

Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 9, No 24

©1971 Intercontinental Press

June 21, 1971

50c



5,000,000 Bengali Refugees

Hussein Renews Attacks on Fedayeen

"We shall chop off the hands which are reaching out to dismantle Jordan's national unity and integrity."

This, as reported in the *Washington Post*, was the response June 2 of Prime Minister Wasfi Tell to orders from King Hussein to take "bold, decisive and tough action against the handful of professional criminals and conspirators who use the commando movement to disguise their treasonable plots."

The Hashemite Nero, it appears, has decided to attempt once again to wipe out the Palestinian fedayeen bases in Jordan. On June 1, two guerrilla leaders, Kamal Adwan of Fateh and Kamal Nasser of the Palestine Liberation Organization, charged in a news conference in Beirut that commando outposts in northern Jordan, in the area of Jarash and Salt, were under siege by army troops, armored cars, and artillery.

According to the June 2 *New York Times*, Kamal Adwan said "that Jordanian forces had recently been joining Israeli troops stationed on the other side of the Jordan River in firing on guerrillas entering or leaving Israeli-occupied territory."

Residents of the Wahdat refugee camp in Amman told newsmen June 1 that the army had attacked a mass demonstration there May 31, killing ten persons and wounding an unknown number.

The Wahdat refugee camp was heavily damaged in the slaughter last September.

The latest killings at Wahdat were preceded by a provocation. Hussein's forces blew up monuments marking two mass graves of victims of the September fighting.

The June 2 *Washington Post* reported: "... the Jordanian government confirmed the monuments were destroyed because they were 'symbols representing a split in Jordan's national unity.'" □

Afraid to Ask Women?

A study by scientists at the University of Michigan has found that one-fifth of all American men believe violence is necessary to accomplish social change.

In This Issue

	JORDAN	562 Hussein Renews Attacks on Fedayeen
	PAKISTAN	563 Cholera, Famine Threaten Millions
Javad Sadeeg	564	Bangla Desh Protest-March in New York
	CHILE	564 Right-Wing Politician Slain
	ANTIWAR	564 Antiwar Activists to Meet
	MEXICO	568 Alaska Brass Try Freeze-Out Tactic on GI Newspaper
	MEXICO	565 Student Demonstrators Shot Down
Ricardo Ochoa	566	The New Upsurge in the Student Movement
	CHINA	569 Nixon Ends Embargo on Trading With China
Allen Myers	569	U.S.A.
Jon Rothschild	570	When New Yorkers Came to Their Bridges and Couldn't Cross Them
	570	Hilliard Convicted
	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	571 Balaguer Marks Political Opponents for Death
	ARGENTINA	572 The Guerrillas of the ERP
	CUBA	573 The Case of Heberto Padilla
Juan E. Mestas	573	BOLIVIA
	575	Put the People's Assembly on the Road to Socialism!
	FRANCE	576 Bringing Up the Rear Behind Jules Moch
	YUGOSLAVIA	577 Student Sit-In Protests Jailings
	SWEDEN	578 Portuguese Exiles Threatened With Deportation
	REVIEWS	579 Roots of the American Socialist Revolution
	579	Oil: The Stakes in the Middle East
	DOCUMENTS	580 Socialism, Nationalism, and Revolution in Ireland
John Garland	582	Australian Communist Party Discusses Trotskyism
	583	Ceylon Mercantile Union to Discuss Reply to Prime Minister Bandaranaike
	PHOTOS	568 Ed Jurenas at 1970 YSA convention
Howard Petrick	568	DRAWINGS
	569	Richard Nixon; 577, Josip Broz-Tito; 578, Marcello Caetano

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

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.

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

MANAGING EDITOR: Allen Myers.

EDITORIAL STAFF: Gerry Foley, George Saunders.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.

TECHNICAL STAFF: H. Massey, James M. Morgan, Jon Rothschild.

Published in New York each Monday except last in December and first in January; 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, 10 Impasse Guemenee, Paris 4, 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.

Cholera, Famine Threaten Millions

The World Health Organization on June 8 confirmed newspaper reports that cholera had spread along the entire 1,350-mile border between India and East Bengal.

"Officials of the agency," Reuters reported, "said in Geneva yesterday that at least 3,000 had died of cholera and gastroenteritis in West Bengal. Other estimates put the figure as high as 8,000."

In a dispatch from Karimpur, India, printed in the June 9 *New York Times*, Sydney H. Schanberg described the effects of the epidemic raging among the 5,000,000 persons who have fled Yahya Khan's army:

"Along the roadsides lie the bodies left by those too frightened of the disease themselves to take the time for burial.

"Vultures, dogs and crows fight. Skeletons already picked clean bleach in the sun. A few bodies have been buried in shallow graves, but the vultures have torn the graves open.

"The roads leading from the border are a trail of clothes and bones. A body floats in a marsh or stream. The stench is acrid and villagers cover their faces as they hurry past."

At the end of the first week in June, the Indian government estimated that there were 68,000 cholera cases, nearly all of them refugees, in the states bordering East Bengal.

"The Indian government is desperately worried about cholera getting into the city [of Calcutta]," reported the June 6 London *Sunday Times*. "Already there are 30,000 refugees in a camp almost at the end of the runway at Dum Dum airport. And there is another refugee colony, several thousand strong, even farther into the city near the northern shanty-towns.

"'Personally,' says Brigadier Michael Blackman, the Oxfam [a British charity] disasters operations officer, who has just come back from the city, 'I think if cholera gets to Calcutta, God help us. It could be like the Great Plague of London.'

"'We know what cholera is,' says Raymond Cournoyer, 'C'est un feu de forêt' (it's a forest fire).

"'There are no terms strong enough to say how dangerous it is. If it once

caught hold in the area round Calcutta, the whole population of both the Bengals might be decimated.'

"There are about 110 million people in the two Bengals. That is three per cent of the human race."

The situation inside East Bengal appears to be even worse. Peter Hazelhurst reported in the June 7 London *Times*:

". . . Indian doctors at border points claimed that an even greater epidemic was raging in East Pakistan, where medical facilities are nonexistent.

