



SHEIK MUJIBUR RAHMAN. Bengali independence leader a captive of Yahya Khan. Massacre of East Pakistan's Awami League leadership has created vacuum that is being filled by more radical representatives of Bengali masses.

April 24 Antiwar Demonstration:

Thousands to Join March on Washington and San Francisco

Ceylon Youth Resist Army Attack

Ping Pong: Mao's Opener in a Bid to Washington

Hugo Blanco Held for 24 Hours

Less than four months after his release from El Fronton prison, where he served almost eight years for his activities in organizing the peasant unions in La Convencion, Peruvian revolutionary leader Hugo Blanco was rearrested March 9 by the political police. Held for twenty-four hours in the offices of the PIP [Policia de Investigaciones del Peru—Investigative Police of Peru], Blanco was interrogated about his support for workers' struggles taking place in the country and the campaign for the release of the remaining political prisoners.

"For the government, Comrade Blanco's accepting an invitation from his mine-worker brothers to discuss trade-union affairs, his explaining the need for carrying out a unified struggle and informing the people of the subhuman conditions to which the miners have been subjected by the imperialist exploiters of the Cerro de Pasco Corporation, represents conspiracy and subversion," *Revolucion Peruana* wrote in its March issue.

"For the government, demanding the release of Comrade Eduardo Creus, of the eight Cuzco peasant leaders still in prison, and of the publisher of the magazine *Libertad* means that Hugo Blanco is ungrateful for the freedom granted him."

Blanco's arrest, the Trotskyist publication surmised, was the result of government maneuvering in response to sharpening contradictions in the country: "It is evident that in taking this step, along with others, the junta was making a concession to the right wing, trying, or appearing to suppress the voice of a revolutionist devoted to the people and the revolution. The increasingly virulent reaction of the right and the thrust of the mass movement have put the junta under conflicting pressures, forcing it to balance between classes and different social strata in order to channel their energies behind its program of bourgeois development."

The magazine stated: "Comrade Hugo Blanco clarified some aspects about the matters he was questioned on. He made it clear that he had broken no law and was operating within the framework of the rights granted by the bourgeois laws themselves."

Husak Closes Library

The library of the Institute for the History of the Czechoslovak Communist party—generally considered one of the best libraries on socialism in all of Europe—has been dismantled, according to a March 20 Reuters report. The building is being converted into a Soviet cultural center.

In This Issue

		PERU	
	346	Hugo Blanco Held for Twenty-Four Hours	
		ANTIWAR	
	347	Hundreds of Thousands Plan to March April 24	
		INDOCHINA WAR	
Allen Myers	349	Intervention in Calley Case Backfires on Nixon	
		U. S. A.	
	350	Right-Wing Bombings in New York	
		PAKISTAN	
Gerry Foley	351	Widespread Resistance Reported in East Bengal	
	368	West Pakistanis in Solidarity with Bengal	
		INDIA	
Kailas Chandra	354	Behind Indira Gandhi's Election Victory	
		CHILE	
	355	Allende Gains in Election	
		CEYLON	
Les Evans	356	Youth Group Resists Army Crackdown	
	358	Interview with Bala Tampoe	
		SOUTH AFRICA	
	357	Prison Population Explosion	
		MEXICO	
	360	Echeverria Discovers Another "Communist Plot"	
		MIDDLE EAST	
Nathan Weinstock	362	Palestinian Fedayeen Face Increasing Difficulties	
		DENMARK	
	363	Scientists Score U.S. on Chemical Weapons	
		CHINA	
	364	Ping Pong—Mao's Opener in a Bid to Washington	
		ITALY	
	365	European Sections of Fourth International	
		Hold Conference of Workers	
	366	Trotskyists Hold Rally in Turin	
		SOVIET UNION	
	367	Bukovsky Faces Seven-Year Sentence	
		CZECHOSLOVAKIA	
	368	Threaten Longer Sentences for Prague Nineteen	
		REVIEWS	
	367	Problems of Women's Liberation	
		DRAWINGS	
Copain	345	Sheik Mujibur Rahman	

Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Village Post Office Station, New York, N.Y. 10014.

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, Ernest Mandel, George Novack.

MANAGING EDITOR: Les Evans.

EDITORIAL STAFF: Gerry Foley, Allen Myers, George Saunders.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.

TECHNICAL STAFF: H. Massey, James M. Morgan, Ruth Schein, Steven Warshell, Jack Wood.

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, Black, and women's liberation movements.

Signed articles represent the views of the authors,

which may not necessarily coincide with those of Intercontinental Press. Insofar as it reflects editorial opinion, unsigned material 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 116, Village Post Office Station, New York, N.Y. 10014. 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 116, Village Post Office Station, New York, N.Y. 10014. 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 © 1971 by Intercontinental Press.

Hundreds of Thousands Plan to March April 24

"This spring [in Washington] it may be hard to see the flowers for the protesters," lamented prowar columnist Kenneth Crawford in the April 3 *Washington Post*. The mass antiwar demonstrations set for April 24 in Washington and San Francisco have been given a big boost by what happened in Laos, according to this hawk:

"The outcome of the aborted foray into Laos will deserve the bad name it is getting if it damages South Vietnamese morale as much as some correspondents on the scene think it will. The damage it has done American morale, if any is left, is probably irreparable."

But if Crawford's morale was low, that of the antiwar movement was high as the spring offensive against the war opened April 2-5 with actions around the country commemorating the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and demanding an end to the war in Southeast Asia.

The largest action occurred in New York City, where 5,000 persons demonstrated April 5. Teach-ins and demonstrations were also held in Chicago, Washington, Cleveland, Detroit, and Tucson, Arizona.

The National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC), sponsor of the April 24 marches, sent out copies of a letter from Coretta King, widow of the late civil-rights fighter. "I plan to be with you in Washington on April 24," the letter said, "because I think this is the single most important thing that I could do at this time toward fulfilling my husband's dream."

In an attempt to head off the spreading dissatisfaction with his war, Nixon advanced by a week a televised speech originally scheduled for April 14.

Nixon's April 7 address must have been a disappointment even to his supporters. Consisting of little but cunning demagoguery and empty boasts of success, it was a graphic reminder of how little room for maneuver Nixon has.

"Vietnamization," Nixon proclaimed, "has succeeded." The announcement, coming on the heels of the Laos debacle, resembled nothing so much as

whistling in the dark. Democratic presidential hopeful Senator George McGovern commented: "The President is still trying to convince us that a tragic blunder represents America's finest hour."

Faced with the necessity to show "progress" of some sort, Nixon went on to promise that an additional 100,000 U.S. troops would be pulled out of Indochina between May 1 and December 1. Presented as an increase in the rate of withdrawals, it was in fact only a return to the rate of the first four months of last year, before the Cambodia invasion slowed the withdrawals.

Nixon's statistics on the number of American troops in Southeast Asia were not accompanied by statistics on the tonnage of bombs he has dropped there or the numbers of Vietnamese, Cambodians, and Laotians killed by this murderous onslaught.

Although members of Nixon's own party, such as Senator George Aiken of Vermont, predicted before the speech that Nixon would promise a complete withdrawal by sometime in 1972, they were put off with phrases so vague as to be meaningless:

"The day the South Vietnamese can take over their own defense is in sight. Our goal is a total American withdrawal from Vietnam. We can and we will reach that goal through our program of Vietnamization if necessary."

Nixon's squirming was due to the growing unwillingness of the American people to be put off with promises. In this respect, one of the most interesting aspects of the speech was the fact that it attracted little public attention in comparison with earlier presidential pronouncements.

The *New York Times*, perhaps because of alarm at the growth of the mass independent antiwar movement, did its best to read into the speech things that simply weren't there. An April 8 editorial, for example, declared more hopefully than accurately:

"President Nixon's new pledge of 'total American withdrawal from Vietnam' through Vietnamization, if not achieved sooner through a negotiated

settlement, will be welcomed by the country even more than his small acceleration of the troop withdrawal rate over the next seven months."

Senator Aiken gave a more honest picture of the public response. Nixon's speech, he said, was not "enough to put the lid back on."

At a news conference the day after Nixon's speech, Jerry Gordon, an NPAC coordinator, reiterated the determination of the antiwar movement to continue its protests and mass demonstrations until all the U.S. troops are brought home from Indochina.

The April 24 marches were drawing increased support from nearly every sector of U.S. society. In the April 3 *Christian Science Monitor*, Trudy Rubin described the plans of Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVAW), who will open the actions in Washington with five days of protests immediately prior to April 24. The group expects 5,000 to 10,000 veterans to participate.

"Membership of Viet Vets," Rubin wrote, "jumped this winter. . . . It is now about 9,500, 1,200 of whom are in Vietnam. VVAW spokesmen say they are getting from 20 to 30 new applications a day." (Emphasis added.)

NPAC placed an advertisement in the April 11 *New York Times* that indicated the breadth of support for the April 24 demonstrations. The message of the ad was simple:

"We urge you to march for peace April 24. We'd do it ourselves, but we're in Vietnam."

The ad was signed by forty-nine members of the U.S. army's First Air Cavalry Division.

The rapidly growing feminist movement has also become a major builder of the demonstrations. Women's liberation groups in at least eighteen cities are organizing women to march in the United Women's Contingents in Washington and San Francisco. The United Women's Contingent has opened a national office in Washington to coordinate women's participation.

The contingent has been endorsed by a wide range of feminist groups



Backing Out of the Saloon

— Conrad in the Los Angeles Times

and leaders, including the New York Women's Strike Coalition; authors Betty Friedan, Gloria Steinem, and Kate Millett; Aileen Hernandez, the national president of the National Organization for Women (NOW); the New England Women's Coalition; San Diego Women United Against the War; and a whole host of campus feminist groups.

On April 1, New York City Mayor John Lindsay joined other prominent capitalist politicians who have recognized the popularity of April 24 and jumped on the bandwagon. Lindsay announced his support in a letter to NPAC that said in part:

"I am endorsing the April 24th rallies in Washington and San Francisco for the withdrawal of all American forces and military personnel from Indochina as fast as possible."

The April 11 *New York Times* reported in a dispatch from Washington:

"Support for the demonstration appears to be more broadly based than for past antiwar protests here.

"In addition to endorsements from 26 members of Congress, the April 24 demonstration has received support from hundreds of labor organizations, veterans groups, theologians, student and community organizations, and even a group of antiwar business executives."

Nixon's policies were also repudiated by several religious organizations. Donald Janson reported from Philadelphia in the April 8 *New York Times*:

"The Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, long the country's leading Quaker organization, rebuked President Nixon to-

day [April 7] for coupling references to his Quaker heritage with a defense of his Administration's war policy in southeast Asia."

In the same week that Nixon spoke on television in defense of his policies, four prominent religious journals took the unprecedented step of publishing a joint editorial entitled "We Accuse." The four publications — *Christian Century*, *Christianity and Crisis*, *National Catholic Reporter*, and *Commonweal*—charged:

"—We accuse U.S. leaders . . . of deliberately closing their eyes to the almost incalculable human suffering which has resulted [from the war]. . . .

"—We accuse the United States of taking the leading role in killing 25,000-35,000 civilians in South Vietnam in 1970 alone, and many thousands more over the decade; of wounding four times as many, perhaps a third of whom have been children under 13; of turning some five million people . . . into refugees. . . .

"—We accuse the present Administration of cruel deception in claiming to be 'winding down' a war by boasting of troop withdrawals while shifting the death and bloodshed to other peoples. . . ."

In a commentary on Nixon's April 7 speech in the April 10 *New York Times*, Anthony Lewis indicated the problem faced by the president:

"In short, the Nixon policy is to go on fighting, and killing, in a war that America demonstrably does not want and is giving up. . . .

"But there are limits of credibility, and they have been reached. No President can persuade sensible men that a Cambodia pitted with American bombs and half-controlled by Communist forces marks a victory for the free world. No President can turn what happened in Laos into a triumph. No President can permanently ignore the moral sensibilities of the American people."

Hundreds of thousands of persons were preparing to carry into the streets of Washington and San Francisco the message expressed by Debby Bustin, national coordinator of the Student Mobilization Committee, at an April 6 press conference:

"One year ago, Nixon murdered American students to defend his right to murder the people of Southeast Asia. We are saying, get the United States out of Indochina and get it out now!" □

Intervention in Calley Case Backfires on Nixon

By Allen Myers

"The Sydney Morning Herald," Anthony Lewis reported in the April 6 *New York Times*, "carried a bitterly ironic letter from a reader, Robert J. Mayne, saying that Lieutenant Calley might have been 'a little harsh in his judgment on the 22 Vietnamese civilians.' Mr. Mayne continued:

"'Might he not reconsider the severity of his sentence? While he is considering his verdict, the least he could do is let the people return to their hamlet and live in comfort.'"

According to Lewis' roundup of the foreign press, reaction to Nixon's unprecedented intervention in the case of convicted mass-murderer William Calley Jr. was almost universally unfavorable, even in countries whose governments are firm allies of American imperialism.

"Published comment," Lewis wrote, "has expressed shock at what is seen as an interference with the process of law. Some commentators have said that a more appropriate political response to the trial would have been to end the Vietnam war."

The criticism included additional elements that Lewis failed to note. The British daily *Guardian*, for example, on April 2 called for trials of Calley's superiors:

"What seems utterly wrong about the Calley case is that the Lieutenant should suffer while the Generals go unquestioned. Two main principles were established at the Nuremberg war crimes trial. The first is that a soldier cannot excuse himself by saying that he committed a crime under orders. The second is that the Generals who order war crimes are as guilty as those who commit them. . . . For its own sake—and not merely in fairness to Lieutenant Calley—the United States must now enforce the principle against Americans. The sentencing of a Lieutenant will not end the My Lai affair."

Such critical comments from the foreign press came amid indications that within the United States as well, Nixon's intervention may have boomeranged against him. The announcement

that Calley's fate would be determined by Nixon himself was intended to quiet public discussion of war crimes and the consequent questioning of the war itself. In fact, it had the opposite effect.

Right-wing forces were encouraged by what amounted to a declaration that killing Vietnamese civilians was considered by the commander in chief as a minor peccadillo at worst. They seized the opportunity to urge still another escalation of the war.

