of struggle but we are certain that this level will rise gradually until they attain power.

We believe that our activity as revolutionists must be based on the present level of consciousness, organization, and struggle of the masses; that our task lies in taking the masses progressively up the ladder leading to the conquest of power and building socialism.

Our roots in the masses, in the working class, or the peasants and students and other sectors, give us an awareness of their most deeply felt aspirations at the moment, their organizational forms, and their methods of fighting. This is where we start from. But this does not mean capitulating to spontanéism. From the start, no matter how low the level of the masses, we stress the importance of direct, independent action without relying on any other force but the mobilized masses.

No matter how modest the victories that are won, we use them to demonstrate the effectiveness of mobilization by the masses. Every victory is exploited to raise the consciousness of the masses, to increase their self-confidence, to advance their forms of organization and tactics of struggle. For us such partial victories are not a "solution" to the problems of the people but an impulse to new struggles.

We do not exclude utilizing the tactics the reformists value so highly, such as electoral and legal activities. Nor do we exclude resorting to guerrilla warfare, bombings, or the other favorite activities of the ultraleftists.

The difference between us and the other currents is that we use both kinds of tactics in subordination to mass mobilization, as an outgrowth of the level of the masses.

One example of applying our method was given in the peasant movement of La Convención and El Cuzco. Here we started off from demands

such as observance of the eight-hour day and ending the mistreatment of the peasants. Many times we participated in commissions sent by the masses to present petitions for the establishment of a school.

Throughout the entire process we fought against the reformism of the Communist party, in comparison with which, at the beginning, our influence was miniscule. Legal and electoral actions were exalted as the ultimate methods by these opportunists.

When they did not resist mass mobilizations as provocations or adventurism, they oriented them in accordance with their reformist methodology. The victories achieved were attributed to the skill of some leader or some lawyer, or to "conscientious enforcement of the law" by some functionary.

We were branded as provocateurs and agents of imperialism and the landlords.

However, the people can learn from reality and we pointed out the reality to the peasants. We showed them the failure of purely legal activity. We showed them the success of mass mobilization, even though the authorities and the bureaucrats tried to hide it under the legalism with which they covered their retreats. We demonstrated this success later by mobilizations that did not push for enforcement of the laws but overrode the bourgeois antipeasant laws.

The state apparatus was increasingly exposed as the servant of the exploiters. The peasants moved nearer and nearer to the conviction that they had to arm themselves in order to defend their rights. Our guerrilla movement and the militia that preceded it emerged as a result of this rise in consciousness. It took form within the mass movement, as its composition indicated. Our guerrillas were peasants, in whose ranks were union leaders elected by the masses.*

Certain people construed this development to mean that we Trotskyists had been forced to "abandon our orthodoxy under the pressure of reality," and that we "had come to understand

* The analysis of the peasant struggle in La Convención including the armed struggle, as well as more extensive explanations of our method and how it differs from the others, are contained in my work *Tierra o Muerte! Venceremos*, which is soon to be published.

the necessity of armed struggle." That is, as they saw it, we, the followers of the chairman of the Revolutionary Military Committee that directed the taking of power in Russia, the followers of the organizer of the Red Army, had to abandon our "Trotskyist orthodoxy" and come, finally (!), to realize the need for armed struggle.

This interpretation is very instructive; it shows the way the minds of some ultraleftists work. If in some country we work with the masses at a low level of struggle, trying to raise them to a higher one, they think that our consciousness is as low as that of the masses. They think that only preparing for guerrilla warfare (or talking about it) shows that you are convinced of the necessity of armed struggle.

As these ultraleftists see it, the masses count for nothing. It is enough for one person or a group to come to an understanding of the necessity of armed struggle in order to carry it out. Therefore, they think that the fact that we took up arms in 1962 meant that only then had we come to grasp the need for armed struggle. The masses reach an understanding of the necessity of armed struggle when they see that bourgeois legality is a farce, when they see that the "public" institutions are only instruments of the exploiters, when they see that the majority is for change and that the minority in power refuses to carry it out.