"The doctors claimed that an increasing number of Bengalis who were affected by the disease were crossing the border every day for treatment in Indian hospitals. Yesterday [June 5] the Indian border security force sealed off sections of the . . . border in the Nadia district where cholera victims, some of them carrying their dead and the dying on handcarts, have been crossing the frontier during the past few days."

The monsoon, which has now begun, creates conditions for an even more rapid spread of the epidemic among the refugees, most of whom are without shelter. Flooding will also create the danger of a typhoid epidemic.

In East Bengal, those who survive the epidemics will be threatened by starvation. The June 6 *Sunday Times* noted:

"For East Pakistan's rice crop should have been sown before the monsoon. Reports suggest that because of the fighting and the subsequent exodus, hundreds of thousands of farmers planted no rice this spring. There is an obvious danger that after conquest, slaughter and death, famine will visit East Bengal as the Fourth Horseman."

Pakistani dictator Yahya Khan has thus created a situation that may lead to the death of hundreds of thousands. The flood of refugees has been created deliberately, according to reporters on the scene. Sunanda Datta-Ray reported from Calcutta in the June 6 London *Observer*:

"About a million Muslim supporters of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman's Awami

League fled to safety in India in the early days of President Yahya Khan's repressive military campaign. But the exodus since then has been almost entirely Hindu—some put the figure as high as 90 per cent. The suspicion is that Pakistan is seizing on this opportunity to get rid of her unwanted minority population of over 10 million Hindus.

"The stories they have to tell all follow the same dismal pattern. The task of the so-called 'Peace Committees' set up by East Bengal's Martial Law Administrator, Lieut-General Tikka Khan, is to 'watch, inform and terrorise.'

"'Each committee has been given 20 rifles,' says an old man with a seamed face the colour of burnt earth, 'and they come round to our houses demanding everything that we possess.' His daughter was raped while he had to watch.

"A woman drew her sari over her head and burst into hysterical sobbing as she described how her husband was stripped naked to find out whether he was circumcised—the only means of telling Hindu and Muslim apart—and then castrated before being killed before her eyes. Huts were burned to the ground, crops seized, gold ornaments—the peasant's capital—torn away."

The members of the "Peace Committees," Datta-Ray added, are not usually Bengalis but "Muslim settlers from Bihar and the Punjab, discredited politicians of the Muslim League and the Jamaat-i-Islami parties . . . all of whom took a bad beating at the hustings last December."

In this situation, Yahya's offer of "amnesty" to the refugees is the height of cynicism. Those who survive may yet return, but it will not be on Yahya's terms. The June 6 *Sunday Times* described the attitude of the refugees:

"One refugee who had left 20 acres behind in the East—a good-sized farm in Bengal—was asked why he didn't go back. 'I go back only when it's Bangla Desh,' he replied. There is no doubt he spoke for a majority of the refugees."

Datta-Ray also noted a mood that must disturb Indira Gandhi as much as it does Yahya Khan:

"Some of the more sophisticated . . . among those heading for Calcutta talk of the People's Republic that will one day unite the two Bengals." □

Allende Declares State of Emergency

Right-Wing Politician Slain in Chile

President Salvador Allende declared a state of emergency in Santiago province and put the armed forces on alert throughout Chile June 8, following the assassination of Edmundo Pérez Zúkovic, a leading figure in the right wing of the Christian Democratic party.

Pérez was killed by three men armed with machine guns who blocked his car as he was leaving his home.

The Associated Press reported that the police had announced the arrest of one person in the killing. Later

accounts, however, said the suspect, Ronaldo Rivera Calderón, was at large and being sought.

Rivera was reported killed in a gun battle with police early in the morning of June 13. His brother Arturo, captured at the same time, died later from a bullet wound in the head, while under surgery. Police claimed he was a suicide.

In a televised speech, Minister of the Interior José Tohá announced that mimeographed pamphlets found with

the Riveras admitted the killing of Pérez.

Rivera was said to be a member of the Popular Workers Vanguard (also called Organized People's Vanguard in some reports), a small group that split from the Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria [MIR—Movement of the Revolutionary Left].

The Christian Democrats seized on the killing to demand that Allende "dissolve and punish all the armed groups acting in Chile."

Miguel Enriquez, a leader of the MIR, met with Allende June 9. He denounced the slaying of Pérez, calling it the work of "extreme rightists and of the CIA."

The next day, both Allende's Socialist party and the Communist party issued official statements accusing the CIA of involvement with the murder.

Following the assassination in October of General René Schneider, the army chief of staff, an act believed to have been carried out by rightists in the hope of provoking a military coup, the MIR accused Pérez of being involved. This charge was denied by both Pérez and the Allende government. □

'Down, Down, Yahya Khan!'

Bangla Desh Protest March in New York

By Javad Sadeeg

New York

Headed by a contingent of women, 300 Bangla Desh nationalists marched for thirty blocks here June 12 to publicize the plight of their people at the hands of the troops of West Pakistan.

"Long live Bangla Desh! Down, down, Yahya Khan!" the marchers shouted in both English and Bengali.

The march started from Columbus Circle and passed the Pakistani United Nations mission and consulate. There the demonstrators paused to call out, "Joi Bangla!" ["Victory to Bengal!"]. They chased away some West Pakistanis who had come to disrupt.

The militant demonstration ended with a rally of some 500 persons at the United Nations.

Speakers ranged from the West Pakistani scholar Eqbal Ahmad to the American Black revolutionist Andrew Pulley.

The rally started with the singing of the national anthem of Bangla Desh. Then Omio Mukreji, who at the age of eighty-five is a dynamic leader of the Bangla Desh community here, introduced the speakers.

Dr. K. M. Alamgir dealt with the treacherous role played by the West Pakistan government in relation to Bangla Desh, culminating "in over three million killed and five million driven out."