In an article printed in the April 8 *New York Times*, for example, a retired rear admiral appropriately named Edward C. Outlaw argued that the entire Calley affair was due to the fact that "we are . . . not willing to use the power which is at our disposal." He went on to urge Nixon to deliver the following ultimatum to the North Vietnamese government:

"We will immediately commence a complete withdrawal of all U. S. forces from South Vietnam and will complete this operation by the end of 1971—provided North Vietnam withdraws her forces to the north of the DMZ [demilitarized zone] and does not interfere in any manner with such a withdrawal nor commit any act of aggression against South Vietnam until the withdrawal is finally completed and, provided that all prisoners of war are immediately rehabilitated [sic] to their homeland. Should North Vietnam violate these provisions in any manner whatsoever, I will direct the air forces of the U. S. to destroy completely Hanoi, Haiphong, all other principal centers of industry and all dikes and dams in North Vietnam."

Other military officers were quick to suggest that "politicians" should keep out of army affairs and allow it to get on with the slaughter. Drew Middleton interviewed a number of such officers and quoted them—without giving names—in the April 1 *New York Times*.

"'Don't they realize we know it's a dirty war,' a veteran colonel asked. 'All wars are dirty, immoral. War itself is the great atrocity.'"

"'Look,' he went on, 'we're soldiers. We train men, give them the best weapons and the best doctrine we can get, and, when a politician tells us to go do something, we go and do it. We teach men not to fire on unarmed people or civilians. We always have. Now this one case, this one lousy case, and we're a bunch of murderers.'"

A general told Middleton:

"I commanded a brigade out there [Vietnam]. We never had anything remotely like the Calley case. But we had bad situations when you were getting fire from women, when teenagers were chucking grenades. Politicians talk about a guerrilla war—and tell us how to fight it—but they just don't know what a guerrilla war is like. Unless they do, they ought to shut up."

Such right-wing views, however, found remarkably little echo. As we reported last week [*Intercontinental Press*, April 12, page 324], the overwhelming majority of those who disapproved of the Calley verdict did so from the standpoint that higher-ups shared Calley's guilt. In the week following Nixon's April 3 announcement, this fact was reflected in cautious criticism by Democratic politicians. Samuel C. Brightman, a former deputy chairman of the Democratic National Committee, in an article in the April 8 *New York Times*, warned his party friends not to be misled by the noise from the right:

"And the professional veterans, the blubbery men in silly hats who rushed before the network cameras to praise Lieutenant Calley and denounce the verdict of Lieutenant Calley's combat peers, these hardened veterans of the beery political combat at the local [American] Legion or V.F.W. [Veterans of Foreign Wars] hall, no matter what you see and hear on your TV set, these characters do not speak for the 'people,' or at least not for me."

On April 5, Senator Adlai Stevenson 3rd of Illinois declared that others responsible for the Mylai massacre also "must be brought to trial." Steven-

son was referring to other military officers, not Lyndon Johnson or Richard Nixon, but his remark nevertheless indicated his evaluation of the public attitude toward American war crimes.

On April 6, four liberal Democratic members of the House of Representatives announced that they would hold informal hearings on U.S. atrocities in Vietnam. "Dove" members of Congress have been put under pressure to call official hearings by antiwar veterans, who over the last few months have held their own public meetings describing war crimes they had witnessed.

In the April 5 *Washington Post*, Richard L. Lyons reported that the Calley affair has played a role in forcing positions critical of the war on the House of Representatives membership, which "almost never leads public opinion and often has trouble catching up with it."

Lyons described the experience of Thomas P. O'Neill Jr., the Democratic whip:

"O'Neill has been receiving antiwar mail from his Harvard constituents for years. But after the Calley verdict, he said his office was deluged with calls from his workingmen's neighborhoods saying 'get us out of there.'"

One of the complaints of the liberals in Congress and their spokesmen in the press was that Nixon's intervention in behalf of Calley had destroyed the ability of the trial to whitewash the military and its civilian commanders. A statement released by ten Democrats in the House of Representatives warned:

"The President's intervention has impaired the military judicial system and lessened any respect it may have gained as a result of these proceedings."

The *New York Times* used more forceful language to say the same thing in an April 8 editorial:

"Calley is a convicted murderer who deserves pity, perhaps, but neither exculpation nor adulation. To have exonerated this wretched lieutenant would have degraded the Army and made a monumental farce of American efforts to secure humane treatment of American prisoners now in enemy hands. *The Army would be saying it was permissible to murder civilians under American control; and in fact the witless uproar over the Calley conviction is giving precisely that impres-*

sion even now throughout the civilized world." (Emphasis added.)

A less self-interested defense of the "judicial system" came from Captain Aubrey M. Daniel, the prosecutor in the Calley case. In an April 3 letter to the president, Daniel said he was "shocked and dismayed" by Nixon's intervention.

"You have subjected a judicial system of this country," he wrote, "to the criticism that it is subject to political influence, when it is a fundamental precept of our judicial system that the legal processes of this country must be kept free from any outside influences. What will be the impact of your decision upon the future trials, particularly those within the military?"

The impact, of course, will be what Nixon intended: to tell court-martial juries that he doesn't want any more decisions that are going to call attention to the continuing crimes involved in his prosecution of the war. The cynicism of this maneuver caused Anthony Lewis to comment in the April 10 *New York Times*:

"It is a strange feeling to be part of a country whose President shows less concern for the process of law than for the comfort of a man found guilty of murdering little children."

Lewis went on to point out the facts Nixon hoped to conceal:

"No one could have known, from listening to him [Nixon's April 7

speech], that since the United States intervened actively in the war, there have been more than 1.5 million civilian casualties, most of them from American and allied action. Or that four or five million people in South Vietnam alone have been made refugees, mostly by American or allied action."

But contrary to Nixon's calculations, it is too late for his intervention in the Calley case to stem the public outrage generated by the war and the crimes it entails.

This was the message of a statement on the Calley case issued April 2 by the National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC), the organization sponsoring the April 24 demonstrations in Washington and San Francisco:

". . . it is now widely recognized that what Lt. Calley did could only occur in the context of a war that has established such criminal norms as 'free fire zones'; saturation bombing of civilian areas; forced relocation of civilian populations in 'strategic hamlets'; murderous 'search and destroy' operations; the wholesale use of chemical and biological weapons and hosts of other barbarisms."

The overall effect of Nixon's action was thus to hasten rather than alleviate the polarization already occurring over the war issue. One week after his April 3 announcement, Nixon appeared to have lost much more than he had gained. □

Right-Wing Bombings in New York

The national headquarters of the U.S. Communist party in New York City was bombed by terrorists at 4:15 a.m. on March 30. The bomb, a ten-inch-long pipe-style device, tore apart the door to the building, shattered wood in the interior, and broke windows of several adjacent buildings.

Several minutes before the explosion, both Associated Press and United Press International received phone calls saying that the office had "just been bombed."

The *New York Times* of March 31 reported that the caller to UPI said: "Let the tools and lackeys who throw our brethren into jail know that they, too, are responsible for the actions of those who they support. Let our people go. Never Again."

The two slogans are catchwords of the right-wing Jewish Defense League, which has been conducting a campaign of harassment against Soviet citizens in the United States.

On the same day, the headquarters of the United States Cuban Health Exchange, a private group set up to promote U.S.-Cuban exchanges of physicians and medical information, was also bombed. Police said that they thought the two bombings were unrelated.

In That Glass of Water

The U.S. Geological Survey issued a warning March 30 that the water supplies of twelve U.S. cities contain concentrations of arsenic and cadmium higher than the amounts allowed by the Public Health Service.

The maximum concentration for arsenic, according to the PHS, is fifty parts per billion. The highest concentration discovered by the Geological Survey was 1,100 parts per billion. This was in South Carolina, downstream from a major industrial complex in North Carolina.

Widespread Resistance Reported in East Bengal

By Gerry Foley

"Our sheikh [Mujibur Rahman] is free and he is leading us,' an Awami League man said," according to an April 5 dispatch from *Washington Post* correspondent Lee Lescaze in Navaran, liberated Bengal. "He must be leading us."

"But another man with less faith confessed that he doesn't know what has happened to Sheikh Mujibur Rahman.

"How can we know anything here?" he says, gesturing to the narrow black-top road, the frail houses, a few bicycles and one battered car unmovable for lack of gasoline."

More than two weeks after the Pakistani military dictatorship launched its murderous attacks on the Bengali people, it has become clear that a prolonged war is developing in the former East Pakistani territory, a war that cannot fail to have far-reaching international consequences.

Although the massacres and round-ups in the first phase of the war seem to have eliminated most of the Bengali national leadership, the inability of the Pakistani forces to occupy the teeming rural areas, or even all the urban centers, has given great masses of Bengalis a chance to organize.

In the countryside and small cities, scattered political, military, and administrative cadres have set up a basis for organized resistance, at least on a local level.

The liquidation of the top leadership of the bourgeois-dominated Awami League has left the way open for a militant leadership to take command of the popular struggle. At the same time it has left a vacuum on the national level. There is no evidence as yet that any organization exists or is developing that can coordinate the war of liberation and give it the necessary political perspective. In a situation where an almost unarmed and confused people are facing ruthless armed repression and the threat of famine, international factors, both moral and material, may play a decisive role in the outcome of a struggle that is already being compared to the Spanish civil war.

In early April, the nationalist leaders in Chuadanga, in the southeast area of East Bengal, declared this small town the capital of liberated Bangla Desh, the Bengali nation.

The local chiefs, Major Mohammed Osman, commander of the southeastern region, and his adviser Dr. Ashabul Haq "apparently made that move by themselves," *Washington Post* correspondent Lee Lescaze cabled April 4 from Chuadanga.

"Men like Haq and Osman—who say they have no contact with the Sheikh or any other central command—are trying to keep the Bengal independence movement alive in this civil war without warfare that has come to this newly designated capital and the surrounding region."

There was little military organization in the provisional Bengali capital, according to Lescaze: "As elsewhere in what Bengalis call 'liberated areas,' there is little motor traffic here, supplies are hard to get and the rebel forces are undecided how to proceed. . . . There is no barbed wire in Chuadanga, no sandbags, no checkpoints on the roads, and little in the atmosphere that makes it clear the young men's constantly shouted slogans are war cries, not a sporting crowd's cheer."

In a dispatch from New Delhi in the April 11 issue of the *New York Times*, James P. Sterba wrote: "According to a reliable report last week, most of the Awami League leadership has been arrested and killed or jailed. Substantial numbers of sympathizers, in regional security and border forces, were also disarmed.

"Yet, despite these factors, the 'Liberation Army,' as it calls itself, has mounted surprising resistance. It has now established four command zones within the country and, with a free run through the rural areas, has increased coordination of its sparsely armed units within each zone. However, direction from the top still appears to be absent."

Faced with almost unanimous sentiment for independence among the

Bengali people, the tactic of the Pakistani military commanders seems to have been to destroy all potential leadership and terrorize the broad masses by deliberate massacres and indiscriminate bombing. Only in this way could a force estimated at less than 100,000 dominate a hostile population of 75,000,000 thickly scattered over a large area of tropical jungles and marshes.

The ruthlessness of the army's first moves may have been motivated by a realization that unless it could behead the Bengali nation in a few quick strokes, its position would rapidly become hopeless: "The Pakistan Army is alleged to have waged a war of genocide in East Pakistan," Louis Heren wrote in the April 2 issue of the *London Times*. "The objective is said to be the elimination of the political and intellectual leadership, and it might well have been achieved."

Heren based his article on information from a contact who left Dacca for London shortly after the army began its attacks: "According to this informant, a systematic pattern of physical and psychological destruction became apparent even during the first night of fighting on March 25. Soon after, it became clear that certain groups had been selected to be the victims of completely unrestrained brutality.

"These included Awami League leaders, students (who are the most radical members of the League), professors and their families, and any Hindu who could be found.

"The Army commanders had apparently concluded that the students were the nucleus of a future Bengali independence movement. . . .

"The reason for killing the Awami League leaders was self-evident. As for the Hindus, my informant is convinced that the troops were led to believe that they were the malign force behind the secessionist movement."

In an April 1 dispatch from Calcutta, *London Times* correspondent Peter Hazelhurst reported that students fleeing from the Dacca massacres had

told him: "The Army then drove through the streets with loudspeakers announcing a list of wanted students. They warned people that anyone who gave shelter to the students would be shot and their houses would be demolished."

In their attempt to reassert the religious link between West and East Pakistan, the only basis of unity, the occupation authorities revealed clearly the fundamentally retrograde character of the Pakistani state.

"Pointedly, the newspaper Morning News, which appears in both Karachi and Dacca, published as a thought for the day a quotation from the Koran: 'Surely Allah forbids indecency and evil and rebellion,'" an April 10 dispatch from Karachi to the *New York Times* reported.

"The paper's columnist, Fazl Ahmed Kar im Fazl, wrote: 'It is negligence of our obvious duty to keep constantly before the people that Pakistan was created for Moslems only that has brought the country to the brink of disaster.'"

In order to secure the country's major cities, the Pakistani army commanders seemed to believe that they had to slaughter the populations of entire districts and drive most of the survivors into the countryside.

"U.S. and other foreign refugees from East Pakistan said today the rebels and their antagonists, the army, had staged an orgy of mass executions in Chittagong and Dacca. Burning and looting left the port of Chittagong an almost deserted wasteland, they said," according to an article in the April 7 *Washington Post* compiled from news dispatches.

"The army only had to see a Bengali on the street and they shot him," said a Briton. 'Chittagong is now deserted. Everyone has fled to the villages outside.'"

From the reports of the first weeks' fighting, it seemed that it was fairly easy for the mechanized, heavily armed, and professionally led Pakistani forces to drive the resistance fighters from selected urban areas. It seemed to be much more difficult for the reactionary forces to hold territory. In an April 6 dispatch from Calcutta, *New York Times* correspondent Sydney H. Schanberg reported the stories of evacuees arriving from the devastated city of Chittagong: "The foreigners said that after several

days of fighting, the army—all West Pakistani troops—had pushed the East Pakistani resistance forces out of the city.

"But, they added, the army's control ends five miles outside the city, at the banks of the Karnalphuli River.

"Everything from the river south, they said, is in the hands of the 'liberation army.'"