We revolutionists have known all these truths for some time, but the masses are in the process of learning them. Some sections have learned more than others. In addition, the masses are learning how to organize and mobilize themselves, to believe in themselves, to understand that they are capable of doing great things. If they are correctly led in this learning process, they will come to understand that they are capable of taking power into their hands.

The party, that was our weak point in La Convención. The lack of cadres and the dynamic of the mass movement in which we were caught up blocked us from building the party.

It is not enough to raise transitional slogans in ascending order. You need an organized party to formulate these slogans correctly as befits each case, and to apply them.

Today the enemy is so well orga-

nized that even torturing prisoners has been elevated to a science, with specialized institutes for training and theoreticians who teach the art by correspondence.

Facing such highly perfected organizations, it is suicide to deny ourselves the right to organize.

While the mass organizations are important, organizing the enlightened vanguard of the masses, the elements that understand the necessity of a socialist revolution and the method to be followed, is no less important.

It is too simplistic to bring up the negative role played by the CPs as an argument against the necessity of a party. The Stalinist parties are guided by the reformist and counterrevolutionary ideology of the Soviet bureaucracy, the product of the ebb of the Russian revolution. These parties were subjected to the bureaucratic norms appropriate to the braking role which they have played and continue to play.

The Stalinist parties are one thing; revolutionary parties are quite another. Revolutionary parties are not in the service of the Soviet bureaucracy, but of the revolution. They have the Marxist ideology of revolution and not the Stalinist doctrine of "peaceful coexistence." They practice democratic centralism, not bureaucratic authoritarianism.

If the task of revolutionists is to orient the masses from their present level, the revolutionists must organize to carry out this work. And their organization cannot be a military one; it must be a political one, which will approach trade-union, electoral, and also military problems from the standpoint of mass action within the framework of an overall strategy. A revolutionary organization cannot address itself to only one aspect of the revolution, the military one.

Rates of development differ, diverse transitional slogans can be used, the level of consciousness of the masses varies widely, but there are some general principles that can be pointed out.

We must start from the present level of the masses, raising them through a program of transitional slogans and the most varied forms of mass mobilization toward the struggle for power.

In order to carry out this task scientifically, we must organize in a party operating under the rules of democratic centralism.

That Mysterious 'Submarine Base' in Cuba

"Will the Pentagon please make up its mind," editorialized the *Christian Science Monitor* October 15. "Does it or does it not believe that evidence indicates that the Soviet Union is building, will build or contemplates building a missile submarine base at Cienfuegos, Cuba?"

Neither the Pentagon nor its chief commander showed any inclination to answer the *Christian Science Monitor's* question. In fact, the Nixon administration had been caught in the act of trying to whip up hysteria against Cuba.

On September 25 an unidentified White House official told newsmen:

"We are watching the deployment of Soviet naval activity and of possible construction there. The Soviet Union can be under no doubt that we would view the establishment of a strategic base in the Caribbean with the utmost seriousness."

The Pentagon made similar charges the same day. According to an article by Benjamin Welles in the October 14 *New York Times*, a Pentagon spokesman "said that it [the Pentagon] had indications that the Russians wanted to establish 'a permanent submarine facility' in Cuba. He implied that the information had come from flights of American U-2 reconnaissance aircraft."

The Cuban government, of course, has every right to extend any facilities it wishes to the Soviet Union. In this case, however, Washington appears to have constructed the Cienfuegos "submarine base" from whole cloth.

Tass, the Soviet press agency, denied any plans to establish such a base, and *Pravda*, the official organ of the Soviet Communist party, suggested that the Nixon administration had raised the charges in an attempt to create an atmosphere favorable to Republican Congressional candidates.

At least one U. S. Congressman had reason to share *Pravda's* view. On October 13 administration officials who had been invited to testify on the matter in a secret session of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee failed to appear.

Said Dante Fascell, the subcommit-

tee chairman: ". . . I do find it exceedingly strange that the discussion of a matter which is alleged to be of such grave importance as to threaten our national and international security should be conducted strictly between high administration officials and the press."