He said that *now* they were talking of granting amnesty. But "who are they to grant amnesty and to whom?" He declared that West Pakistan should not be permitted to stay an extra day in Bangla Desh.

Before introducing Eqbal Ahmad, Mukreji said that thousands of West Pakistani students have shown support to Bangla Desh. This met with a warm response.

Eqbal Ahmad was well received and interrupted with shouts of "Joi Bangla." He demanded immediate withdrawal of West Pakistani troops and the immediate convening of the National Assembly, in which Bangla Desh holds a majority, in order to reach a solution.

Some of the speakers expressed hope and confidence in organizations like the United Nations, the U. S. government and Congress to help out politically.

Andrew Pulley, who was introduced as a "representative of the Socialist Workers party, which has opposed imperialism in all its forms for a long time," scored the hypocritical silence of the United Nations.

Citing the crimes committed by the U. S. in Vietnam, he said: "We cannot depend on the UN, the U. S., and not on any congressmen. We must depend on ourselves."

Opposing U. S. aid to Yahya Khan, he called for more actions to mobilize the American masses for the right of the people of Bangla Desh to control their own destiny.

He also condemned the Maoist bureaucracy for the aid it is providing to the counterrevolutionary governments of Pakistan and Ceylon. His remarks were repeatedly applauded.

The rally ended after two hours. The organizers announced that more actions were planned. □

Antiwar Activists to Meet

The National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC), which sponsored and organized the massive April 24 antiwar demonstrations in Washington and San Francisco, has called for a national antiwar convention to be held in New York City on July 2-4.

The convention call urges peace activists throughout the country to "meet together and plan mass demonstrations and other activities for the fall of 1971."

"We who marched and millions who marched with us in spirit are now the majority—not the 'silent majority,' but rather the majority which speaks loudly for 'PEACE NOW!' We are united in demanding the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all U. S. military forces and materiel from Indochina."

NPAC announced that Victor Reuther of the United Automobile Workers, U. S. Senator Vance Hartke of Indiana, and Debby Bustin of the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam would be among the keynote speakers opening the convention, which is expected to be the largest ever held. □

Mexican Student Demonstrators Shot Down

"On the University of Mexico campus yesterday [June 11] . . . in place of the passive, cautious, even indifferent air of a few days ago, there was a mobilization that reminded me of the 1968 movement," a reporter wrote in the June 12 issue of the Mexico City daily *Excelsior*.

Above the university, the Mexican flag was lowered to half-mast. The students were honoring an unknown number of their comrades killed June 10 when heavily armed rightist commandos, assisted by police and riot troops, opened fire on a demonstration of 8,000 persons in Mexico City.

Meetings were held in the schools and departments. It was agreed that the mass of students and "not just a few" should decide how to answer the government's murderous attack.

A general assembly began in the Justo Sierra auditorium at 6:00 p.m. "At about 6:30," the *Excelsior* report continued, "there was a blackout . . . the huge crowd jammed the doors and corridors inside and outside the hall. It was almost impossible to get in, but many youths managed it. . . . In this atmosphere of exaltation, of protest against violent acts, order was maintained. With the flickering light of matches and cigarette lighters, the assembly went on in semidarkness."

Finally, the crowd grew so large that it had to move onto the esplanade. In the open air, the organizers played recordings of police radio broadcasts directing attacks on the June 10 demonstration. In one case a report noted that a "Halcón" [Hawk], one of the rightist commandos, had been wounded. The authorities deny officially that such a group exists.

The march June 10 began at 4:55, the moderate progovernment daily *El Día* reported the next day. It formed on the Calle Carpio near the School of Biology and the university infirmary. The students were demonstrating in support of their comrades at the Universidad de Nuevo León in Monterrey who have been struggling for more than a year for democratic control of their school.

The marchers were warned by Police Colonel Emmanuel Guevara that

they were exposing themselves to danger. Later another colonel, Angel Rodríguez, issued a similar warning. The leader of the march, Manuel Marcué Pardiñas, a well-known journalist and recently released political prisoner, appealed to him to "respect the constitution."

"Just before the intersection of the Avenida de Maestros and the Calzada México-Tacuba, a gas grenade exploded, followed by the appearance of one of the first groups, which some demonstrators identified as 'Los Halcones' [the Hawks]," *El Día* continued.

Another Mexico City daily, *La Prensa*, gave this account, under the headline "The Counterdemonstrators Arrived in Buses": "Just after 5:17 the demonstrators were halted . . . by the youths from the gray buses, El MURO [one of the component groups of the Hawks], and army parachutists."

About 500 commandos, according to the June 11 *New York Times*, armed with clubs, knives, and high-caliber firearms, stormed the line of march. After the initial attack, "wounded persons were lying everywhere," *La Prensa* reported. The shooting continued for five hours.

The rightists seemed to make a special point of attacking passersby and damaging property in the area: "The ones from the gray buses, MURO, and the other groups attacked again," *La Prensa* wrote. "But this time they struck out right and left against women and children passing through San Cosme and along the Calle de Velázquez de León."

Remembering the massacre of Tlatelolco, when the police attacked wounded students in the hospitals and carried away the bodies of the dead for secret burial, crowds of demonstrators refused to abandon their injured comrades taken to the nearby Rubén Leñero hospital.

"At 6:50," *La Prensa* reported, "a contingent of goons armed with rifles and machine guns made a cowardly attack on all those in the crowded hospital. . . ."

"The counterdemonstrators charged at the patients and other persons in the corridors. Several students were

gunned down. It was hard to see how many, because this reporter had taken refuge in Doctor Sánchez's office, where there were police, doctors, nurses, administrative officials, and three unidentified students."

A patient in the hospital, unconnected with the clashes, described how the goons searched for victims: "The men with clubs and machine guns came up. They walked like drug addicts, their eyes reddened and their faces twisted with hatred. They were arguing and fighting among themselves. . . . A doctor—an intern—was with them and he looked very nervous. Soon Dr. Durón came and bawled them out: 'I told you not to go into the women's wards.'"