Toward the end of the first week in April, Pakistani troops recaptured Jessore, one of the principal towns in the hands of the resistance forces. In a dispatch from Calcutta published in the April 11 issue of the *New York Times*, Jean Vincent of Agence France-Presse—who left the city a few days before the army entered—described the pattern of the fighting:

"A 'Liberation Army' lorry with a dozen 'freedom fighters' and two or three rifles among them takes you along the road to the Bengalis' proudest possession in this part of the region—the city of Jessore, 30 miles from the Indian border. . . . Before entering Jessore you pass several razed villages. Bodies lie in the charred ruins. The ruins in the heart of Jessore suggest that the West Pakistani air force has not been too careful."

Despite the apparent successes of their latest offensive, the Pakistani authorities were becoming increasingly worried as mid-April approached, according to press reports. "In West Pakistan, official figures are beginning, in private, to express their concern, especially because of the approach of the monsoon season, expected in about two weeks," *Le Monde* reported April 7. Once the heavy rains begin, flooding the soggy delta country, it will be all but impossible for the Pakistani troops to make armored strikes at centers of opposition in the rural areas.

Moreover, unless it receives substantial foreign aid, West Pakistan lacks the resources to continue the war against the Bengali people for an extended period: "Pakistan's foreign-exchange holdings are reportedly \$184-million, and the conflict is said to be costing \$70-million monthly," Benjamin Welles noted in the April 10 issue of the *New York Times*. "Some United States officials say privately that Pakistan cannot maintain the present expenditures longer than two months."

In addition, the bloodstained "Islamic" regime seemed threatened with a material shortage that could very rapidly immobilize the "valiant soldiers of Allah."

"According to Indian sources, the Karachi government is trying to obtain new sources of gasoline in South-east Asia, especially in Thailand, since it can no longer use the Chittagong refinery, and Burma and Ceylon have refused to sell it gasoline," the Paris daily *Le Monde* stressed in its April 7 issue.

American aid, of course, could enable the Pakistani army to fight a long war. It may be significant that the Islamabad military dictatorship is seeking sources of gasoline in the Pentagon fief of Thailand. Moreover, the U.S. is still sending military supplies to Pakistan directly, Welles revealed, despite now overwhelming evidence that this equipment is being used to slaughter almost defenseless people.

"The United States is continuing to ship to Pakistan ammunition and spare parts for weapons under a program begun in 1967.

"There is growing evidence that the Pakistani Army has been using American tanks, jet aircraft and other equipment in its attempt to crush the movement for autonomy by the predominantly Bengali citizens in the eastern half of the country."

Washington has thus far made only minimum face-saving protests against such use of its military aid:

"At least twice, the United States has expressed concern to the Pakistanis over reports of the use of American equipment in the east, but otherwise has muted its disapproval for fear of jeopardizing the safe evacuation of Americans from East Pakistan and of appearing to intervene in what the State Department regards as primarily an internal affair."

Writing in the April 3 issue of the well-informed Hongkong weekly the *Far Eastern Economic Review*, T. J. S. George speculated on the reasoning that may have led the Pakistani army commanders to undertake the desperate gamble of trying to suppress Bengali nationalist feeling by brute force:

"According to a diplomatic source, there was one round which Yahya won in his running battle with the army. This was following the mass rally in Dacca on March 7. Leaders in the west wing [of Pakistan] were sure this would be the occasion for

what they called UDI (Rhodesia-style unilateral declaration of independence).

"The assumption was based on the fever pitch which Bengali nationalist feelings had reached following the assembly postponement [postponement of the constitutional assembly in which the Awami League would have the majority]. A few hours before the rally was to begin, some 10,000 emotion-charged people went to the Sheikh's house, invited him to get into a big limousine, flying a black flag, drive to the Paltan grounds and there declare the birth of independent Bangla Desh.

"The sheikh spoke affably to them for a while, then got into a small car. At the rally ground, a wildly emotional multitude seemed in no mood for anything except independence then and there.

"The sheikh shrewdly asked the Maulvis (religious leaders) to start reciting immediately from the Koran. This is a common practice in Pakistan and the rule is that while recitations are going on, people should remain absolutely calm, silent and orderly. The long Koran recitation cooled tempers. At the end of it, before the people had time to raise slogans and work up emotions afresh, the sheikh grabbed the microphone and started his speech. And during the speech, he stopped short of UDI.

"The deftness with which the sheikh managed the explosive situation is reported to have impressed Yahya Khan and, more importantly, given him an opportunity to impress upon his army colleagues that the sheikh was a responsible leader with whom it was possible to do business. It was on this note that he took off for Dacca.

"During the Dacca conference, the army's pressure on Yahya continued. Sheikh Mujib himself was under heavy pressure from his own followers to strike out for independence. When the talks became prolonged, with Mujib calling for immediate transfer of power, the army group again took the reins of power from Yahya. According to the diplomatic sources, it was this group which ordered the precipitate actions: vetoing of the 'compromise formula' Yahya Khan reportedly agreed to in Dacca; imposition of strict martial law in East Pakistani cities; the use of tanks and bombers."

Some Western reporters have speculated that the army unleashed its

attacks because the Pakistani military machine can only be maintained with the help of the profits from the East Pakistani jute exports. It might be expected that the military bureaucracy as a whole would be more inflexible than the individual capitalist elements that dominate West Pakistan.

However, there is no evidence that the main representative of the West Pakistani bourgeoisie, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, has differed with the policy of the army.

In several important ways, the Bengali nationalist upsurge resembles the political development in Ireland after the 1916 uprising. It is extremely difficult for the dominating power to suppress such a movement, which envelops the whole organization of social life.

Conversely, the Achilles' heel of a spontaneous, politically vague, all-inclusive nationalist movement is that there is no clear differentiation between the authentically revolutionary forces and bourgeois elements whose attitude is necessarily ambiguous. In Ireland during the 1919-21 war of independence, the lower levels of the state administration transferred their loyalty to the rebel government, remaining substantially intact and continuing to defend capitalist property relations.

After the British occupation army had worn out the nerves of the Irish people by two years of terror, the right wing of the nationalist movement found itself in a position where it could accept a compromise solution offered by London. As a result, the independence forces were split, the revolutionists were isolated, and basic imperialist domination of the island was preserved.

Sheik Mujibur Rahman could be the key piece in such a strategy. The West Pakistani government released a picture April 10 showing the Awami League leader under guard at the Karachi airport, which indicated that he has not been shot—as have the other nationalist leaders. Press reports suggest that the Liberation Army commanders still consider Sheik Mujib their leader, failing to realize that their struggle already goes far beyond anything he contemplated.

Similarly, in Italy during the last years of the second world war, isolated Communist groups attempted to begin a revolutionary struggle, in the belief that they were following Stalin's leadership. When the Kremlin de-

nounced these formations—which suffered very heavy losses—they lost ground rapidly.

Such a strategy would seem to offer the only hope for pacifying the area, not only for Islamabad, but for all the powers with interests in the area—all of which are opposed to the creation of a radical new state on the Indian subcontinent. However, the conditions for applying such a line are unusually difficult. Among other things, for its own reasons the Indian government must also try to divert the Bengali nationalist movement, and is doing this it cannot avoid coming into conflict with Pakistan.

"Diplomatic observers here believe the Indian Government must convince West Bengal that it is firmly behind the East Pakistanis or else face wide rebellion and possibly a secessionist movement there," James P. Sterba cabled April 8 from New Delhi:

"Another factor, which Indian officials here cite, is that if fighting in East Pakistan drags on, aid efforts might fall into the hands of extreme radical groups seeking not only an independent East Pakistan but also a revolution in India as well. By taking the lead in the support movement, the Government hopes to negate that possibility."

The protests of the Pakistani government against this ambiguous Indian support to the Bengali freedom fighters have been backed up by the Mao regime: "Peking sent a 'firm protest' to the Indian Ministry of Foreign Affairs April 6, in which it supported the Islamabad government's accusations reproaching India for interfering in Pakistan's internal affairs," Paul Balta reported in the April 9 issue of *Le Monde*.

With all possibility of internal criticism crushed by the "great cultural revolution" and the obscurantist cult of Mao, Peking apparently considers it politically possible—for the sake of its diplomatic maneuvers—to actively support the massacre of tens of thousands of Bengalis, the most militant of whom probably consider themselves Maoists or friends of China. At the same time, the Chinese position gives the Indian government an excuse for limiting its support to the Bengali freedom fighters, making it difficult for the Maoist or pro-Chinese leftists in West Bengal to criticize New Delhi for its role in the Bengali national struggle. □

Behind Indira Gandhi's Election Victory

By Kailas Chandra

Bombay

The landslide victory in the mid-term poll for the Lok Sabha [lower house of parliament] of the traditional party of the Indian bourgeoisie, the "new" Congress led by Indira Gandhi, came as a big surprise even to the most optimistic supporters of the ruling party. Of the 515 seats so far filled—elections for three are still to be held—the new Congress has won 350, more than a two-thirds majority. Both rightist and leftist opposition parties have been routed.

The right-wing "Grand Alliance," consisting of the Syndicate or "old" Congress, the Jan Sangh [a Hindu communalist party], Swatantra party, and the petty-bourgeois SSP [Samyukta Socialist party], has nearly been eliminated. All the top leaders of the alliance were defeated, with the exception of Syndicate members Morarji Desai (Gujarat) and Kamaraj (Madras) and Atal Behari Wajpai of the Jan Sangh.

The alliance partners, who had boasted of possibly forming an alternate government, secured a total of only 49 seats: Jan Sangh 22, Syndicate 16, Swatantra 8, SSP 3.

In the new Lok Sabha the CPI(M) [Communist party of India (Marxist)—formerly pro-Peking, now neutral in the Sino-Soviet split], with 25 seats, has emerged as the largest single opposition group. It won 20 of its seats from West Bengal while losing its traditional constituencies in other states.

The Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam [DMK], a regional party in Tamil Nadu and an ally of the new Congress, won 23 seats, as did the pro-Moscow CPI [Communist party of India]. The PSP [Praja Socialist party], a reformist party that fought the elections on the basis of "responsive" cooperation with the new Congress, won only 2 seats.

The other parties represented in the Lok Sabha are: Telangana Praja Samiti [TPS—a separatist party in Andhra demanding a Telangana state] 10, Muslim League 4, Revolutionary

Socialist party (RSP) 3, other parties 15, independents 11.

In the old Lok Sabha, Indira Gandhi's party had 228 seats, the Syndicate 65, Swatantra 35, Jan Sangh 33, CPI 24, CPI(M) 19, SSP 17, PSP 13, RSP 2, DMK 24, other groups 18, and independents 37.

Despite the landslide proportions of the new Congress victory in terms of seats in the Lok Sabha, it won only 43.6 percent of the popular vote. The Syndicate received 10.56 percent. In 1967, the still-united Congress won 40.7 percent.

The Swatantra party's votes fell from 8.68% in 1967 to 3.08% in 1971, the Jan Sangh from 9.41% to 7.48%, SSP from 4.92% to 2.43%, PSP from 3.06% to 0.98%, and the CPI from 5.19% to 4.89%. The CPI(M) improved its percentage slightly, from 4.21% to 4.97%.

The success of the new Congress party at the polls cannot be explained solely in terms of the charismatic qualities that the capitalist press tried to give Indira Gandhi—even though the Grand Alliance attempted to create a negative personality cult with its slogan "Indira Hatao" (Throw Out Indira).

The new Congress was the only party that appeared to the masses to be "moving forward" toward radical reforms. This contrasted with the inaction of the traditional left parties, which, because of their opportunist practices, failed to build an independent class image.

The Gandhi government had nationalised fourteen commercial banks. It took steps to abolish privy purses and the privileges of the former feudal princes. These measures did not in any way undermine the interests of the capitalist class, but they created the popular illusion that Gandhi was out to fight capitalism.

In West Bengal, the government under President's Rule introduced land reforms that had been refused by the CPI(M)-led ministry. In this state also, the internecine warfare among the left parties repelled the masses while

providing antiworking-class forces with an opportunity to organize the systematic elimination of militant cadres in the left parties. The left parties themselves, along with the terrorism of the Maoist "Naxalites," gave the capitalist state a pretext to repress the worker and peasant masses.

All these factors combined to give Indira Gandhi and her party a positive image in the eyes of the masses.

The Indian bourgeoisie also realized the tremendous advantage likely to be gained by backing Gandhi. It is no secret that the big businesses financed the campaign of the new Congress in the hope of building a stable government at the centre.

The election demonstrated that reactionary parties openly committed to the preservation of capitalism cannot appeal to the masses in a poverty-stricken and underdeveloped country like India. Even those industrialists who ran as independents were defeated.

Another important result was the defeat of communalist parties like Jan Sangh and the anticommunist, regional chauvinist Shiv Sena in Bombay.

The new Congress victory showed that the electorate in most areas acted above regional, communal, and caste considerations. Muslims voted overwhelmingly in favour of Gandhi, as did the youth—25 percent of the electorate—and women. The only regional parties to meet success were the DMK in Madras and the TPS in Andhra.

There are positive aspects of the poll results from the revolutionary, working-class point of view. The vote indicated that the masses of workers and peasants expect Indira Gandhi to bring about radical changes in the existing social order. Expectations have been aroused tremendously. Gandhi herself has admitted the "big challenge" posed by the spectacular victory of her party.

Some leftists, however, think that Gandhi might emerge as a bonapartist leader playing the role of an arbiter between conflicting social forces, and

that she might move in the direction of radical reforms. They cite the examples of Ben Bella, Nkrumah, Sukarno, and Nasser.

But these leaders, despite their radical images, could not break through the shackles of capitalism. Three of them were themselves overthrown by military coups after their usefulness to the ruling bourgeoisie had been exhausted.

The Indian bourgeoisie, relatively more mature and developed, can project Gandhi herself as their ideal class representative who can keep the masses at bay with radical slogans while being prepared to ruthlessly suppress any revolutionary challenge to capitalism. The Indian state has adequate repressive powers without taking recourse to direct military rule. Military rule in itself is not a "safe" solution to the crisis facing the capitalist rulers, as recent developments in Pakistan have shown.

Armed with a new popular mandate, the prime minister has announced that she would take steps to "eradicate poverty," provide "more employment opportunities," introduce land reforms, etc. "Banish Poverty" was the main election slogan of her party.

The masses, who have waited for twenty-three years since political independence, are in no mood to wait indefinitely. They are demanding quick results, and if these are not forthcoming soon, the masses will act on their own. In that sense, the election ushered in a new period of instability for capitalist rule in India.