Three days earlier, James Goodsell had written in the *Christian Science Monitor* that "United States officials in Washington say the information upon which the White House statements were based was both dated and somewhat tenuous."

This did not stop U. S. Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird from telling a press conference October 12 that "there is evidence naval base construction is going forward" at Cienfuegos.

The next day not only the construc-

tion but even the construction plans had disappeared. Benjamin Welles reported in the October 14 *Times*:

"The Defense Department said today [October 13] that new evidence from Cuba made it now appear less likely that the Soviet Union was planning to build a submarine base there."

Welles went on to describe what the evidence did show:

". . . it was disclosed here [Washington] that the extent of the construction being carried out . . . amounted to two single-story barracks — which a qualified source described as resembling chicken houses — plus a soccer field, a tennis court and an exercise area."

So far, not even Nixon has claimed that a tennis court is an offensive weapon.

REVIEWS

Israel and Nationalism

The Truth About Israel and Zionism by Nathan Weinstock and Jon Rothschild, Pathfinder Press, New York, N. Y. 15 pp. \$.25. 1970.

Nathan Weinstock is the author of *Le sionisme contre Israel* [Zionism Against Israel]. A resident of Palestine prior to the creation of Israel, he now lives in Belgium. Jon Rothschild is the Socialist Workers party candidate for lieutenant governor of New York state.

Weinstock deals primarily with the Israeli state: how it was formed, how it manages to continue to exist. He provides a great deal of little-known information — such as the fact that in 1968 Israel received 10 percent of the world foreign aid to all underdeveloped countries — in the process of refuting the myths of a "democratic" or "socialist" Israel.

He places the Palestinian revolution in the overall context of the colonial revolution and demonstrates the ne-

cessity for the Jewish community in Palestine — in its own interest — to ally itself with this struggle.

Rothschild takes up some of the arguments of "left" or "radical" Zionists, who believe that Israel can be cleansed of its more openly racist and imperialist features.

Such a belief, Rothschild holds, is generally based on the claim that Zionism represents a Jewish nationalism comparable to that of Blacks or Chicanos in the United States. He shows, however, that unlike the latter movements, Zionism represents petty-bourgeois nationalism. Instead of struggling against the oppression of imperialism, it has necessarily become a junior partner of imperialism in oppressing Palestinians.

Together, the two essays provide a brief but clear explanation of the revolutionary-socialist approach to the Middle East question.

— Allen Myers

Fateh's Case for a Democratic Palestine

The goals of the Palestinian revolution have often been subject to distortion by Zionists and their allies, one of the most notable incidents being Nixon's claim during a television broadcast that the Palestinians wanted "to drive Israel into the sea."

Dissemination of the truth about the aims of the Palestinians has been aided by publication of a document in the October 9 and October 16 issues of the American revolutionary socialist weekly *The Militant*.*

Entitled "Towards a Democratic State in Palestine," the document states the position of Fateh, the largest of the Palestinian liberation organizations.

Fateh is fighting for "a progressive, democratic and non-sectarian Palestine in which Christian, Moslem and Jew will worship, work, live peacefully and enjoy equal rights." It hopes that Jews living in Israel will join in carrying out this revolutionary transformation.

In support of its stand, Fateh reviews the experience of both Palestinians and Jewish immigrants.

No attempt is made to gloss over the anti-Jewish sentiments that were aroused among the Palestinian masses after 1948; in fact, these are squarely condemned. At the same time, Fateh maintains that this anti-Jewish attitude is being overcome as the liberation movement gains size, strength, and self-confidence.

Fateh acknowledges that it will be more difficult to change the attitude of Jews living in Israel. They stand in the unhappy position of a once-oppressed people now acting as oppressors, with a reactionary government serving as an outpost for U.S. imperialism in the oil-rich Middle East. The document deals with the contradiction in considerable detail, citing the historical record to show how it came about.