The patient continued: "At 9:00 next morning, my mother came. . . . She told me that she had seen more than thirty bodies piled up and a lot of bullet holes in the hospital walls."

The rightist commandos followed a peculiar procedure. They picked up numbers of people, interrogated them, and checked their identification. One of the people "arrested" this way was Marlise Simons, correspondent for the *Washington Post*: "I could hear a radio conversation," she cabled June 11, "as they talked to the *nido*, their 'nest,' about what to do with their catch. . . ."

"The orders were simple: Keep them, get her camera, and take them to point 'Six-R.' . . ."

"They were professionals . . . a chief gave orders to make an inventory of my bag and clothes."

Simons was released, she wrote, when she told her captors that she had an appointment with President Echeverría. They promised her the police would return her belongings.

At a press conference held the next day by Mexico City Mayor Alfonso Martínez Domínguez, a representative of the press corps delivered an official protest against the Hawks' attacks on journalists.

Martínez Domínguez answered: "In the street, they talk about 'gorillas,' 'hawks,' . . . and other such names created by the fantasy of the people to express certain aspects of their thought, their imagination. . . . But the government has no special forces except the public security bodies you are all familiar with." He attributed the clashes to "philosophically antagonistic" and "dogmatic" campus groups.

"The mayor lamented," *La Prensa*

reported, "that violence had arisen among groups whose passions are

uncontrolled by discipline, reason, or authority." □

A Background Article

The New Upsurge in the Mexican Student Movement

By Ricardo Ochoa

Mexico City

Two important victories in May highlighted the new upsurge of the Mexican student movement. On May 3 the government was forced to permit the return of a group of exiled leaders of the 1968 struggle. On May 31, more than 2,000 students stormed the administration building of the Universidad de Nuevo León in Monterrey, Mexico's second largest city, driving out the police and the new rector whom the state governor had tried to impose on the students by armed force.

The May 31 battle was the culmination of a whole phase of struggle. The conflict began in September 1969, when the students of the liberal arts school went on strike, demanding university reform.

The strike forced the state governor, Eduardo Elizondo, to make important concessions. He issued decrees authorizing the students and professors to elect the heads of schools and departments and empowering the Consejo Universitario [Academic Council] to choose the rector of the school. At the same time, he agreed to let a parity commission draft new statutes to govern the university.

But the governor very soon began to try to take back what he had given. He apparently did not like the way democracy worked in practice. Under student self-management, among other things, the study of Marxism was made compulsory for all majors.

In March 1970, the state legislature rejected the statute proposed by the parity commission. At the same time, a campaign of economic and political intimidation was opened up against the university. From February to December 1970, the state subsidy was withheld, threatening the school with bankruptcy.

On March 26, the state legislature passed a new law regulating the university. The bill, which had been drafted and discussed behind closed doors, set up an "Asamblea Popular" [People's Assembly] to run the school. Most of the members of this assembly were to be appointed by the government-controlled unions, peasant organizations, mass media, and financial and business interests. Out of thirty-seven members, three were to represent the students and another three the professors.

Meeting in the first week of April, the Asamblea Popular appointed Colonel Arnulfo Treviño Garza as the new rector of the university. Since the governor had promised that the Asamblea Popular would "end the political agitation" on the campus, it seemed that Treviño Garza's military rank was not the least of his professional qualifications. But he found the university a very difficult "command."

The students mobilized to prevent the colonel from moving onto the campus. "It was 2:00 in the afternoon on April 11 when Doctor and Colonel Arnulfo Treviño Garza arrived at the Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León," the electrical workers' weekly *Solidaridad* reported in its April 30 issue. "He wanted to take possession of the rectory offices. But hundreds of students blocked his path."

The colonel left to make a formal protest to the Asamblea Popular. He then returned, accompanied by a "special commission."

"In the suffocating heat, hundreds of students were waiting for the new rector—to explain to him respectfully but energetically that they would not let him in," *Solidaridad* continued.

The colonel was forced to retreat

and try to assert his authority from his law offices. The students mounted a constant guard on the university and continued to recognize the freely elected rector, former head of the civil engineering department Héctor Ulises Leal.

To counter the propaganda put out by the state government and the local conservative interests, the students of Nuevo León waged an extensive protest and publicity campaign. "The students, one of the few mainstays of the struggle for democracy in Nuevo León, have won the streets and the support of all the oppressed sectors of society not only in their state but throughout the republic," *Solidaridad* wrote. "They have won this support because they represent a struggle that is increasingly important to the great mass of the people—the struggle for democracy."

In the face of the sharpening student struggle in Nuevo León, the ruling circles divided. The academic community came out against Elizondo. Speaking for the UDUAL [Unión de Universidades de América Latina—Union of Latin American Universities], Efrén C. del Pozo said, in a statement quoted in the June 1 issue of the Mexico City daily *El Universal*: "The loss of academic and financial freedom, as well as the rights of self-government, is extremely harmful to the free development of a genuinely scholarly atmosphere in the universities."

The president of APUM [Asociación de Profesores Universitarios de México—Mexican University Professors Association] argued that Elizondo was following a dangerous tactic: He called for repeal of the Asamblea Popular law and for beginning a "dialogue" in order to "prevent agitation from developing and to prevent the expression of genuine university interests from being diverted into alien channels."

The rector of UNAM [Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México—Autonomous National University of Mexico], Pablo González Casanova, warned that the situation in Monterrey could lead to an "escalation" of similar conflicts in other universities.

The student movement in Mexico City gave full support to the Monterrey students, trying to give national prominence to their fight.

In the period leading up to the confrontation May 31, the COCO [Comité

Coordinador de la UNAM, Politécnico, Chapingo, y Iberoamericana—The Coordinating Committee of UNAM, the Polytechnic Institute, the Chapingo Agricultural School, and the Ibero-American University] held three mass meetings to inform the national public about the Monterrey situation and demonstrate the solidarity of the national student movement. Ulises Leal and members of the Comité Central de Lucha [Central Struggle Committee, the leading body of the Monterrey student movement] addressed one of these rallies.