The task before the revolutionary working-class movement, therefore, is to direct the popular upsurge in favour of social change toward mass initiatives in the struggles against the capitalist class and its state. Nationwide movements must be built around immediate demands of the working class and the exploited rural poor.

If the sentiments of the masses are to be channelized in a positive direction, mass movements in the coming period should be based on demands that the masses can easily understand — demands for the immediate fulfilment of the electoral promises of the ruling Congress party itself. They should include:

1. Immediate amendment of the constitution to abolish the right to private property, guarantee the right of every citizen to work, and permit recall of

elected representatives in parliament and state legislatures.

2. Enactment of land reforms providing for confiscation of all surplus lands held by absentee landlords and others. Redistribution of all available waste and surplus land to actual tillers through elected committees of the rural poor. Enforcement of the principle of land to the tiller, annulment of all indebtedness of the rural poor.

3. Immediate nationalisation of all "sick" and "closed" industrial establishments under workers' control and management. Nationalisation of all key and basic industries, including mines and plantations. Nationalisation of all foreign undertakings. Elected workers' councils in all industrial establishments to create effective control and management by the workers.

4. A new labour policy providing for: enforcement of a minimum national wage; reorganization of trade unions on the principle of one union in one industry, based on elected workers' committees; and annulment of all antilabour laws.

5. Free universal education for all children up to the high school level. Free books, clothes, and meals to children of poor parents. Student participation in college and university administration. The mother tongue to be the medium of instruction at all levels.

6. Full guarantee of the civil liberties of the people. Annulment of all repressive laws like the Unlawful Ac-

tivities Act, Preventive Detention Act, etc. Disbanding of special coercive agencies like the Central Reserve Police, Industrial Security Force, etc. Universal military training for all youth between the ages of seventeen and twenty-seven. Democratization of the armed forces and police, with top officers being elected by the ranks. Reorganization of the administrative services on the principle of election of top officials by the ranks.

Mass movements built around such demands can dispel the illusion that it is possible to achieve them without a revolutionary transformation of present capitalist society.

For these movements to have real social force, they will require a leadership that rejects the opportunist practice of collaboration with the bourgeoisie now followed by the present working-class leadership.

The CPI, for example, has decided to support a Congress ministry in West Bengal. In Kerala, the CPI and RSP have set up a coalition government supported by Indira Gandhi's party. The CPI(M) has made a tradition of subordinating class struggle to electoral manoeuvres.

A new process of differentiation is bound to take place among the working-class parties in the coming period. Revolutionary Marxists will have an important role to play in forging a united leadership of the working class on the basis of common action against the bourgeois state and its policies. □

Allende Gains in Chilean Election

The Unidad Popular government led by Salvador Allende won a narrow majority in municipal elections held throughout Chile April 4. The coalition received 49.73 percent of the votes as opposed to 48.05 percent for four opposition parties. (The rest of the ballots were spoiled, blank, or cast for independents.)

The outcome marked a big increase for Unidad Popular over the 36.3 percent it won in the September presidential elections. This was seen as an endorsement of Allende's program of nationalizing United States mining interests. Another important factor was the way the youth voted. This was the first election in Chile in which persons between eighteen and twenty-one were given the franchise.

The biggest gainer in the election was Allende's Socialist party, now the strongest group in Unidad Popular. The Socialists won 22.38 percent, half again as

much as they had ever received before. The Communist party increased its vote only slightly, to 16.96 percent.

The opposition Christian Democratic party, which has supported nationalization of some U.S. interests but opposed such items of Allende's program as the creation of "people's courts," remained the largest single party, with 25.62 percent of the vote. The right wing won only 22 percent.

"The main rise in the Socialist vote," Juan de Onis wrote from Santiago in the April 6 *New York Times*, "was in working class and shantytown areas of this capital, which holds a third of the Chilean electorate. These districts would benefit most from Dr. Allende's policy of freezing prices, raising wages, subsidizing public service rates at low levels and giving powdered milk, shoes and overalls to children." □

Ceylonese Youth Group Resists Army Crackdown

By Les Evans

APRIL 12—After a week of fighting—and almost a month after a national state of emergency was declared—the Bandaranaike regime in Ceylon had not succeeded in suppressing an island-wide insurrection allegedly led by the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (JVP—People's Liberation Front), called "Che Guevarists" by the press.

The government has mobilized all available army and police units, numbering some 25,000 troops, and has used tanks and planes against the insurgents. Western press reports have been scanty and most information seems to be based on government handouts, but the Associated Press estimated April 10 that as many as 1,000 persons had been killed by government forces since the fighting began April 5.

Troops were ordered on the alert following an "attack" on the U. S. embassy in Colombo March 6. Prime Minister Bandaranaike declared a state of emergency March 16 after weapons and homemade bombs were reportedly discovered in a room at Peradeniya University.

Hundreds of supporters of the JVP and of other left-wing organizations were jailed in the large-scale roundup that followed. This included members of the pro-Peking Communist party, which has not supported the insurrection, according to the press.

The emergency powers invoked by Mrs. Bandaranaike included such draconian provisions as the death penalty for persons involved in "unlawful assembly." Distribution of all literature or leaflets was prohibited without military approval of the contents. Trade-union rallies and meetings have been banned.

In a March 23 speech to the House of Representatives, Mrs. Bandaranaike sought to justify declaration of the state of emergency by claiming that the attack on the American embassy was "the culmination of indications of an imminent attack on the Government in different parts of Ceylon."

The government's assertions were widely disbelieved at the time by for-

eign observers. The bourgeois coalition regime—which, in addition to Bandaranaike's Sri Lanka Freedom party (SLFP), includes the renegade ex-Trotskyists of the Lanka Sama Samaja party (LSSP) and the pro-Moscow Communists—is on the verge of bankruptcy and is courting the imperialist financial institutions. The coalition, which came to power in May 1970 in a landslide victory, has been moving sharply to the right in an effort to reassure potential investors. Thus the March 27 Hong Kong weekly *Far Eastern Economic Review* gave this assessment of the state of emergency:

"Because of the dangerous financial situation . . . Ceylon cannot afford to offend anyone in its bid to stay afloat.

"This is one reason Mrs Bandaranaike, who retains three key portfolios—defence, foreign affairs and planning—must avoid too great a swing to the left. In this connection the Guevarist scare appears to have come at an unusually convenient moment.

"Also, the emergency may temporarily take the people's minds off their economic plight."

It is true that the coalition partners have been waging a cynical propaganda campaign against the JVP since last year, denouncing this growing radical youth movement as a creation of "foreign reactionaries." But the current emergency shows that the government's course has been dictated not only by a desire to impress its imperialist bankers with its respectability, but also by a growing awareness of the rapid erosion of its own electoral and social base.

The "socialist" promises made by the coalition in its election propaganda remain unfulfilled. Unemployment stands at 750,000 out of a population of less than 13,000,000. Many of the jobless are university graduates who have begun to organize against the regime they helped to bring to power. The government has refused to nationalize the basic sectors of industry as it promised. As the *Far Eastern Economic Review* put it:

"While government has been assembling and oiling the machinery of socialism [sic], living conditions have been deteriorating. More than anything the administration needs time, but try convincing a jobless man to be patient when he has seen governments come and go with no visible improvement. Prices have been climbing, unemployment continues at a phenomenally high rate; necessary commodities have been in short supply, unrest has grown."

In an April 2 speech in Kandy, Prime Minister Bandaranaike frankly admitted that students as a group had turned against her government. Her comments were paraphrased by the April 8 Colombo weekly *Ceylon News*:

"The University students appeared to be against the United Front government which was set up to work towards a genuine socialist set-up, through the democratic process. They had collected and stored in the university thousands of hand bombs, dynamite and a vast quantity of raw material for making hand bombs sufficient to plunge the country in a blood bath. Why had the University students lent themselves to such an anti-social and anti-democratic plot? . . .

"Even the girls appeared to have played a vital role in the campaign for destruction and devastation of institutions. . . ."

Bandaranaike's coalition partners gave their endorsement to the army for whatever killing of radical youth was necessary to keep the capitalist government in power. Leslie Goonewardene, Mrs. Bandaranaike's minister of communications and a long-time leader of the reformist LSSP, at a meeting in Kurunegala on March 18 called on the army to "wipe out" the rebel youth.

The March 19 *Ceylon Daily News* reported: "The Government would not give in to the attempts of misguided youths to use terrorism to destroy the democratic privileges enjoyed by the masses. It would take every possible measure to wipe out such dis-

ruptive activities, said Mr. Leslie Goonewardene. . . .

"Mr. Goonewardene said the Prime Minister, Mrs. Bandaranaike had declared a state Emergency with the whole-hearted support of the Cabinet. Under this, the Government gave necessary powers to the armed forces to wipe out disruptive elements and preserve law and order."

The Stalinist representative in the cabinet, Housing Minister Pieter Keuneman of the pro-Moscow CP, was quoted in an April 9 AP dispatch as calling the rebel youth "fascist terrorists."

The government did its best to carry out Goonewardene's prescription. Yet despite its preparations, advance warning, and the wave of arrests, the scope of resistance proved to be beyond the capacity of the armed forces to suppress without prolonged heavy fighting.

According to the government, resistors attacked some twenty-five police stations simultaneously the night of April 5.

A nationwide curfew was imposed April 6 and the JVP was formally outlawed.

On April 7 the government radio announced that air support was called in against youths holding a key bridge at Alawwa on the road from Colombo to Kandy. The Associated Press reported:

"The Government said an armored column had swept down the main road connecting Colombo with Kandy, a major trade center 60 miles to the northeast, and had wiped out terrorists armed with homemade bombs and firearms.

"Attacks on many public buildings, mainly police stations, were repulsed, the broadcast said."

The press estimated the strength of the "Che Guevarists" at 20,000 but there was no indication of the source of this figure.

The April 8 Paris daily *Le Monde* reported:

"According to the Ceylonese press, twenty-nine insurgents were killed in the attack on the Polonnaruwa police station, in the center of the island; at Mirigawa, about sixty kilometers from the capital, the police were said to have killed three rebels, while twenty others were reportedly taken prisoner at Gampaha, near Colombo. Many arrests have been made in Colombo, where police and troops are

guarding strategic points."

An April 8 dispatch in the *Washington Post* said that Ceylon air force planes "yesterday bombed insurgents holding out in a school and a textile factory. A brief broadcast by the government radio said the school and factory were 40 miles from Colombo. . . .

"Armored columns flushed out a large number of insurgents in the rubber district of Kegalle, killing 30 of them, the authorities reported. . . .

"Gunfire was heard in the capital yesterday but there was no official mention of incidents there."

The curfew was extended around the clock April 9 as the Associated Press reported "some estimates" that put the number of those resisting the government crackdown "as high as 80,000." Prime Minister Bandaranaike made a national radio speech, dressing up her counterrevolutionary campaign in a cheap plagiarism of Churchill's wartime orations: "My government," she said, "will fight these terrorists in the remote areas, will fight them in the provinces and will fight them everywhere, but will not surrender my right to govern or the trust you have placed in me."

The death penalty was decreed for anyone "aiding" the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna.

Despite the fierce repression and the reportedly heavy casualties, an April 9 AP dispatch said that outlying police posts were reportedly "being abandoned as officers fled to larger encampments."

The curfew was lifted during daylight hours in Colombo April 11, but at the same time it was extended in other parts of the country. Tillman Durdin, writing from Colombo in the April 12 *New York Times*, gave this account:

"Eight administrative districts in the southern and central provinces, including the cities of Galle, Matara and Hambantota were today [April 11] placed under 24-hour curfew.

"The districts encompass jungle areas in which 'Che Guevarist' guerrillas are strongest, and security forces clearly hoped to pinpoint and strike at them by banning movement of any kind. . . .

"The Army Commander in Chief, Maj. Gen. Sepala Attygalle, today appealed to the people not to be influenced by rumors that, he said, were being spread deliberately to create

panic. He warned that no one must leave his home during the curfew and disclosed that 11 persons who had done so were killed in the Colombo area last night. . . .

"Regular security forces are stretched to the limit and auxiliaries are being mobilized as fast as possible." The socialist pretensions of the Bandaranaike government have been exposed for what they are: the lying claims of a Sukarno or a Yahya Khan.

Bandaranaike's left-wing cohorts, of both the Stalinist and ex-Trotskyist variety, in assuming responsibility for the military's bloodbath have branded themselves as criminals in the eyes of working-class organizations and socialist-minded people throughout the world.

Whether the Ceylonese coalition proves to be as successful in its repressive efforts as its Indonesian counterpart remains to be seen. □

Prison Population Explosion

The Commission of Prisons of South Africa has issued a report stating that the average daily prison population of the country is 90,555, of which 71,000 are Blacks. An average of 484,661 people are imprisoned each year. Of these, 92 percent receive sentences less than six months. Most of these are Blacks convicted under South Africa's notorious pass laws, which require Blacks to carry identification passes with them at all times. The total population of the country is only 20,000,000.

The publication of the statistics, according to the April 4 *New York Times*, has generated some discussion among South African lawyers about what can be done to reduce the number of persons in prison.

Dr. Barend van Niekerk, senior lecturer at the University of Witwatersrand and an advocate of abolition of the death penalty, called for a "revolutionary overhaul of the sentencing policy as well as the conditions that make these figures possible."

Herman Venter, a criminology professor, suggested fines rather than sentences for minor offenders.

In general, the jurists seem to be concerned more with South Africa's image than with the repressive system that results in such a huge prison population. A. S. Strauss, a professor of criminal law at the University of South Africa, said that secret executions "are feeding our enemies abroad with ammunition."

Look Who's Talking

The U. S. command in Saigon apologized April 9 for a memorandum that said a newsman was visiting the country with an "ulterior motive."

On 'Che Guevarist' Youth Movement in Ceylon

[The following interview is reprinted from the March issue of *Direct Action*, the monthly journal of the Australian Socialist Youth Alliance (SYA).

[Bala Tampoe is the general secretary of the Ceylon Mercantile Union (CMU) and the secretary of the Lanka Sama Samaja party (Revolutionary), the Ceylonese section of the Fourth International. Tampoe was in Australia as an invited speaker at a national antiwar conference held in Sydney February 17-21.]