The winning of Jews—both outside and within Israel—to the Palestinian revolution, the document maintains,

will be based on the objective reality that Israel cannot solve the problem of anti-Semitism as the Zionists have claimed. "Security" for the Jews in Israel has proved to be utopian. By depriving the Palestinian Arabs of their security, the Zionist state generated counterforces that have led to permanent war and ever-increasing insecurity for the Jews. But this has likewise led to a new perspective:

"In the 1948-1967 period, Jews enjoyed security when the Palestinians and eventually all other Arabs with them were deprived of security.

"The Palestinian revolution has provided a new set of alternatives, no security in the racist state but all the security in the new democratic Palestine."

Fateh outlines its vision of a democratic Palestine.

A truncated Palestine consisting of the West Bank of the Jordan and the Gaza Strip is unequivocally rejected, as are a number of other proposals which have been advanced and which might be characterized as an attempt to create a "Zionism with a human face."

"The new democratic Palestine is NOT a substitute for liberation. Rather, it is the ultimate objective of liberation. A client state in the West Bank and Gaza, an Avneri-style de-Zionized or Pasteurised Israel or a Semitic Confederation are all categorically rejected by the revolution. They are all racist blueprints to delude the Palestinians and other Arabs and continue Israeli hegemony and Palestinian subjugation. . . . The sine qua non of the new Palestine is the destruction of the political, economic and militarist foundations of the chauvinist-racist settler-state."

The objective as defined by Fateh is to liberate *all* of Palestine and end its status as a beachhead of imperialism in the Middle East:

"The liberated Palestine will be part of the Arab homeland and will not be another alien state within it. The eventual unity of Palestine with other Arab states will make boundary problems less relevant and will end [the]

artificiality of the present status of Israel, and possibly that of Jordan as well.

"The new country will be anti-imperialist and will join the ranks of progressive revolutionary countries. Therefore, it will have to cut the present life-links with, and the total dependence on, the United States. Therefore, integration within the area will be the foremost prerequisite."

The recognition of Palestine as an inseparable part of the Arab world does not imply any curtailment of the rights of Jewish residents willing to accept the nonsectarian state. This is an important point, on which the document places heavy stress.

Fateh does not specify the political or economic structures which it believes will be established, saying that this will be decided in the process of the liberation struggle. Thus certain questions that are crucial to the fate of the revolutionary movement in the Middle East are not touched on, such as the nature of the future economy, the role of Nasserism, of Stalinism, the need for a revolutionary-socialist leadership, etc.

But the document does set a certain framework by rejecting "a theocratic, an authoritarian, or a racist-chauvinist form of government. It will be a country that does not allow oppression or exploitation of any group of people by any other group or individual; a state that provides equal opportunities for its people in work, worship, education, political decision-making, and cultural and artistic expression."

One outcome of the current developments in the Middle East is certain to be an intensification of discussion on the great political and theoretical questions facing the liberation movement and how to answer them. This document is a valuable contribution to that discussion.

The Patriot

"When the Hashemites came, Amman was a village. If I ever have to leave Amman, then I will leave it as my ancestors found it."—King Hussein, quoted in *Der Spiegel*, October 5, 1970.

Driver Education

Since the beginning of 1969 sixteen motorists in Uganda have been beaten to death by angry crowds after being involved in driving accidents.

* The two issues can be obtained from *The Militant*, 873 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 10003. Send 40 cents.

Radicalizing Students and the Irish Revolution

[The following interview was given to Gerry Foley in Dublin in late July by John McGregor, the outgoing secretary of the Trinity College Republican club for the 1969-70 term. Trinity was the top educational institution of the old British imperialist ascendancy class in Ireland. It is still attended by many children of ascendancy families in the Twenty-Six Counties as well as the Six Counties of Northern Ireland. Because of its ambiguous status in a formally independent Irish state, Trinity has been better able to resist the pressures for religious and political conformity that have emasculated the rest of Irish higher education. The academic establishment is split between the vestiges of the old Protestant ascendancy and the supporters of the Catholic establishment.]

* * *

Question. When and how did the radical student movement start at Trinity College?