On the eve of the decisive battle in Monterrey, the COCO passed a resolution pledging that if the Asamblea Popular law were not repealed "by next week, we will hold a demonstration in the Zocalo." The enormous square where the government buildings are located was the scene of huge student and popular demonstrations in 1968.

Thus, when the confrontation came, the student public and broad layers of the people had already been alerted to the issues that were at stake.

Recognizing that he could not break the students' resistance by indirect means, Elizondo ordered the police in to occupy the school. But they were unable to hold it.

The army was standing by, but Echeverría refused to send it in. Instead he sent his secretary of education, Víctor Bravo Ahúja, to mediate between the governor and the students. This move also gave the government-controlled press and its official spokesmen the green light to begin making Elizondo the scapegoat for the entire affair.

The effectiveness of the student movement in Monterrey and the national campaign of support forced Echeverría to back off from resorting to open repression. The new president is trying to maintain the image of a "reformer." He does not want to incur—at the very outset of his administration—the disgrace that marked the end of former President Díaz Ordaz's term.

The victory in Monterrey marked a high point in the resurgence of the student movement throughout the country. In particular, UNAM, the main and center of the student movement, has been intensely active in the past weeks. This revival, which began in April, was clearly shown on May

3 by the reception given to a group of leaders of the 1968 movement returning from exile.

Secretary of the Interior Moya Palencia had claimed that the students released from Lecumberri prison and flown immediately to foreign countries could return any time they wanted. Mexico had "no political exiles," he said. (It is not supposed to have any political prisoners, either.) A group of eight former leaders of the CNH [Consejo Nacional de Huelga—National Strike Council, the leading body of the 1968 movement] took him at his word.

On May 3, Raúl Alvarez Garín, Gilberto Guevara Niebla, Luis Tomás Cervantes Cabeza de Vaca, Eduardo Valle, Federico Emery, Roberto Escudero, José Tayde, and Lino Osegueda arrived at the Mexico City airport.

They were greeted with a demonstration reminiscent of the most intense moments of the 1968 mass rallies, with more than a thousand students chanting slogans and singing songs. Later a caravan of hundreds of cars proceeded up the Avenida de los Insurgentes to the University. Although it tied up traffic badly, it got an immense show of sympathy from the population.

In the afternoon, more than 5,000 students attended a giant press conference given by the newly arrived leaders.

At the conference, all eight leaders declared their support for the COCO's project of building a student congress representing all of the Mexican campuses. They called for reviving the best sides of the 1968 struggle, but with greater ideological depth and a higher level of consciousness. They all said they wanted to rejoin the ranks of the movement and learn from it.

Another former political prisoner, Heberto Castillo, got especially enthusiastic applause when he said that the student and popular movement would exhaust every means to convince the Mexican people that they could not continue living under the present system. We are struggling for power, he said.

Finally, in a statement read by Guevara Niebla, the former prisoners noted that since they were released, they had been tacitly absolved of any responsibility for the massacre of Tlatelolco. At the time of this slaughter,

the government claimed that snipers and political provocateurs had incited the troops into firing on the peaceful and unsuspecting crowd.

Now, as a result of this, it was more urgent than ever for the new president, Echeverría, to bring to trial the person really responsible for this atrocity—former president Díaz Ordaz. This was the only way he could prove that he really wanted to offer the country a new deal. The only way he can show that he really intends to renovate the system is to try all those officials guilty of complicity in the massacre of hundreds of Mexicans, mostly youth and many of them children.

At the end of the meeting, the former prisoners pledged to keep up the fight for the release of their compañeros still in prison. They reminded the crowd that dozens of political prisoners are still being held in Lecumberri prison.

While they were greeted with enthusiasm by the mass of students, the return of these leaders inspired panic in all the left political groups, with the sole exception of the GCI [Grupo Comunista Internacionalista—Internationalist Communist Group, a sympathizing organization of the Fourth International]. In particular, the PCM [Partido Comunista Mexicano—Mexican Communist party] and its youth organization did everything possible to discredit this student vanguard that subjected them to so much criticism in 1968 and subsequently.

The Mexican Trotskyists, on the other hand, felt encouraged—not threatened—by the return of these leaders. With all their immense prestige and all the revolutionary honesty they have shown in the critical moments of the past few years, these compañeros promise to make a very positive contribution to the student and revolutionary movement as a whole.

The Mexican Trotskyists will fight more resolutely than ever alongside this vanguard to achieve the natural objectives of the student movement, which remains the key sector of the revolutionary struggle in this country. In this we are following the guidelines set forth in the Transitional Program of the Fourth International and the analysis of the international youth radicalization made by the Ninth World Congress of the Fourth International. □

Alaska Brass Try Freeze-Out Tactic on Antiwar Newspaper of GIs

Some time ago, the U. S. army began a policy of transferring antiwar GI activists to Alaska—the American Siberia. The army's assumption was that the prospect of a tour of duty in the ice and snow would discourage antiwar GIs in other places, as well as isolate those who were transferred.

Private Ed Jurenas was a member of the Young Socialist Alliance when he was drafted. He was given a leave of absence from the YSA, and was inducted into the army, intent on exercising his constitutional rights to express and organize antiwar sentiment within the armed forces. At first, Jurenas was given orders to Vietnam; but after he attended the December 1970 YSA convention while on leave, he was ordered to report to Fort Greely, a small outpost about 100 miles south of Fairbanks, Alaska.

To the consternation of the army brass, GIs in Alaska turned out to be just as opposed to the war, and just as interested in acting against it, as GIs in "the lower forty-eight" states.

The army has now decided to court-martial Jurenas for his activity in helping to produce and distribute the

Arctic Arsenal, an antiwar paper put out by GIs at Fort Greely. On June 1 Jurenas was charged with violation of three articles of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The articles involve disrespect to an officer, willfully disobeying a regulation, and promoting "disaffection" and "disloyalty" among troops.