* * *

Question. Comrade, you mentioned during the Anti-War Conference that Ceylonese port workers have taken action against the American intervention in Vietnam. Is there any organised trade union activity against the war, and what is being done to support the Vietnamese revolution by trade unionists?

Answer. Since the very inception of active American intervention in Vietnam, it has been accepted in Ceylon that there should be absolutely no support given to that intervention by any Ceylonese government, either directly or indirectly, and for that reason, for instance, no military aircraft can use any Ceylon airport and no ships carrying men or material for the war in Vietnam can enter any Ceylon port. If any such vessel does enter the port, the dockers would immediately refuse to handle it.

We had one example of that when a ship came in and a rumour spread that it was carrying war material for Vietnam. The dockers immediately stopped work on the ship and contacted union headquarters to verify whether there were war materials. And it was only after we had confirmed that there were no war materials on board, that they returned to work. So, on that point, there is no need for any organised trade union decision. It's already an accepted fact among the dockers that they do not handle any ships carrying war material for Vietnam, and that any government—even the most conservative one—dare not, so long as they seek to maintain any kind of popular support, have any direct association with the imperialist intervention in Vietnam.

We have had several public demonstrations and mass meetings in solidarity with Vietnam, sponsored by organisations like the Vietnam Solidarity Committee, the Ceylon Peace Council, and in certain cases by the trade unions. In recent times, though, there hasn't been much solidarity activity because the situation in Ceylon is one in which other questions have occupied more public attention. There is not much similarity in the situation in Ceylon to that in Australia with respect to the establishment of an anti-war move-

ment as such, because there are no Ceylonese troops in Vietnam, and the question doesn't even arise of any Ceylonese government giving any support to the imperialist intervention in Vietnam.

Q. How do you see the war in the general context of imperialist strategy for the third world countries?

A. I see it primarily as the effort of American imperialism to hold back the advancement of the colonial revolution in Asia by armed force. To understand the present situation in Indo-China one must remember that after World War Two, several countries achieved what is described as national independence or political independence—depending on how it was achieved. In the case of Indonesia, for instance, there was an uprising against the Dutch following the Japanese surrender and that resulted in Indonesia achieving national independence.

In Indo-China and Vietnam itself there were various struggles during World War Two, but none were successful, and at the end of the war the big powers, with the acquiescence of the Soviet Union, divided Indo-China at the 17th Parallel. Purely for military purposes, the southern portion was taken over by the British and the northern portion was given to the Chinese, even though in September 1945, for a very short time, Ho Chi Minh had declared an Independent Republic of Vietnam and the French had recognised it as an independent republic within the French Union. In fact, it was made impossible to install an independent republic of Vietnam by this division at the 17th Parallel, and the question of national independence for the Vietnamese people has remained unresolved from that time up to now. Ho Chi Minh was himself in difficulty because he had to respect the Potsdam Agreement because the Soviet Union was a party to that agreement.

Later, and to this day, the portion of Vietnam which is now generally called "North Vietnam" has been treated as being a separate state when in reality the whole of Vietnam is one country and one people. The present situation is an artificial creation, by the imperialists, of a situation in which the north of Vietnam is treated as the North Vietnamese state and the portion in the south is treated as the South Vietnamese state. As a result you get a situation in which now when a demand is made for the unconditional withdrawal of imperialist forces from Vietnam, the imperialists counter by saying they are prepared to withdraw their forces if the north Vietnamese withdraw their forces. And they make it appear that if there are any north Vietnamese forces fighting in the area they call

South Vietnam, then that amounts to an intervention by another state.

The position is further complicated by the Geneva Agreements, under which it was agreed that there would be no intervention by armed forces on either side of the dividing line until elections were held. But now, having disrespected the agreement, they themselves use the situation created under the agreement (where the state or government of North Vietnam is not to intervene in South Vietnam) to say that since there are north Vietnamese forces in south Vietnam, the north Vietnamese now do not respect the agreement, and that they are therefore free to pour any number of their own troops into that struggle.

The simple situation remains that from the end of World War Two up until today, first the French imperialists, and then the American imperialists, have systematically intervened with the use of armed force to deny independence to that country. Now the significance of this, to my mind, is that in the course of this period of over 25 years, the nature of the situation in south Vietnam itself has altered to such an extent that any genuine independent government that can emerge from the liberation of south Vietnam cannot remain within the capitalist social structure. It will be necessary to go over to a socialist transformation on a revolutionary basis because of the long-standing character of this national liberation movement. Its content has been continually changing, and where to begin with, the National Liberation Front no doubt had within its ranks various liberal, petit-bourgeois and other components which might have continued had independence been granted even in Ho Chi Minh's time, to the establishment of some kind of bourgeois regime there. But today that is no longer possible. National independence for Vietnam will now mean that the whole of Vietnam goes outside the sphere of operations of the capitalist system and this the United States is not prepared to allow. They think that its immediate effect will be to accentuate the revolutionary development in bordering countries. I think the substance in that fear of theirs, their so-called domino theory, is not to be understood in a mechanical sense, but in a political and social sense. There is no doubt that a victory for the Vietnamese people would result sooner or later in the overthrow of capitalism in the whole of Vietnam. It will not merely be a victory for the national liberation forces, but essentially for revolutionary social forces, and such a victory will then further accentuate, for imperialism, the danger of extension of the colonial revolution of South East Asia, with increasing emphasis on its socialist character and not mere-

ly on a basis of the replacement of direct imperialist rule by local or native bourgeois rule.

If you take what happened in India, Burma and Ceylon, you will see that the British recognised the danger of national liberation movements leading not only to the overthrow of foreign rule. In these countries there was a danger not of a mere national liberation, but of a socialist transformation taking place in what Trotskyists describe as the process of the Permanent Revolution. All the native bourgeoisies, even in India which is the biggest Asian country within the capitalist framework, are incapable of solving a single basic problem of the masses in their countries. These bourgeoisies are weak economically and are capable of only one kind of development: national development, as they call it, in alliance with and subordinated to imperialism. Even a big country like India, for all its neutralist stands or non-alliance stands in international politics, in practice depends primarily on imperialist capital for development and for the achievement of its so-called Five Year and Ten Year Plans. The same applies to countries like Ceylon and Pakistan. Even Burma today is floundering in a completely unclear situation, primarily because its imperialist support has been withdrawn from the Burmese regime with a view to bringing it down and replacing it with a more collaborationist type of regime.

Ceylon has the same problem. The new government claims to be trying, following a middle way, that is to make certain concessions to the masses or at least not to take away concessions previously granted, but the imperialists can no longer tolerate such intermediate regimes. They want regimes which will suppress the mass movement, cut down living standards and guarantee maximum return on capital for foreign investment.

Now the British, having had the experience of the Vietnamese development and the Indonesian national liberation struggle, decided in relation to India, Burma and Ceylon, to grant what they call political independence within the British Commonwealth, in advance of any general uprising in these countries. It's an indication of the farsightedness of British policy: India and Ceylon not only remained within the Commonwealth, but they have now become centres in which capitalism is desperately seeking to establish bases against the extension of the colonial revolution. So in this context too, for the people of Ceylon and India, there is a very special significance in the Vietnamese struggle. A victory for the Vietnamese revolution will strengthen the possibilities of revolution in Ceylon and India. Contrariwise, the defeat of the Vietnamese revolution or the establishment of some kind of halfway house in south Vietnam will mean a weakening of the forces for revolution in Asia. Imperialism cannot stabilise its position in Asia any more: it is historically incapable of doing so.

The clearest proof of this is what happened in Indonesia. As a result of the

policies followed by the Communist Party of Indonesia (PKI) the mass movement was hamstrung behind Sukarno. The imperialists prepared their counter-revolutionary action in collaboration with reactionary military and other rightist forces in Indonesia and they *smashed* the mass movement, by the physical destruction of over 300,000 people who were either supporters or members of the PKI, or *suspected* of being so.

Nevertheless, despite this virtual massacre of the mass movement on a scale not hitherto seen anywhere, the mass movement is *again* developing in Indonesia, especially amongst the youth. Hundreds of millions of people of Asia have *no other* road but struggle and, ultimately, revolutionary uprising against the capitalist structure. What is required in all these countries is the formation of genuine revolutionary parties which should then co-ordinate with each other and develop their own revolutionary strategy in Asia, to counter and overcome the already existing and highly co-ordinated imperialist counter-revolutionary strategies. Australia will have to play a role in one way or another. In this country at the moment the bourgeoisie is placing Australia within the counter-revolutionary strategy of imperialism. It will be up to the revolutionary forces in Australia to break it free of that alliance and bring it into the field of *revolutionary* strategy.

Q. One of the main results of the Indo-China war is the world-wide radicalisation of youth. What about the radicalisation taking place in Ceylon? Is it taking place mainly amongst the youth or is it much wider than that?

A. The sweeping electoral victory of the United Front of the Sri Lanka Freedom Party (SLFP), the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (LSSP) and the Communist Party (Moscow wing) at the elections of May 27, 1970, was due primarily to the youth radicalisation. According to my analysis of the figures, of 750,000 new workers registered after the 1965 elections, at least 600,000 voted for the coalition on May 27. The older workers divided more or less evenly between the coalition and the previous government, so that the position of the older workers was not very different to 1965, but the overall total changed in favour of the coalition, with about 1.8 million workers voting for the previous government and about 2.3 million voting for the coalition. These new workers contributed decisively to the victory of the coalition not only by their numbers, but also by their active participation in the election campaign. They gave a very definite radical aspect to the campaign, but, of course, this helped the LSSP and the CP to pass off the election struggle as a struggle for socialism, and to pass off the electoral victory as a people's victory. My party, the Lanka Sama Samaja Party (Revolutionary) [LSSP(R)], did not put forward any candidates in the campaign, and in a manifesto accused the LSSP and CP of misleading the masses to the belief that the

establishment of a coalition government would be a victory for the masses.

Now a large proportion of the youth expected radical changes once the coalition government was established. As a result of these changes not being brought about, disillusionment has spread amongst the youth. One striking feature of this is the emergence in the (majority) Sinhala areas of Ceylon, of a new movement called the Janata Vimukthi Peramuna (JVP) or People's Liberation Front. This organisation has been developing unknown to most people since 1966. A section of its leadership came out of the Peking wing of the Communist Party, a section from the Moscow wing, and a section from the LSSP.

The JVP was organised in all the Sinhalese villages and in the provincial towns since 1966 without any publications or public meetings. They organised in groups by holding classes and discussion meetings in private houses. Nobody was aware of their extent until just before the May elections. The newspapers began to run reports of the Criminal Investigation Department, which has a political branch, which said that there was some kind of insurgent movement being built up with the intention of disrupting the elections. This movement they dubbed the Che Guevara movement, and the newspapers began to use the term frequently, and in this way people came to hear about this movement, but very few people had any idea who really belonged to it.

About two weeks before the elections, the leader of the movement was arrested. Almost overnight posters appeared all over the island demanding his release. In this way people realised that there was some kind of a mass movement going. Then came the elections and, according to statements made subsequent to the elections, the JVP supported the coalition in 45 electorates and contributed materially to its success, although the coalition doesn't acknowledge this. After the election, for reasons which are not yet very clear, the JVP appears to have become completely alienated from the coalition. They announced a big public meeting for August 10 in Colombo as the first of a series of public meetings to explain their position to the people. On August 9 the United Front leadership of the SLFP, LSSP and CP, published a political denunciation of the movement, claiming that it was some kind of force set up by reactionary rightist foreign interests. Some of the leaders of the coalition parties openly called it a CIA inspired organisation. The LSSP(R) had no clear idea of what the JVP was, but when they held their meeting on August 10, it was quite clear that it was entirely a genuine mass movement of Sinhala youth. There were about 10,000 people at that first meeting. Every subsequent public meeting throughout the country had a minimum attendance of 5,000, culminating in a mass meeting in the hill capital of Kandy (where both the coalition and the UNP [United National party] had held their final pre-election rallies) with an attendance of 15,000 to 20,000, nearly all between the ages of 15 to 20. There is no doubt that

this is a mass manifestation of political radicalisation and is most significant for the future of the Ceylonese revolution.

They have now come out in open opposition to the coalition government and have been suppressed as a result of this opposition. The police have for some time been arresting people whom they suspect of belonging to this organisation whenever they put up posters or even when they hold group meetings in private houses. This police action is illegal, and I myself, since I happen to be a criminal lawyer, have, on a decision of the LSSP(R), defended several of their members in the courts as a public defence of their democratic rights to publicise their political views. Other members of our party have also defended them in the courts, and our newspaper, which is published fortnightly, has denounced the government's repressive actions against this movement. As a result, our party has established very friendly political relations with the leadership of the movement, even though to begin with they undoubtedly had what we would describe as a Stalinist orientation, and to some extent, since

their movement is comprised entirely of Sinhala youth, they also had to some degree a racialist orientation. But after the elections, and with each passing month, they have developed more and more in a revolutionary socialist direction. They are associated with our party, my union, the Ceylon Mercantile Union and an organisation called the Socialist Youth Front. Last November the LSSP(R) and the JVP called a meeting to denounce the shooting of two plantation workers of Indian origin, and the leader of the JVP thus gave the lie to the propaganda that the JVP was a racialist organisation of Sinhala people only.

Recently, after the Commonwealth Conference in Singapore, the LSSP(R) called for a meeting of various political parties and trade union, youth and other mass organisations to demand that Ceylon quit the Commonwealth. Besides the Ceylon Mercantile Union, only the JVP answered the call, and in addition, they brought in a student organisation under their leadership called the Socialist Front. This organisation, together with the JVP, LSSP(R) and the CMU held a giant pub-

lic meeting in Colombo shortly before I left to come here for the Anti-War Conference, to denounce the establishment of an American imperialist base, with the consent of the British, on Diego Garcia, an island close to Ceylon. The meeting also denounced the sale of British arms to South Africa, and generally exposed the fact that Ceylon's continued association with the Commonwealth is a clear manifestation of the subordination of Ceylon to imperialism's interests in Asia.