Answer. The Connolly Youth Movement was formed in 1965 as the youth group of the Irish Workers party, which is now the Communist party of Ireland. A few people from both Trinity College and UCD [University College Dublin] went along to meetings of this group. They were not exactly members but they participated in the work of the organization.

In early 1966 a group of dissatisfied intellectuals formed the Internationalists, which has now developed into an ultraleft Maoist group opposed to every other grouping in the country and in the university.

At Easter 1966 the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Easter 1916 rebellion took place in Dublin with tremendous pomp and ceremony, and a group of students, especially students from Northern Ireland, got together—there were about twelve or thirteen—and decided to form a republican club. This group had personal contacts with the republican movement outside the academic community and proposed to act as an un-

official branch of the republican movement in the university.

As soon as the club got itself organized the following year, that is, the following academic year, it came into its own. It applied for a grant and started asking for its democratic rights as a student organization. And with that the dormant Fabian Society, which was a group of anyone that was more or less left wing, drew confidence from the fact that someone else was being militant, and started asking for a grant and a room and the other facilities it was entitled to.

Because of its contact with the outside republican movement and because of its contact with the Connolly Youth Movement, the Republican Club developed into a very powerful student organization. It was the only student organization with one line.

The Socialist Society, the old Fabian Society, quickly broke up into several factions. What's left of it is entirely Trotskyist and has contacts with the Socialist Labour League in England and the Trotskyist left wing of the Labour party. The Labour left wing has very little influence on the national Labour party policy but does have influence on the young rank-and-file Labour supporters, in Dublin especially.

This Trotskyist faction split away from left liberal people who were active in the antiapartheid movement and a lot of foreign students who were not really committed to working for socialism in Ireland. As a result the Republican Club emerged as the strongest single force. It wasn't very strong compared to the British conservative youth organization, which is called the "1964 Society" in TCD [Trinity College Dublin] or compared to the TCD Labour party branch.

But the Republican Club had tremendous influence in the academic year 1968. It controlled the SRC [Student Representative Council]. The president of the SRC was a member of the Republican Club. With this rise, which has gone on two years now, the left-wing group in Trinity was responsible for starting off left-wing movements in all the other universities. A

UCD Republican Club was formed, which was quite active and is still there. And also as a result of the Republican Club's formation in UCD, a group called Students for Democratic Action was formed which caused quite a bit of trouble for the establishment and had a very large amount of support for about a year.

With the growth of this left-wing activity in the universities, the establishment political forces—Fianna Fáil and the Labour party, and so on, stepped up their activity.

The national Labour party assumed much tighter control over its own little Labour party group at TCD. Ever since then the Republican Club has lost a lot of the influence it had in student government circles, even though our opinion is still listened to in quite a few quarters.

Q. What activities does the Republican Club engage in at the present time?

A. We operate on four levels. We take part in the demonstrations which we support, and contribute speakers to whatever agitations are required. Secondly we have public meetings which are mainly to introduce the ordinary student to republicanism in general, trying to get him interested in joining the Republican Club, or supporting the Republican Club, or buying our magazine [*Republican News*], and so on. To do this we hold quite large meetings every two or three weeks. We have had many prominent figures speak and have had some good discussions. This is mainly where we draw our membership from.

On an internal level, or a less external level shall we say, we hold regular study groups once a week at which we discuss whatever we feel like discussing at the time. That might be an issue that has cropped up at the university, or outside the university, or any debate going on in the country at the time, or a purely theoretical question.

If we do discuss theory, we start mainly with Connolly and the Irish

revolutionary classics, Fintan Lalor and John Mitchel, and so on. Later on, at a less concentrated stage, we take up the Marxist classics, Marx, Engels, and so on.

On the final level we have *Republican News*, which is published rather irregularly. Anybody is invited to contribute, provided he's prepared to discuss the article and defend it at a study group. As often as not these study groups are based on articles which have appeared in our publication. *Republican News* has quite a large circulation within the universities. We send it all over Ireland. We send it to the other universities if we have addresses at the time, because the Republican Clubs at the other universities are rather ephemeral; they disappear and reappear. However, the *Republican News* is also sent to national newspapers and the *United Irishman*. As often as not, it is quoted and its opinions are listened to.