The first issue of the *Arctic Arsenal* appeared on May 20. The following day, the Criminal Investigation Division (CID) of the army went around the base confiscating copies of the paper, as well as other literature.

The June 4 issue of *The Militant* quotes Jurenas on the objectives of the paper: "The basic tenets that unite us in this common effort are expressed in the first issue of the paper: an immediate end to the war, an immediate end to the draft, and a full defense of our rights as citizen-soldiers. . . . The GIs are overwhelmingly opposed to the war in Vietnam. They are overwhelmingly opposed to the draft. After all, they are the ones being drafted. They are the ones being forced to kill and die in Southeast Asia.

"The idea for the *Arsenal* originated

with the desire of a number of GIs to reach out to other soldiers. We want to encourage them to speak out against the war. We not only want to show the brass that we are against the war, but we want to add the energies and efforts of the GIs to a common struggle with civilians throughout the United States. Our goal is to unite GIs so that our voices can be heard."

The Fort Greely brass took a dim view of GIs making their voices heard. On the same day that the first issue of the *Arsenal* appeared, the acting post commander issued a "supplement" to the army regulations concerning distribution of literature. The supplement completely forbade distribution of any form of material on base, unless it is first cleared by the post brass. On May 26 thirty GIs, fourteen of whom were assigned as military police, presented the post commander with a written request to distribute the *Arsenal*.

The next day, every one of the GIs received a letter from the commander informing them that their request had been forwarded to the Department of the Army in Washington. Therefore, distribution of the *Arsenal* would be considered illegal until army headquarters had responded.

This stalling tactic has been combined with intensified harassment of antiwar GIs. Jurenas reported in the June 11 *Militant*: "GIs who have been involved with the paper or have voiced complaints to the inspector general about their rights have been led to believe that their security clearances would be revoked, their names dropped from promotion roles, or their records flagged for security reasons. CID has gone around post, questioning and intimidating others by saying that for their own good they better cooperate or their job positions might be jeopardized. The net result of these harassment tactics has been an intensified anger at the brass and CID. There is a general determination to see to it that the next issue of the *Arsenal* comes out."

Among the harassment methods being used by the CID is wiretapping of conversations among GIs. According to the June 4 *Militant*, at least two GIs with personal knowledge of such practices have made sworn statements to Jurenas's defense attorney. The issue of electronic surveillance of soldiers is likely to be one of the major issues in the case.

In the wake of the support Jurenas received when he was charged—the



Photo by Howard Petrick

ED JURENAS at Young Socialist Alliance convention in New York in December.

GI Civil Liberties Defense Committee, which successfully handled the case of GIs United Against the War at Fort Jackson, South Carolina, in 1969, has taken the Jurenas case—the top brass in Alaska got nervous about how to proceed. The commanding general of the U. S. Army in Alaska is none other than James Hollingsworth, the man who brought charges against the Fort Jackson GIs. Apparently somewhat cautious since he got his fingers burned on that case, Hollingsworth

has turned the Jurenas case directly over to the Pentagon, which is now deciding what to do next.

Regardless of whether or not Jurenas is brought to trial, the Fort Greeley GIs are determined to continue the *Arsenal*. Said Jurenas in the June 11 *Militant*: "While CID has been quick to label the *Arsenal* as obscene and libelous, GIs are behind it almost 100 percent. To them, the *Arsenal* tells it like it is, not the way the lifers and brass would like it to be." □

Further Response to Mao's Overtures

Nixon Ends Embargo on Trading With China

By Allen Myers

On June 10, the Nixon administration announced the relaxation of a twenty-one-year-old embargo on trade with China. More than 1,000 items were placed on the list of approved exports. They included everything from iron and steel to grain, live animals, and sporting goods—the latter category presumably including ping-pong paddles.

Not approved for export to China were certain goods considered to be of "strategic" value, such as aircraft, petroleum products, locomotives, and advanced computers. "But the White House statement," Robert B. Semple Jr. reported in the June 11 *New York Times*, "suggested that 'consistent with the requirements of U. S. national security' such items might well be granted special licenses on a case-by-case basis after review by the Department of Commerce and other agencies."

No one pretended that the relaxation of the embargo was primarily concerned with trade. The *New York Times* pointed out in an editorial:

"In the short run, this step has far more political than economic significance, and it represents a logical advance as the Chinese People's Republic and the United States move toward normal relations. Two months ago Peking opened its borders to American visitors, and now President Nixon has opened American doors to a wide variety of goods that may be exported to or imported from China."

In fact, on April 14, as the U. S. table tennis team was touring China, Nixon had declared his intention to lift most trade restrictions. In the intervening two months, the Mao government has demonstrated its ability to behave in a manner that imperialism considers "responsible" by backing the bloody repression of revolutions in East Bengal and Ceylon.

Nixon made it clear that further im-

provements in relations between Peking and Washington would depend on Mao's willingness to show additional support for imperialist "peace." In announcing the new trade regulations, White House press secretary Ronald Ziegler declared:

"President Nixon looks upon these measures as a significant step to improve communications with a land of 800 million people after a 20-year freeze in our relationships.

"The President will later consider the possibility of further steps in an effort to re-establish a broader relationship with a country and a people having an important role for future peace in Asia."

Nixon's greatest hope, of course, is that Mao will cooperate to the extent of persuading the Vietnamese to accept an indefinite U. S. occupation of at least part of their country. Figures as high in the administration as Secretary of State William Rogers have all but said as much publicly. (See *Intercontinental Press*, May 10, p. 429.)

In the *New York Times* editorial quoted above, the influential daily suggested that Nixon would be willing to pay a good deal for such a token of Mao's desire to improve relations:

"... Washington might open the way for a massive infusion of American capital and technological expertise into the still relatively small and slow Chinese industrialization effort. This would require an end to existing legal barriers to loans to China and encouragement of private American corporations to advance credits. Economically large-scale aid to Chinese development would worsen, for the near future, this country's already unsatisfactory balance-of-payments situation. The prospect for major commercial and financial interchange is therefore probably slight until after American forces are out of Vietnam and after there is substantial improvement in this country's foreign accounts."