With the upsurge of the youth through the influence of the JVP in the Sinhala areas, as well as the upsurge of the working class youth, particularly in the increasing membership of the CMU in industrial establishments, I am sure that the new radicalisation of youth will be manifesting itself in Ceylon very definitely on a revolutionary basis, not only with university and school-going youth, but working class youth combining in more and more positive steps to take Ceylon on a revolutionary road which, in our view, is the only road to the establishment of a socialist democracy in Ceylon. □

Five Soviet Diplomats Expelled from Mexico

Echeverria Discovers Another 'Communist Plot'

Under the banner headline "GUE-RRILLAS," the Mexico City daily *El Universal* wrote in its March 16 issue: "The police have just crushed the pretensions of a group of bad Mexicans who were working to impose a Marxist-Leninist regime on our country. They arrested nineteen persons who have confessed to a robbery that brought them \$84,000, which the robbers were going to use in the activities of their movement. The group was trained abroad and received technical and economic support from the Republic of North Korea."

Underneath the scare headlines, a picture showed the material the police claimed to have captured from the "guerrillas." The caption said: "The members of the MAR [Movimiento de Acción Revolucionaria—Armed Action Movement] caught by the Federal Judicial Police possessed a complete arsenal for guerrilla warfare, as well as books on Marxist-Leninist doctrine."

Along with eight pistols, what appeared to be three hand grenades, and a rifle, there were a few small books with pictures of Lenin, Marx, Che Guevara, and Mao on their covers. The ideological arsenal of the alleged gue-

rrillas was apparently much more extensive than their military one, or at least more varied, including some items quite odd for an allegedly Kremlin-sponsored group.

If the statements of the political police were to be believed, it would appear that workers states which have failed to join together in a united front to support the Vietnamese liberation forces had, in this case, combined to sponsor an adventurist armed plot by a small group of Mexican youths.

The Soviet Union, East Germany, North Korea, and China, according to the Mexican attorney general and the progovernment press, were linked to a conspiracy to develop a guerrilla nucleus south of the U. S. border. The plot was supposedly organized through the Soviet cultural institute.

Following the announcement of the plot story, the government of President Luis Echeverria expelled five ranking Soviet diplomats.

In their column in the March 24 issue of the *Washington Post*, two well-known American journalists, Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, predicted that the plot case would have wide repercussions: "Moscow's diplomatic

probing with traditionally anti-Communist governments in the hemisphere, just on the verge of success, is now endangered by the Soviet cloak-and-dagger maneuver." And further on:

"The official reaction of the Mexican government, probably the most sophisticated in Latin America, was highly unusual public indignation. . . . Beyond that, the affair raises serious questions about Soviet standing throughout the hemisphere—as in Venezuela."

If the allegations of the Mexican political police were true, the importance of this "affair" would go far beyond the diplomatic sphere. Soviet support for a guerrilla nucleus in the heart of the American sphere of influence would mean a basic shift in foreign policy and perspectives.

Writing in the March 28 issue of the British weekly *Observer*, Charles Foley quoted Fabricio Souza, one of the nineteen arrested, as saying: "If we got an armed struggle going here, with all military and political consequences, then US pressure on Socialist countries in other parts of the world would be much dispersed."

There is no evidence of such a shift

in Soviet policy, however, except the statements of the police and the alleged guerrillas in their hands. Despite the Mexican authorities' record of extorting confessions from political prisoners, well documented in the wake of the bloody suppression of the 1968 student movement, Charles Foley, along with the rest of the international press, accepted the police version without question:

"The facts seem undeniable. The prisoners have all 'sung'—indeed they express pride at their participation in the Revolutionary Action Movement. They were handpicked by Cultural Attaché Boris Voskoboinikov, one of the expelled five. . . ."

The international press differed on the extent of Soviet involvement. Evans and Novak referred to "the vast effrontery of the Soviet Union's aborted attempt to plant highly trained Mexican agents and provocateurs inside Mexico." In the March 20 *Washington Post*, correspondent Raphael Rothstein noted: "It is widely believed here that Soviet support of indigenous guerrilla activities is fairly common in Latin America."

In his article in the March 28 issue of the *Observer*, Charles Foley described the Kremlin's role as hesitant and cautious: "They [the "guerrillas"] found their Soviet hosts anxious to avoid direct involvement in fomenting revolution. So they turned to the North Korean Embassy, which had no such inhibitions."

The account in *El Universal* went as follows: "Fabricio confessed that along with his companions López Murillo, Camilo Estrada Luviano, Isidro Rangel, and Candelario Pacheco, as well as Salvador Castañeda, he got a scholarship to study at the Patrice Lumumba University in Moscow.

"The scholarship was granted them through the Instituto de Intercambio Cultural Mexicanoruso [Mexican-Russian Cultural Exchange Institute] located in this city.

"In 1968, the previously mentioned persons formed a 'study circle' together with Leonardo Mendoza, Juan Raúl Ching, and other Mexican graduates of this institution, in order to put the teachings of Marxism-Leninism into practice in our country.

"For this purpose, they decided to transform the 'circle' into an underground organization which they called the Movimiento de Acción Revolucionaria. This movement was to have an

'urban guerrilla' base called 'October 2' and another rural base known by them under the name Ejército Popular del MAR [People's Army of the MAR].

"Thus, the prisoners said, they established contact with the People's Republic of North Korea in Moscow. And the functionaries of this legation agreed to give them economic support and intensive training—both political and military—in order to carry out their plans.

"Later, in October 1968, the North Korean embassy in the Soviet capital arranged for Fabricio to go to Pyongyang, the capital of North Korea, where he met with civilian and military functionaries during the twenty days he remained there. It was agreed that an initial group of ten Mexicans would receive training.

"Fabricio Gómez Souza confessed that on returning to Moscow, he received \$10,000 from a North Korean diplomat to pay the traveling expenses of the group that was to receive training."

The allegations of Soviet involvement seemed to rest primarily on claims that the Kremlin permitted the so-called guerrillas to travel freely through the USSR and on the fact that some persons involved had past connections with the Soviet cultural exchange mission and had studied in the Soviet Union.

"The second group followed the same procedures as the first. When they arrived in West Berlin they changed their Mexican passports for North Korean ones and traveled by train to Moscow without any trouble from immigration officials, even though their ethnic characteristics and language—the Attorney General of the Republic pointed out—made it evident that they were not North Korean citizens. From Moscow, they left by Aeroflot [the Soviet airline] for Pyongyang, stopping at Omsk and Irkutsk in Russia, where their passports were checked without any difficulty."

In addition to conspiracy, stockpiling arms, inciting to rebellion, and other strictly political crimes, the nineteen "guerrillas" were charged with robbing the Banco de Comercio in Morelia in mid-December 1970 and with killing a bank guard. A member of the group, López Murillo, was accused of killing another member, Areola Téllez, during target practice.

Whatever the facts of the "Soviet-North Korean-Chinese guerrilla" case,

the Echeverría government seems to have good political reasons, from its point of view, for creating a new foreign subversion scare. Similar pretexts have been used by the Mexican government several times in recent years to justify rounding up left-wing opponents of the regime.

In attributing contradictory left-wing associations to the "guerrillas," the present case resembles that of Professor Salomón Swann, an intellectual supporter of the 1968 student movement. Swann was deported December 29, 1968, accused of being both a Cuban and Soviet agent at a time when the policies of Havana and Moscow as regards the Latin-American revolution were diametrically opposite. (See "The Arrests Continue in Mexico," *Intercontinental Press*, February 17, 1969, p.160.)

The latest guerrilla case coincides with a revival of the student movement. "Mexico's traditionally leftist students are uniting and reorganizing for the first time since their anti-Government movement was broken by the army in 1968," a special dispatch to the *New York Times* reported April 2.

One of the main objectives of the resurgent student movement is to drive rightist terrorist groups off campus. Gangsterism in the universities, the unions, and the prisons has been the traditional method of control of—to use Evans and Novak's words—the "most sophisticated" government in Latin America.

The most notorious of the progovernment goon squads offers the following defense of its activities, according to the April 2 *Times* dispatch:

"The Pancho Villa Group denies any violence. Members admit only that 'we are moderately rightist . . . adhering to the thoughts of Dr. Luis Echeverría.'" □

But They're Mostly Dead Anyway

The British Ministry of Defense has agreed to pay £5,000 damages to biologists whose study of fish life was destroyed when an army camp dumped pollutants into a river. The out-of-court settlement was not reported to have provided any compensation to the fish.

Fox Guards Chicken Coop

An automobile in Bonn, West Germany, driven by Guenter Hartkopf was found to contain 50 percent more carbon monoxide in its exhaust than the legally permitted maximum. Hartkopf is Secretary for Protection of the Environment in the ruling national coalition.

Palestinian Fedayeen Face Increasing Difficulties

By Nathan Weinstock

[We have translated the following article from the March 12 issue of the Belgian revolutionary-socialist weekly *La Gauche*, where it appeared under the title "La longue marche du peuple palestinien."]

* * *

The terrible defeat suffered by the Palestinian resistance in the bloody September days has provided a clear opening for the intrigues of the great powers. We can now expect a move to carry out the Rogers plan—in fact, the Nixon-Kosygin plan—by which Moscow and Washington propose to stamp out the Palestinian revolutionary ferment that threatened to tip the entire region into the camp of the revolution.

The general lines of the solution to be imposed on the Palestinian masses are becoming quite clear. A formal concession will be offered. The West Bank and the Gaza Strip will form a kind of Palestinian rump state, in reality militarily, politically, and economically dominated by its powerful Zionist neighbor. In this way, the butcher of Amman can rid himself of the most turbulent part of his realm while preserving his throne, a key political "stabilizing" factor in Western plans.

The creation of this Palestinian entity will make it possible to claim that the national question has been solved: the Palestinians will have their own country. Israel, on the other hand, will have to give up essentially all of the territory it conquered in 1967, including the old quarter of Jerusalem and the Latun region. In exchange for this "sacrifice" of their coveted lands, the Israelis will get what in fact has been the primary goal of Tel Aviv's foreign policy since 1948—recognition by its Arab neighbors of the status quo, that is, legitimization of the Zionist endeavor.

There is no purpose in concealing the fact that the Palestinian resistance today is undergoing a very grave crisis. The balance sheet was presented

in the January 27, 1971, issue of *Figaro*:

"Militarily the fedayeen have never been in such a critical situation. Both in the Jordan valley and in South Lebanon, their attacks against Israel are confined to ineffectual harassment. In Syria, they have lost their firmest elements. In the aftermath of a more moderate team taking over the government, the 2,000 to 3,000 men of the powerful Saika have been disarmed and interned. In Lebanon, more than half of their forces have melted away—2,500 guerrillas today as against 6,000 at the time of the October-November 1969 clashes with the Lebanese army—and all the recruiting offices in the refugee camps have been closed by order of the government.

"In Jordan, the last important base of the resistance, where it still has a substantial number of forces—about 7,000 to 8,000 regulars and 10,000 auxiliaries and militiamen—its striking power seems in practice to have been broken."

While the January 13 compromise forbids the Jordanian army to keep on openly "hammering" the fedayeen, the government continues to weaken them and strangle them. To this end, it has ordered the expulsion of foreign, or purportedly foreign, commandos; destruction of arms depots; systematic searches; and incessant checks. (It was by such a process of attrition that the Jordanian forces succeeded in "restoring order" in the northern part of the country.) In short, while the Jordanian army has been greatly strengthened by shipments of American arms, the fedayeen have found themselves numerically weakened and partially disarmed.

The setback suffered by the resistance movement has had obvious psychological repercussions. The fedayeen apparently find themselves isolated, their sympathizers are disoriented. It is reported that the command of the Palestinian militia had to dissolve its units in order to forestall a collapse. In a word, what exists

is disarray. (In the meantime, 17,000 Palestinians are still in prison in Jordan.)

In these conditions, the American-Soviet plan of a Palestinian rump state is undeniably making some progress, above all on the West Bank itself. Washington is playing an obvious game, in which it seems to have the support of Moscow. It is negotiating only with Al Fateh, to the detriment of the left-wing resistance organizations. At the same time, Al Fateh is being gradually strangled in order to make it amenable, since the rank and file clearly want no part of this game. The grave money crisis of the Palestinian resistance reflects American pressure on its Arab financial backers.

In this phase of retreat, the Palestine Liberation Army (PLA) has come to the fore. It is a regular army, i.e., bourgeois in structure, organized for demagogic purposes by the Arab states neighboring Israel. It is comprised of three brigades, which in reality are under the control of the governments of the countries where they are stationed. These are the Ain Jalud brigade in the United Arab Republic, the Kadsiya brigade in Iraq, and the Hatin brigade in Syria. In all, these forces total 6,000 fully equipped troops.

The sudden attempt by the PLA to impose its views (or rather those of its three general staffs) on the Palestinian resistance movement reflects the decline of the resistance movement as well as its present dependence on the neighboring states, of which the PLA brigades are instruments. This attempt also testifies to the decline in influence of the guerrillas. The PLA is not just demanding strong representation in Palestinian leading bodies. It seems to be preparing to take control of the future Palestinian rump state.

The PLA then is in direct competition with Yassir Arafat, who remains the leader of Al Fateh despite rumblings among the rank and file—where questions are being asked. Arafat also seems determined to take control of

the Bantustan that is to be created. It would seem, according to the March 3 *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, that he has recently had discussions on this subject with the Soviet ambassadors to Amman and Cairo at a meeting allegedly held in Zerka.

This rivalry casts light on the debates that have just taken place in the Palestinian National Council, a sort of national assembly of the resistance. It is clear first of all that, under the pretext of strengthening military unity, Arafat sought to achieve a fusion of the various resistance organizations. In practice, such a move would mean that the left groups, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) and the Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (DPFLP), would completely lose their *political and organizational autonomy*.

Such a plan would presuppose abandoning the struggle based in the countries bordering Israel, in favor of establishing a base at some future time in the occupied territories. (So far there has been no success in this regard anywhere except in the Gaza Strip.) Obviously this project involves abandoning all revolutionary or agitational activity directed at the Jordanian, Lebanese, or Egyptian masses. In other words, under a revolutionary cover—the pretext of creating a Palestinian united front comparable to the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam—what is envisioned is virtually complete liquidation of the resistance.

It is significant, moreover, that we are seeing the appearance of a new organization of notables alongside the Palestinian National Council, i.e., the "Palestinian People's Congress," which has met in Cairo.

Thus, two parallel maneuvers are taking form—on the one hand, an attempt to impose the dominance of Al Fatah within the resistance; on the other, pressure on the resistance movement by organizations representing the Palestinian bourgeoisie or the neighboring Arab states.