I feel that it is because of the Republican Club's contact and involvement with the republican movement and the Connolly Youth Movement, which is an outside young workers group, that we have managed to keep our feet on the ground, unlike other student groups in Western Europe, England particularly. We have made — we think anyway — a very useful contribution to the thinking of the republican movement and the left-wing movements in Ireland. Both of us, we in the university and those outside, have benefited from this sort of contact which other student groups lack.

In the Republican Club we've debated the questions that relate to the national revolution, to the social revolution, and the connection between reunification of the country and social change. But we have debated these questions on their own merits and not on the basis of the Marxist classics.

Q. What kind of a revolution do you think is on the agenda for Ireland? A national revolution or a social revolution? What class will lead the revolution?

A. My own opinion is that there has been no successful bourgeois democratic revolution in Ireland. The 1919-21 war of independence was led by people who represented business and commercial interests, as well as large farmers. They did not succeed because

their counterparts in the North, the people who represented the same class interests there, opposed the revolution. So there was no question of any kind of national revolution.

In my opinion the upper-class interests worked out a deal with Britain to prevent any successful democratic revolution of any kind. Objectively this deal has been accepted by all politicians who have taken power, including Fianna Fáil, which took power under the banner of republicanism in 1932.

The program of the republican movement, the Freedom Manifesto, serves as the basis for the organization to be constructed to move toward the revolution, the National Liberation Front. This Front must be working-class led. This does not mean that it won't have to make concessions to other groupings to gain their support. It doesn't mean it won't have to bide its time and wait, but provided that the working class leads this alliance, I'm quite satisfied that it will be a step in the right direction.

I am talking about the urban working class. In the North we still have the problem of the division of the workers on the basis of religion. This is only just beginning to be broken down. And even now it's certainly very, very hard to see how it's going to be broken down completely. But the working class is to be the main group in the alliance projected by the Freedom Manifesto.

Another group whose support must be gained and kept are the small farmers, that is, in Irish terms, the farmers with one cow and one acre and a few hens, not the larger farmers with around thirty or more acres and cattle, who are more independent.

Some concessions may have to be made to shopkeepers and owner-managers of small businesses and so on. However, I feel that these must be very strictly limited. I do see the need for such concessions, in the sense that a socialist economy requires an awful lot of ability and technical know-how. I am personally rather dissatisfied with the Soviet economic textbooks I have seen. Therefore we will probably be working in the dark if a revolution is achieved. So it is wrong to be dogmatic about anything except that the working class must remain in complete control of the rev-

olution and the revolutionary alliance as it proceeds towards socialism.

To clarify what I mean by working-class leadership, the working class must be conscious of its role as the leadership of the socialist revolution, must have a clear idea of what it wants to end up with. To make the point clear about concessions to other classes, these concessions are to win their support but should not give them any power or any lever that could be used to divert the revolution.

Q. Do you see the revolution in Ireland as part of an international process?

A. With regard to the international picture, we feel in the Republican Club that the center and the source of revolution has shifted from the socialist countries and the Communist parties of Western Europe, the more or less orthodox Communist parties, who have tremendous power and control tremendous support but don't seem to be able to do very much with it. We feel that the social revolution is shifting toward the underdeveloped countries in Latin America and Africa, and Vietnam in particular.

These movements are led by working-class organizations usually. I think it's fair to say that the Vietnamese struggle is led by working-class movements. These movements seem to be very, very critical of Communist parties generally. They don't say this, because they have to rely a lot on help from these people.

I feel, myself anyway, that the Communist parties show a lot of laziness and lack of imagination generally as well as in Ireland. However, the Communist party here isn't as bad in my opinion as others in Western Europe. The Irish Communist party seems anxious to support the *Comhdhail na Saoirse* [Freedom Council], which is what we are trying to set up as our national liberation movement. The Communist party here is much more anxious to support this sort of thing and much more militant than other Communist parties in the world seem to be.