If agreement can be reached on Vietnam, Nixon is willing to work out further accommodations with Mao, Tad Szulc wrote in the June 11 *Times*:

"... Mr. Nixon and Secretary of State William P. Rogers are known to be tailoring the China policy to what they believe will be the realistic needs of Washington as well as Peking when the Indochina war has ended and new Asian security arrangements have to be worked out." □



NIXON: "Let me make one thing perfectly clear. . . ."

When New Yorkers Came to Their Bridges and Couldn't Cross Them

By Jon Rothschild

Traffic to and from the island of Manhattan was thrown into massive jams on the morning of June 7, when 318 bridgeworkers, members of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local 237, opened the drawbridges linking the island to surrounding sections of New York City, and went home.

The strike was precipitated by the failure of the state legislature to ratify a pension plan that had been negotiated by the union with the City of New York.

The city's Transportation Authority estimates that the bridges affected are normally used by more than 900,000 vehicles, carrying nearly 2,000,000 people daily. The inability of New York thoroughfares to cope with the usual amount of traffic is well known. But with the bridges open, it took the entire day to unsnarl the mess.

Bridgeworkers took keys, machine handles, fuses and other equipment with them when they walked out. The result was that the supervisory personnel brought in to close the bridges could not do so.

Highways Commissioner Vincent J. Gibney, in requesting a restraining order against the strikers, stated: "No supervisory personnel have sufficient training and/or experience to safely operate the bridges in question."

Barry Feinstein, president of Local 237, charged that the refusal of the legislature to grant the pension plan was racist: "That which is good enough for white cops and firemen is good enough for black and Puerto Rican employees of New York City and the New York City Housing Authority.

"It is apparent to our membership [half of which is Black or Puerto Rican] that their race and ethnic backgrounds, rather than the alleged fiscal crunch, motivates [New York Governor Nelson] Rockefeller to refuse to permit the execution of the pension provision of the collective bargaining agreement we freely negotiated."

In conjunction with the bridgeworkers, the 88,000-member District Council 37, American Federation of State,

County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) also conducted selected strikes. Tractor trucks and heavy dump rigs, owned by the city and operated by AFSCME members, were laden with sand, had their tires flattened, and were left in key intersections by municipal workers.

Mayor John V. Lindsay, aware of the impending strike, mobilized the police to prevent water workers, also members of Local 237, from "sabotaging" the water supply of corporate offices. But the bridge openings were unpreventable.

On June 8 sewage and incinerator workers (AFSCME) also struck. Park workers followed suit.

New York City generates 1,300,000,000 gallons of sewage each day. With the shutdown of thirteen treatment plants, hundreds of millions of gallons of raw sewage poured into the East and Hudson rivers. The Sanitation Department collected 21,000 to 27,000 tons of garbage on June 8, but it merely piled up near the closed incinerators. According to Sanitation Commissioner Herbert Ellish, about 300 to 400 loads, weighing seven to nine tons each, were left, uncollected, on the streets.

The fact that less than 8,000 organized workers could, and did, bring partial paralysis to the nerve center of U. S. imperialism threw the guardians of "law and order" into panic.

Mayor Lindsay, a liberal Republican, threatened to call out the national guard if the strike were not immediately ended. The *New York Times*, voice of a significant sector of the U. S. ruling class, urged Lindsay and Governor Rockefeller to use police and national guard troops and to "unite in whatever other measures are required to restore full city services."

Toward the evening of June 8, the second day of the strike, the bridgeworkers were ordered back to work by the Teamster leadership. On the morning of June 9, AFSCME leaders called their members back. The pension plan remains unratified. City officials agreed to present it to the 1972

session of the state legislature, and to seek ways of granting the pension without ratification, if that is not forthcoming from the state.

The strike was primarily a response by city workers to the efforts of the state and city governments to force the workers to bear the brunt of the general budget crisis through a reduction in their standard of living.

Sentiment in the unions for strike action had been building for months. The union leaderships, which have been closely tied to the Lindsay administration, deliberately picked an issue that would direct the wrath of the strikers toward Rockefeller, rather than Lindsay.

Unfortunately, because the majority of the rank and file have not yet shed their illusions in the possibility of winning their demands through the capitalist parties, the union bureaucrats were partially successful in their aim.

But the power demonstrated by a relatively small number of workers will not soon be forgotten. All the highways into New York were snarled within minutes. Automobiles by the tens of thousands choked both lanes on all routes, resembling barricades. It was a small indication of what is in store when the American workers move into action on a mass scale to defend their living standard and ultimately to replace capitalism with a better economic system. □

Hilliard Convicted

Black Panther party chief of staff David Hilliard was found guilty June 12 on two charges of assaulting a policeman. The same jury acquitted Hilliard on two counts of attempted murder.

The accusations stemmed from an April 6, 1968, gun battle in Oakland, California, in which the cops killed Panther member Bobby Hutton.

Defense attorney Vincent Hallinan claimed that his client played no part in the battle. Hallinan alleged that Eldridge Cleaver, leader of an opposing faction in the Black Panthers, was the one involved.

According to a June 4 United Press International dispatch, Hallinan told the jury in his opening statement June 2 that when the shooting started, Hilliard fled because "he feared for his life."

The cops, according to Hallinan, fired two shots over Cleaver's head, and he thereupon returned their fire. □



PHOTOGRAPH taken some months ago shows the widow of Rafael Perez Guillen, killed in "La Victoria" prison, weeping on the shoulder of Carmen Mazara de Gomez. Now Carmen Mazara is likewise a widow, her husband having died under

mysterious circumstances in Brussels. When the news came of the death of Gomez, Carmen Mazara was behind bars, a political prisoner herself. A Santo Domingo newspaper reports that the prison inmates are subjected to extreme torture.

Balaguer Marks Political Opponents for Death

Santo Domingo

As the Balaguer regime's isolation deepens, it strikes out with increasing savagery against all real or potential opponents.