In view of these maneuvers, support must be given to the position of Nayef Hawatmeh, a leader of the DPFLP. Pointing out the ambiguity of the notion of "Palestinian national unity" (unity for what purpose?), he has declared himself in favor of a "Jordanian-Palestinian national front that would struggle against Zionism and for the liberation of Transjordan. This

requires . . . that the resistance revise or rectify its relationship with the Arab countries and collaborate with the Arab liberation movements directly and no longer through the intermediary of the established regime."

In practice, such a policy must be carried out through an Arab revolutionary front. The Palestinian revolution can only win victory by extending itself.

The Palestinian National Council meeting, to the contrary, ended with an enormous step backward. Arafat's unification proposal was adopted and a framework for the meeting of the new council was set, in which the representatives of the PLA will have at least a major voice. Of course, the council unanimously rejected the plan for the creation of a Palestinian rump state. But this magnificent unity is only a facade for behind-the-scenes wheeling and dealing.

At bottom the fundamental contradictions remain. But this does not diminish the fact that the council meeting confirmed the terrible weakening of the left wing of the resistance and of the movement as a whole.

In the midst of all this, new developments appeared in Israel itself. The "Black Panther" movement, comprising young Jews of Eastern origin, organized a demonstration against racial discrimination. This new development of plebeian consciousness, greatly helped along by the Israeli

Socialist Organization (ISO), has disturbed the Zionist authorities.

The demonstration was banned. Hundreds of police were mobilized on a war footing. Fifteen youths—nine ISO comrades and six Black Panthers—were placed under *preventive* arrest, to prevent the demonstration from taking place.

The emergence of this current from the disadvantaged strata of the Israeli Jewish population has a greater portent than might seem. In protesting against the authorities' indifference to the poverty that exists in the country, in contrast to their considerable efforts to promote the immigration of Western Jews, the demonstrators *concretely* challenged the Zionist policy. By demanding that the Israeli state concern itself with its own citizens instead of trying to attract immigrants, they have advanced a program that can also win the support of the Arab proletariat. An apparently harmless sentence in one of their leaflets challenges the whole substance of Zionism: "Why do we have to sleep ten in a room when they build comfortable houses for immigrants from Europe and America?"

At latest report, some of those put under preventive arrest are still being held, which is eloquent testimony to the uneasiness of the Israeli authorities in the face of this domestic challenge. □

Denmark

Scientists Score U.S. on Chemical Weapons

Copenhagen

Some 300 Danish scientists have signed a sharp and very dramatic protest against the U. S. A.'s use of chemical weapons in Southeast Asia. The most striking thing about this statement is that this is the first time a group of Danish researchers have taken such a pronounced political stand.

"In circulating petitions we were met again and again with arguments such as 'it doesn't do any good, anyway' and 'solidarity won't do the Vietnamese any good,'" said Jan Krag Jacobsen, who organized the action. "But solidarity can help the Vietnamese very much. Declarations of solidarity

are a great moral encouragement for them, especially when they come from Western and NATO countries. The statement was printed in the North Vietnamese papers and drew considerable comment.

"Such statements also have great importance for the groups in the U. S. A. that oppose the war in Southeast Asia. The Vietnamese realize that they cannot destroy the American war machine. They know that the struggle must be won politically, and first and foremost in America. By declarations of solidarity we can support the opposition to the war."

The scientists' protest is at the same time the sign of a turn in the Danish

scientific world. Up to now scientists have felt that they should not concern themselves with political questions. The circulators of the petition tried to overcome this error by advancing

the slogan: "It's our duty to take positions on questions that we are better able to understand because of our work and education."

The reason Danish scientists have

been hesitant to take political positions is that the scientific world in Europe is strongly influenced by the U. S. A., through grants and foundations, for example. □

A Timely Assist for Nixon

Ping Pong—Mao's Opener in a Bid to Washington

In November 1969 Nixon demonstrated his love of sports by watching a football game on television while 800,000 persons staged an antiwar demonstration within shouting distance of the White House.

Now, on the eve of another antiwar protest, Nixon has shown a sudden taste for another sport—ping pong.

Peking's April 6 invitation to an American table-tennis team to visit China caused a sensation in the White House.

Nixon's escalation of the war into Laos had resulted in a disastrous rout for the American-supported Saigon troops. The March 29 court-martial conviction of Lieutenant William Calley for war crimes in Vietnam had drawn worldwide attention to the even greater guilt of U. S. war planners in the White House and the Pentagon.

Now after months of hostile coverage even from the bourgeois press, the State Department was able to point to a conspicuous victory for the president's diplomacy in Asia.

"To the State Department," Harrison Salisbury commented in the April 11 *New York Times*, "the invitation was a major breakthrough, proof positive that, despite all the rhetoric and propaganda, there exists on the Chinese side, as on the American, a genuine and persistent desire to break the long diplomatic deadlock that has endured almost since the inception of the regime of Mao Tse-tung on Oct. 1, 1949."

Washington was quick to reciprocate. A State Department official announced April 9 that American oil companies had been warned by the U. S. government that it would be "inadvisable" for them to explore oil deposits in the East China Sea.

The next day, the Chinese government made its most significant concession to date by granting visas to three American reporters, permitting

them to cover the visit of the U. S. ping-pong team.

This was the first time in twenty-two years that a group of U. S. correspondents have been allowed to enter China.

The government of the People's Republic of China has, of course, every right to seek diplomatic recognition and trade agreements from the countries of the imperialist West, including the United States.

But the timing of Mao's current move has special political significance. It provides priceless aid to Nixon in his efforts to counter the impact of the Laos setback and of the Calley scandal.

The sudden flurry of friendly gestures from Peking also helps to discount China's warnings against further escalation of the Indochina war which were issued during the Laos invasion.

The Pentagon responded by immediately escalating the size of the bombs being dropped on Vietnamese civilian areas.

Some commentators are of the opinion that Mao is in fact seeking "peaceful coexistence" with Washington on a par with the arrangement existing between U. S. imperialism and the Soviet bureaucracy. This view is given additional substance by the fact that Washington and Peking are in a common front, supporting the use of troops by Yahya Khan against the freedom-seeking Bengali people.

Imperialist America and the Maoist regime are suppliers of the arms used by the Yahya Khan dictatorship to massacre civilians in East Bengal. This common stand against Bengali nationalism shows how the narrow bureaucratic interests of the Mao regime can coincide, at least temporarily, with those of American imperialism.

Mao's overtures to Nixon are nothing

new. He made a broad hint even before the latter's inauguration. On November 26, 1968, Peking made its first bid by calling for the resumption of ambassadorial contacts with the U. S. in Warsaw.

At that time the move appeared to be an opening rejoinder to Moscow's game of wheeling and dealing with Washington in atomic power politics at China's expense.

The Nixon administration was alert to the possibilities of playing the two giant workers states off against each other, but Mao did not follow up at the time.

More than two years ago we predicted the possible concessions that would be made by Moscow and Peking in their courtship of Nixon. In our February 3, 1969, issue we wrote:

"With such offers coming in already, Nixon seems to be in excellent position to fan the ardor of his suitors by stimulating their mutual jealousies and suspicions. He could put each of them through a series of tests to prove their devotion and dependability. Peking, for instance, might be asked to admit U. S. correspondents to China. Moscow's ideas on a 'Middle East settlement' and 'limiting nuclear missiles' might be explored."

This prediction has been borne out almost to the letter.

The Chinese table-tennis team will certainly win the match in Peking, if they do not decide out of courtesy to let the Americans win. Win or lose at ping pong, the end result may be to open a new and much more profitable game for Nixon. □

Bombs Are Better?

In announcing restrictions on abortions performed by military hospitals April 3, Richard Nixon explained that he was motivated by "my personal belief in the sanctity of human life." In addition, he said, "I consider abortion an unacceptable form of population control."

European Sections of Fourth International Hold Conference of Workers

Rome

The third workers' conference of Trotskyist organizations—including sections of the Fourth International as well as sympathizing groups—took place March 27-28 in Turin. The first conference was also held in Turin November 1969, and the second in Liege in July 1970.

More than 100 activists attended, including blue- and white-collar workers, as well as trade-union members and leaders. Most of the participants were young militants. Among the most significant delegations were those from the Renault and Rhone-Poulenc factories in France; from FIAT, and from Nebiolo and other foundries in Italy; from Cockerill-Ougree and F. N. Herstal in Belgium; from Standard Electric Lorenz in Germany; and the Belwal-Arbed Acieries in Luxemburg.

The Swiss delegation was composed of comrades who played a role in the recent strikes in French-speaking Switzerland, strikes which marked a turning point in the political struggle in that country.

The Italian delegation, the most numerous, included activists from about fifteen cities.

After the presiding committee was elected and the agenda proposed by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International was adopted, a worker from Renault, a member of the Ligue Communiste [Communist League—the French section of the Fourth International], reported on the situation and perspectives in the automotive industry. He stressed the importance of this sector (in which more than a million European workers are employed and which produces 45 percent of the world's cars and trucks).

This industry is experiencing quite a few difficulties at the present time. A decline in the rate of profit has developed as a result of various factors (an increase in the price of steel involving a redistribution of surplus value within the big capitalist groups, wage rises forced by great workers' struggles, and the spread of the subcontracting system, which entails a rise in the cost price). The danger exists, moreover, of a progressive saturation of the market. All these factors, especially in the event of a general recession in Europe, will inevitably have repercussions on the level of employment.

In order to cope with their difficulties, the capitalists have resorted, and will continue to resort, to the classical measures—layoffs, speedups, price increases. Thus, the workers will have to counterattack on the same ground. They will have to struggle against layoffs by raising, especially in the most critical situations, the slogan of a sliding scale of hours. Price rises must be fought by imposing a sliding scale of wages applied retroactively and

fixed on a basis that can guarantee the workers against any erosion of their standard of living. A struggle must be waged for workers' control over the speed of assembly lines and the size of crews. At the same time, the fight for higher wages must be continued, with agitation centering on the demand for equal pay increases for all, in order to strike at the job-classification system imposed by the bosses.

In the discussion that followed, a worker from FIAT in Turin drew a balance sheet of the experience with the Delegates Council in the big automotive trust, pointing out that the trade-union bureaucrats have succeeded in draining away the content of this body and in paralyzing it in practice. The Turin comrade outlined the demands that the revolutionary worker-activists are proposing in their alternative platform for the new struggles building up—immediately raising all workers to pay-category No. 2, equalizing piece-work premiums for all and including these in the base pay, and inspection by workers' delegates of sanitary conditions in the shops.

A metalworker from Bari expressed the view that the causes of the present difficulties in the automotive industry were stepped-up international competition, the wage rises won by the workers, and the underutilization of equipment.

A comrade from Nebiolo in Turin talked about a recent struggle in his plant.

The report on the steel industry, which came second on the agenda, was given by a comrade from Liege. She highlighted the three main characteristics of the present situation in this sector—the introduction of new equipment involving a danger of excess productive capacity, more and more advanced rationalization, resulting in a tendency toward a drop in the number of workers employed and increased concentration.

In the second part of her report, the Liege comrade discussed the most significant strikes that have occurred in the recent period in Belgium, placing her main stress on the Sidmar and Cockerill-Ougree experiences.

The last struggle at Cockerill was particularly significant because it developed in spite of the open opposition of the union federation, on the basis of powerful pressure from below. Finally, the comrade drew attention to the experiments in workers' control carried out in the big Liege steel plant. Workers' control has been applied to the composition of the work crews and assembly-line rates, even involving a certain measure of control over hiring and a right of veto over firings.

At the Thomas foundry in particular the workers have endeavored to exercise

supervision over stockpiling and inventories, and there have even been attempts to impose supervision over investments and the types of new equipment to be adopted.

An Italian comrade from Genoa took up the struggles, which were centered around opposition to the system of job classification, waged last year by the workers of the Italian steel trust Italsider. Despite the extended period of struggles and considerable wage losses from strikes, new conflicts have shaped up quite recently, particularly in Genoa, over the question of the makeup of work crews.

The third report—on workers' control and the problem of transitional demands—was given by Antonio Moscato, a member of the Political Bureau of the Italian section of the Fourth International. He made an extensive analysis of the experiences of the workers' upsurge in Italy, with special reference to the important lessons of the birth, development and present crisis of the workers' councils. (A written synopsis was distributed in advance to the participants.)

In fact, the reporter stressed, not only did forms of workers' control appear (notably over assembly-line tempos and work crews) along with embryonic forms of dual power in some plants, but, with the workers' councils that arose in the first period, organizational instruments of control developed. The upsurge in Italy that followed the great struggles in the autumn of 1969 has, however, been marked in the current stage by the need for finding general political solutions. Lacking these, the movement was destined to become dispersed, and, in the last analysis, to mark time, despite the continuing combativity of the workers and the power of the struggles developing without letup in specific industries or localities.

The reformist leaderships of the traditional parties and unions have understood this need. They have tried, in the context of their general outlook, to meet it by launching a campaign for reforms designed essentially to put pressure on the center-left government. Given their simplistic political ideas and their total lack of understanding of the question of a transitional program, the ultraleft groups have found themselves in difficulties.

As for us, we have made and must continue to make an effort to fill this void by developing a program of transitional demands encompassing not only the question of a sliding scale of hours and workers' control but housing, the environment, taxation, medical assistance, etc. Documents have already been drawn up and are being published in *Bandiera*

Rossa, the organ of the Italian section.

After a contribution to the discussion by a Belgian comrade, Paul Doyen, who summarized the Armco-Pittsburgh experience, a comrade from the Ligue Marxiste Revolutionnaire [Revolutionary Marxist League, the Swiss section of the Fourth International] took the floor to discuss the recent strikes in Geneva, Yverdon, and other centers in French-speaking Switzerland.

These strikes mark an important turn in the class struggle in Switzerland, inasmuch as they have opened an important breach in the class-collaborationist system that the bourgeoisie and the reformist bureaucracy had succeeded in imposing on the proletariat for decades. In these struggles, which were still going on at the time of the conference, a prominent role was played by Spanish and Italian *emigre* workers, but the Swiss workers participated with the same militancy. As in other European countries, the workers in Geneva and Yverdon elected strike committees which had to continually account for their work. The trade-union bureaucracy, completely outflanked, tried to defend itself by all sorts of maneuvers (from chauvinism to ultraleftism).