I feel, and probably many in the republican movement also, that the Communist party here has influence but is not doing much with it. For example, the Communist party has members on the executive of the Irish

Transport and General Workers Union. And I feel that if the republican movement had members on the national executive of this union that they'd have done much more by now than the Communist party seems to have done. The Communist party seems to be trying to stick to constitutional means and the public platform rather than use militant methods, which is what the republican movement has always stood for.

Q. Do you think the republican movement has become any less militant since it adopted a program of political action?

A. Because the republican movement was so militant, because the ordinary man trusted nothing but the gun, he never examined the movement's policy to find out what it stood for. He said we'll get rid of the British troops and then we'll work out something.

In fact the republicans were quite radical even though they never examined themselves. As a result of this apolitical attitude, if they had succeeded they probably would have been betrayed by politicians more astute than they were.

But now because of the failure of the military approach, especially in the North, the republicans have examined themselves and have discovered a revolutionary heritage which has been passed down from Wolfe Tone, which is quite radical and has made a major contribution to the mainstream of revolutionary thought. In my opinion, if the republican movement does succeed in making a revolution, it will make a major addition to the stock of revolutionary theory and, I feel, definitely shake up a lot of orthodox revolutionaries in the world.

With regard again to national liberation fronts versus the Communist parties of the industrialized countries, the republican movement, because of its new awareness, sees itself filling the role of leader in such a front. It sees itself in these international terms and recognizes in the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam an ally, for example, somebody to work with. Whereas it certainly doesn't feel the same kind of camaraderie with Communist parties.

I think that this international perspective is a very good thing because

as long as the republican movement stands on its own, aloof from international revolution, it won't convince working-class people, or ordinary people of any class, that it is credible, that it is able to stand up to an international system like capitalism, unless it puts forward an alternative to capitalism in conjunction with other groups throughout the world.

Q. What has the republican movement done concretely to show its solidarity with the Vietnamese struggle?

A. Along with the rise of the Republican Club and the Connolly Youth Movement, as well as other youth groups, an organization called the Irish Voice of Vietnam was founded, which is the broadest possible coalition of those opposed to the Vietnam war in Ireland. The main spokesmen are Communist party members, because they probably know more about

the question than anybody else in Ireland. There have been a few demonstrations, nothing more than marches to the American embassy and maybe a little trouble out there. Certainly nothing very spectacular.

The main reason for the smallness of the movement is, I think, the republicans' preoccupation with getting on with the problems that face Ireland. Whereas you have the odd Vietnam demonstration in order to keep the question alive and inform people every now and again of the situation that still exists in Vietnam, there's been no major series of demonstrations to make the war a real issue.

It has not been felt that the war is an acute issue in Ireland. It may be important from a theoretical point of view—if you examine the question, you learn things from it—but it certainly isn't going to affect Ireland very much economically as it might affect Britain or America.

Mandel Case

Fresh Support for 'Right to Hear' Campaign

Seven prominent academic and literary figures have issued an appeal for aid to the case of Ernest Mandel, the Belgian Marxist scholar who was twice barred from visiting the United States in 1969.

They are Professor Germaine Brée, University of Wisconsin; Professor Laurent B. Frantz, Berkeley Law School; Professor Gabriel Jackson, University of California-San Diego; Professor Christopher Lasch, Northwestern University; Nobel Laureate Salvador E. Luria, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Robert Silvers, editor *New York Review of Books*; and Paul Sweezy, editor *Monthly Review*.

They are asking support for the suit brought by Mandel and eight scholars from seven Eastern universities for an injunction restraining the government from excluding him from the United States. This case is the first challenge to the restrictive provisions of the 1952 McCarran-Walter Act excluding aliens solely because of their political opinions.

A panel of three federal judges heard the arguments in Brooklyn on June

24 presented by the noted constitutional lawyer Leonard Boudin, and decision is pending. Whatever their verdict, the case will be appealed by one side or the other to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The basic issue at stake, the signatories to the appeal point out, is whether Americans have the constitutional right to hear the views of individuals of all nationalities and persuasions free of censorship. The Nixon administration contends that it has arbitrary power to refuse admission to citizens of other countries for any reason, thereby exercising arbitrary control over what Americans can hear and discuss.

Mandel was barred from participating in a debate with Harvard Professor John K. Galbraith at Stanford University in October 1969 and from speaking at a number of Eastern universities the following months, even though he had spoken at thirty U.S. universities in 1968.

As part of its pattern of curbing dissent, Nixon and his Attorney General Mitchell have been tightening re-

strictions upon foreign visitors of radical views in order to prevent the free exchange of ideas. This reversion to the practices of the McCarthyite period by the Justice Department has stirred considerable protest in this country and abroad.

The Mandel Case Legal Defense Fund has been set up under the auspices of the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, which initiated the suit with the support of the Social-

ist Scholars Conference and the American Foundation for Social Justice. It is launching a nationwide campaign centered around the American universities to publicize this important civil liberties action and raise money for the heavy expenses involved in the litigation.

Contributions to the defense should be made and mailed to: The Mandel Case-NECLC, Room 913, 25 East 26th St., New York, N. Y. 10010.

China

Good Harvests Reported in Many Areas

Virtually all sources, including some that are bitterly hostile to the Chinese revolution, are admitting that bumper crops have been harvested this year in many areas in China although no figures have been issued by Peking on this.

The bourgeois press in the West tends to ascribe the favorable results this year to two factors.

First of all, say the commentators, the Chinese have finally worked their way out of the chaotic situation engendered by the "cultural revolution."

Secondly, the weather in China was exceptionally favorable.

Whatever truth there may be to these explanations, the bourgeois experts are chary about pointing to the elimination of the Chiang Kai-shek regime that maintained a capitalist economy of general scarcity and periodic famines whatever the weather or the ups and downs of the domestic political situation.

The press also appears singularly reluctant to draw any comparisons between China's favorable food situation and the bitter hunger that stalks India under the blessings of a capitalist economy and the "democracy" of Indira Gandhi.

Unfortunately, it is easy for the columnists of the Western press to divert attention from the deficiencies in their accounts. They quote absurdities from Maoist propaganda.

These are provided in an unending flood by the bureaucracy in China as part of the effort to uphold the cult of Mao in imitation of the achievements of the Soviet bureaucracy in this field in Stalin's day.



Smiles on Crops

Thus Peking, viewing the good harvest with satisfaction, is concerned that the populace bow in the proper direction in offering up thanks. And the expression of this concern makes good copy for the capitalist press.

For instance, Donald Bremner wrote two whole columns in the October 4 issue of the *Los Angeles Times* on China's bountiful harvest without saying very much. Nevertheless, he succeeded in making Peking look ridiculous by quoting various items from the Chinese press, an example being the following bit from the *Fukien Daily*:

"Two opposing views exist regarding the bumper rice harvest we have

reaped this year. The broad masses of peasants say that the bumper harvest is the result of the application of Mao Tse-tung's Thought.

"Some people hold, however, that it was the result of this year's favorable weather—in other words, a favorable act of God. On the basis of the principle of grasping revolution and promoting production, we can say that the first view is correct while the second is gravely mistaken.

"Our great leader, Chairman Mao, teaches us: Man is the most important thing in the world. With man, it is possible to create any miracle. In both revolutionary struggle and in the struggle for production, it is man and not objective factors that determines success or failure.

"The view that a bumper harvest depends on favorable weather is, in effect, a denial of the omnipotence of Mao Tse-tung Thought. As a matter of fact, this year's weather was not favorable. Our bumper harvest has been achieved through our hard struggle against nature, with Mao Tse-tung Thought as the weapon."

Too bad China's night-soil collectors could not cart this off for application in a more productive way than spreading it in the pages of the *Fukien Daily*.

Something to Look Forward To

The amount of air pollution in New York City doubles every ten years.

MEMO to:

Intercontinental Press
P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station
New York, N.Y., 10010

from:

Name
Street
City
State Zip
Country

[] \$15 enclosed for one year.
[] \$7.50 enclosed for six months.
[] Send information on first-class and airmail rates.