A comrade from the GIM [Gruppe Internationale Marxisten—International Marxist Group, the German section of the Fourth International] summed up the experience of the "wildcat" strikes that have shaken Germany, pointing out especially the divisions within the trade-union bureaucracy that have considerably facilitated the spontaneous upsurge of struggles.

The German Trotskyist organization succeeded in developing a platform for intervening in these struggles on a national level. The response was favorable. The principal demands that must be raised in the present stage are equal pay boosts for all, a sliding scale of wages, and workers' democracy in the unions. In addition, the German Trotskyists are active among apprentices, a group constituting an extremely important area of work.

Ross Dowson, a leader of the Canadian Trotskyist movement and member of the leadership of the Fourth International, spoke on the struggles of the British workers, in particular the great mobilizations against the antilabor bill presented by the Conservative government.

The final report, given by Jean Metais, a member of the Political Bureau of the Ligue Communiste, dealt with the participation of revolutionary Marxists in workers' struggles and the construction of Trotskyist nuclei in the plants. First of all, Comrade Metais noted that the present political context is much more favorable for revolutionists than ever in the past. He indicated three problems that all sections have to solve in a precise way at a certain stage in their development: (1) the problem of relations with the most radicalized strata of the working class, which are very combative but have insufficient political education (it is particularly important to prevent these layers from isolating themselves from the rest of the class); (2) the problem of our at-

titude toward the traditional organizations, in particular the trade unions (in opposition to all ultraleftist deviations, we must reaffirm the positive role played by the unions and at the same time fight to break the hegemony of the reformists over the union movement); (3) the problem of utilizing the forces that we win in the student movement to bolster our involvement in workers' struggles and in the plants.

Comrade Pellegrini (Italy) stressed the need for developing links with the workers who hold key positions in the plants. He pointed out that we can do this if we do not limit ourselves to political campaigns but are capable of leading real struggles at all levels. On the other hand, we must utilize all instruments that exist or may arise, including rank-and-file committees and councils of delegates, and not just the unions.

A comrade from the Ligue Communiste Revolutionnaire [Revolutionary Communist League] of Luxembourg spoke about the educational problems facing his organization as a result of recruiting young workers. The LCR is striving to develop activities in industry both intensively (intervening in shops where they have comrades or contacts) as well as extensively (general propaganda work, distributing leaflets in front of factories).

Italy

Trotskyists Hold Rally in Turin

Rome

On the occasion of the European Trotskyist workers' conference, the Trotskyist organization in Turin organized a public rally in a theater in the downtown area. The enthusiastic meeting, attended by about 700 people, was chaired by a metalworker who is a member of both the Italian section of the Fourth International and the Central Committee of the FIOM [Federazione Impiegati e Operai Metallurgici—Federation of Blue- and White-Collar Workers in the Metal Industry], which is affiliated to the CGIL [Confederazione Generale Italiana del Lavoro—Italian General Confederation of Labor].

The first speaker, Ernest Mandel, a member of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, analyzed the political and economic position of capitalist Europe in the context of the world situation. The growth rate of the capitalist economy, he said, has shown a marked slowdown and the United States and Great Britain are already suffering a recession, while a downturn is shaping up in West Germany.

A characteristic feature of this period is that unemployment is increasing without this having led, up to now, to an ebb in struggles. A wave of unemployment sweeping the capitalist world would undoubtedly generate a new surge of radicalization among the younger generation.

Livio Maitan, a member of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, summed up the conclusions briefly. The conference, he said, had permitted a further exchange of experiences, which was all the more useful since the great majority of the comrades present had not participated in the preceding meetings. We were, he said, able to see that we concurred in our analysis of the situation of European capitalism at this stage and of the tendencies shaping up for the near and relatively near future. We noted that essentially the same tendencies are operating throughout capitalist Europe as a whole and that the criteria of our work are becoming more and more the same (the emphasis need no longer be put on the peculiarities of each situation).

We must, he continued, again consider the question of studying our various experiences more thoroughly. There are still serious insufficiencies in this area. Secondly, we must prepare smaller meetings where it would be easier to discuss certain organizational and political aspects of our work more deeply. We must also consider the question of taking steps to coordinate our political and propaganda work. Finally, in a broader perspective, we must take up the problem of initiating united struggles and demonstrations of workers from different European countries. □

In the present phase, it is necessary to give these struggles more precise political content. That is why the Fourth International is calling not only for extending workers' struggles but at the same time for fighting for workers' councils, for workers' control, and for building the revolutionary party.

The second speaker, a delegate from FIAT-Mirafiori in Turin, said that revolutionary workers are proposing to revive the struggle in the big Turin trust. This comrade also referred to the struggle of the Argentinian workers at the FIAT assembly plants in Cordoba.

An Italian worker who had lived in Switzerland, Gaspare Bono, gave a vivid description of the difficulties and sufferings of the *emigre* workers, and denounced the maneuvers of the capitalists to divide the workers of different nationalities. Bono's speech was warmly applauded. A speech by a Spanish worker, who had likewise lived in Switzerland, was also well received. He said that the foreign workers in Switzerland, who were in the forefront of the struggles there, were fighting at the same time in the interest of the Swiss workers, their brothers.

A metalworker from Cockerill-Ougree in Liege talked about the struggles now in progress in his factory to defend the workers' standard of living. This com-

rade read a letter of greetings to the conference from the Italian workers in Belgium.

Speaking for the Ligue Communiste, Jean Metais analyzed the efforts made by the French bourgeoisie to canalize and block the youth rebellion, to choke off the workers' upsurge, and isolate the revolutionary organizations. The big high-school student mobilizations, the workers' struggles last year at Berliet, and the Batignolles strike, as well as the demonstrations of tens of thousands of persons organized by the revolutionary organizations have demonstrated that the plans of the bosses and the government have failed in the main. Comrade Metais invited the militants to participate in a revolutionary demonstration May 15-16 in

Paris to commemorate the anniversary of the Commune.

The final speaker, Livio Maitan, informed the activists present about the discussion at the Trotskyist workers' conference held previously. Maitan pointed out that the European bourgeoisie is caught more hopelessly than ever in an impasse. The most probable perspective is one of very sharp struggles taking place in a framework of extreme tensions. This is all the more true if we consider the world context, which is marked by the resurgence of the conflict in Indochina; by a deepening crisis on the Indian subcontinent, demonstrated most spectacularly by the breakup of Pakistan, and by the new rise of mass struggles in several Latin American countries. □

dangerous documents as the United Nations charter and the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights.

Another cofounder of the committee, nuclear physicist Andrei D. Sakharov, immediately responded to Bukovsky's arrest by sending a protest letter to Interior Minister Nikolai Shchelokov. Sakharov called the arrest "unjustified" and demanded Bukovsky's immediate release.

Sakharov's letter was followed by a protest from thirty intellectuals. This demand for the freeing of Bukovsky was sent to the Twenty-Fourth Congress. Its signers included historian Pyotr Yakir and mathematician Aleksandr Yesenin-Volpin.

It is not yet known what specific charges will be filed against Bukovsky. Last June, he was threatened with prosecution after the publication in the *Washington Post* of an interview in which he described conditions in the prison camps, and condemned the confinement of political oppositionists in mental hospitals.

Bukovsky also took part in another interview last year that was broadcast on British and American television. This interview was cited as one of the charges against another of its participants, historian Andrei Amalrik, at his trial in November. □

Soviet Union

Bukovsky Faces Seven-Year Sentence

Soviet dissident author Vladimir Bukovsky was arrested in Moscow March 29, the day before the opening of the Twenty-Fourth Congress of the Soviet Communist party. His arrest came shortly after an appeal he had issued on behalf of oppositionists confined in mental hospitals reached the West.

Bukovsky has a long history of defending democratic rights against the Kremlin bureaucrats. He was imprisoned in a mental hospital in 1963 for organizing an "illegal" art show, and again in 1965 for organizing a protest against the trial of the writers Yuli M. Daniel and Andrei D. Sinavsky.

In January 1967, Bukovsky was arrested for organizing a demonstration in Moscow on behalf of imprisoned writers Aleksandr Ginzburg and Yuri Galanskov. He was sentenced to three years' imprisonment on a charge of "disturbing the peace" and was released in January 1970.

Anthony Astrachan reported from Moscow in the April 3 *Washington Post* that Bukovsky now faces a possible seven-year sentence under Article 70 of the Russian Republic's criminal code, which outlaws "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda."

The arrest of Bukovsky appeared to be part of a general crackdown on dissent, which was hinted at by party chief Brezhnev March 30 when he said the government would attempt "to strengthen legality and law and

order, to educate citizens to observe the laws and rules of Socialist community relations."

Astrachan reported that the same day Bukovsky was arrested, secret police agents searched the apartment of physicist Valery N. Chalidze, a cofounder of the Committee for Human Rights. In addition to papers of the committee, the police seized such

REVIEWS

Problems of Women's Liberation

Problems of Women's Liberation by Evelyn Reed. Pathfinder Press, New York, N. Y. 96 pp. \$1.45. 1971.

In this, its fifth edition, Evelyn Reed's book has been expanded by the inclusion of two major new articles. "Women: Caste, Class or Oppressed Sex?" is the text of her paper presented at the 1970 Socialist Scholars Conference in New York. "How Women Lost Control of Their Destiny and How They Can Regain It" is a speech Reed delivered at more than thirty colleges and universities during a nationwide tour in 1970.

The first is an informative treatment of theories advanced by such spokeswomen for sections of the feminist movement as Roxanne Dunbar and

Ti-Grace Atkinson in an attempt to discover the social origin of women's oppression. Reed not only shows that characterizing women as a distinct class or caste is inaccurate, but also demonstrates how such an error can give the feminist movement a false strategy in the fight for women's liberation.

In "How Women Lost Control of Their Destiny and How They Can Regain It," Reed analyzes a specific institution that oppresses women—the family. She describes its origin in the concrete needs of class society and shows how it was modified by the development of capitalist economy. The deterioration of this institution—much lamented by procapitalist com-

mentators—is for Reed a symptom of the revolutionary ferment behind women's demand for the right to control their own lives.

The other articles in this collection are equally timely explanations of the Marxist view of women's oppression.

They take up such subjects as the role of fashion, Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique*, the significance of prepatriarchal forms of society, and the historical origin of the myths of women's supposed inferiority.

—David Burton

was widely seen as preparation for the prosecution of officials of the Dubcek government. The trial and sentencing of Prchlik confirm this view.

"General Prchlik," Eric Bourne noted in the April 1 *Christian Science Monitor*, "... as head of the Army's political department, was an extremely well-known officer. He is thus the first high-ranking figure of the reform period to be arraigned—and the first indicted for activities prior to the August, 1968, invasion."

The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation has sponsored a commission of prominent socialists and radicals concerned about socialist democracy in Czechoslovakia. According to the April 1 issue of the British daily *Guardian*, the commission plans to visit Czechoslovakia and speak with present and former government leaders. Its members are Prof. Christopher Hill, Prof. Maurice Dobb, Dr. Eric Hobsbaum, Raymond Williams, Lawrence Daly, and Prof. Noam Chomsky. □

Czech General New Witch-Hunt Victim

Threaten Longer Sentences for Prague 19

The prosecutor in the case of nineteen Czechoslovak youths accused of "Trotskyist" activities has decided to appeal for heavier sentences, according to a report from Prague in the *London Times*.

The trial ended on March 19 with the conviction of 16 defendants and the acquittal of one. Trial for two others was postponed because of illness.

The appeal, reported in the March 24 *Times*, was not mentioned by other papers. The London daily quoted "informed sources" as saying the prosecutor had asked stiffer penalties for "at least 13 of the 16" defendants convicted. He also reportedly asked a reversal of the acquittal of Matylda Brozovska. The article continued:

"Unofficial sources said the prosecutor, Dr. Frantisek Stilip, had asked the Czech Supreme Court to increase the four-year prison sentence on Professor Petr Uhl, aged 29, for whom he had demanded a maximum five-year sentence.

"Twelve other persons, for whom Dr. Stilip had demanded sentences of three to five years, received prison terms ranging from a 15-month suspended sentence to 30 months. He has appealed for increases in the prison terms for these persons also."

This new move against the "Prague Nineteen" was followed by other signs of the determination of the Husak government to suppress all opposition before the opening of the Communist party congress, now less than two months away.

On March 26, Vaclav Prchlik was sentenced to three years' imprisonment. The former general was chief of the armed forces political section during the spring of 1968. Pressure from the Soviet bureaucrats forced his removal even prior to the August in-

vasion. Prchlik had aroused the wrath of the Kremlin by advocating less Soviet domination of the Warsaw Pact and by criticizing a delay in the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia after scheduled military maneuvers.

According to the West German weekly *Der Spiegel*, Prchlik was convicted of "endangering the functioning of a state organ."

The trial of the Prague Nineteen

Britain

West Pakistanis in Solidarity with Bengal

[The following statement, which is self-explanatory, has been received by *Intercontinental Press* from a group of West Pakistanis in London.]

* * *

In view of the disgusting chauvinism which is, at the moment, rampant in West Pakistan and the treacherous behaviour of the People's Party leadership, a small group of West Pakistani socialists have decided to set up a committee to be known as *West Pakistanis in Solidarity with Bengal*.

The aims of this committee are elementary:

1. To unconditionally support by all possible means the national liberation struggle which is being waged today in East Bengal and to give all possible assistance to the Bengali Action Committees which have been set up abroad.

2. To attempt to draw the maximum numbers of West Pakistanis to this committee on a position of solidarity with the Bengali masses and by a

programme of intensive education on the realities of the situation in East Bengal following its invasion by the Pakistan Army.

3. To make use of all possible channels to get the truth regarding the oppression of Bengal, and the brutal massacres being conducted by the West Pakistani army, to the workers and students of West Pakistan, where a strict military censorship is in force.

4. To continue these efforts till the total liberation of Bengal has been accomplished and the invading armies have been forced to withdraw from Bangla Desh.

Founding members: M. K. Janjua, Nasim Bajwa, Raza Ali, Mohd Akhtar, Mohd Azam, Tariq Ali, Mohd Shuja, Ali U Khan.

If you want to help or are interested in more information, please write to: *West Pakistanis in Solidarity with Bengal*, 182 Pentonville Road, London N. 1 (01-837-6954). □