Two recent developments illustrate the degeneration into gangsterism of this government, "elected" under the supervision of U. S. troops sent in to crush the revolution of April 1965.

On May 23, Maximiliano Gómez, general secretary of the MPD [Movimiento Popular Dominicano—Dominican People's Movement], was found dead in an apartment in Brussels. The circumstances made it plain that he was murdered. He had fled to Brussels from Paris, where he was living, to escape a murder team, the May 27 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde* reported.

Gómez was released from prison in Santo Domingo March 1970, along

with a number of other political prisoners, in exchange for U. S. Colonel Donald Crowley, an "adviser" to the Dominican armed forces kidnapped by urban guerrillas.

Not long after Gómez's murder, the May 30 issue of the Santo Domingo weekly *Renovación* published a report smuggled out of La Victoria prison. About 2,000 persons are confined in this jail, including Marcos, the organizational secretary of a Trotskyist group that supports the Fourth International.

Marcos was detained on the charge of "communist activity" without a hearing. About half the prisoners in La Victoria have been tortured, according to the *Renovación* report, 300 of them three times. And this does not include random beatings by the guards, and other pressures.

As in South Africa, the police can

arrest anyone on "suspicion" and keep them in jail for long periods. Prison officials refuse to release most political prisoners when their terms are up. Sometimes the officials even refuse to let prisoners be taken to court.

About 300 prisoners in La Victoria are in serious danger of dying from burns and other wounds, according to the *Renovación* report. On April 24, 500 prisoners were savagely beaten to "celebrate" the anniversary of the 1965 revolution.

Besides being tortured by professionals in a special torture chamber called "the fun house," prisoners are subjected to outrages by administration stooges among the inmates. This happened, for example, to Maximiliano Gómez's wife Carmen, who was jailed March 10 and held while the government murder team tracked down her husband. □

The Guerrillas of the ERP

[The following article includes information on the kidnapping of the honorary British consul in Rosario May 23 that has not yet appeared in the international press. We have translated it from the June 7 issue of the Buenos Aires weekly *Panorama*. For other details, see "The Kidnapping of Stanley Sylvester," in *Intercontinental Press*, June 7, p. 517; and "'Le Monde' Assesses Sylvester Kidnapping," *Intercontinental Press*, June 14, p. 542.]

* * *

The Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo (ERP) began to take shape in 1968 when the PRT [Partido Revolucionario de Trabajadores — Revolutionary Workers party, the Argentinian section of the Fourth International] split. Two factions arose out of the crisis of that year, two Trotskyist groups. Each became known by the name of its paper, *La Verdad* and *El Combatiente*. *El Combatiente* held its first congress as a distinct grouping in July 1970 and decided to form the Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo [Revolutionary Army of the People].

The ERP was not, however, conceived as the "military arm of the party," but as a "mass organization for civil war." While the PRT, as such, projected socialist aims, the ERP adopted a "minimum" program of a "democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist" character.

In a report published early in 1971 by the monthly magazine *Cristianismo y Revolución*, the ERP noted that "despite internal problems" it carried out "actions of all types (expropriations, stockpiling arms, etc.)" before it was formally constituted, although it did not "put its signature" on these actions.

The first operation where it used its initials seems to have been the attack on Police Station No. 24 in Rosario, in which two policemen were killed. This action occurred on September 18, 1970, and was attributed to the Comando Chiquito Barrios [Chiquito Barrios Commando Group] of the ERP.

Since that time, the ERP has carried out dozens of actions (150 in all). The following caused the greatest stir: On February 12, 1971, at Yocsina in the province of Córdoba, a cell captured 121,000,000 old pesos [350 old pesos equal US\$1] from the Banco de la Provincia de Córdoba. "We considered it a matter of justice to return this money, through our action, to the hands of the people," the ERP later explained.

On March 28 another commando team occupied the studios of Channel 10 in Córdoba and read a proclamation over the air for twenty minutes. At the same time, the picture of Ernesto Guevara appeared on the screen along with the slogan "Win or Die for Argentina," which is the favorite battle cry of these guerrillas.

Finally, on Sunday, May 23, the "Comando Luis Norberto Blanco" kidnapped the English consul in Rosario, Stanley Sylvester, who is also the manager of the Swift packinghouse in that city.

The audacity of this stroke seemed to indicate that in less than a year of activity, the ERP has reached a higher level of development than the other four major urban guerrilla movements—the Fuerzas Armadas Peronistas [Peronista Armed Forces], Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación [Liberation Armed Forces], Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias [Revolutionary Armed Forces], and the Montoneros [Mountaineers, named after guerrillas in the war against Spain].

One of the clearest differences between the conduct of the ERP and the other armed groups is the way the ERP conceives its operations. The other movements have chosen to work through strictly compartmentalized cells, which prefer to strike unexpectedly, in isolation from protest movements.

The Sylvester kidnapping is an example of the "ERP style." They chose their target not just for its publicity value (Sylvester's diplomatic position) but because of the English consul's connection with the Swift packinghouse. "Sylvester was one of the brains that planned the policy of layoffs and

the system of *changas* (make-work) in the Rosario packing plant," an ERP spokesman said. "He was helped by the complicity of the union bureaucracy."

Kidnapping the consul made it possible, the same source said, to "show the corruption of the union leaders, link our activity with a workers' struggle, and deal a blow to an imperialist enterprise."

In order to broaden its ranks, the ERP urges supporters of armed struggle to "form support commando teams." These cells, they advise, "must be organized by compañeros ready to take part in the struggle without waiting for contact with our members. In the midst of the difficulties of underground work, it will never be possible to take on everything at once. The linkup with the ERP will come. In the meantime the watchwords must be—organize, arm, fight."

Of course, some have taken advantage of this invitation for other ends. A so-called Comando Halcón, which claimed to belong to the ERP, seized 325,000 pesos [35 pesos equal US\$1] from the office of two Rosario lawyers, accusing them of being loan sharks. The ERP repudiated the action. To avoid similar possible confusion in other cases, it warned that "whoever uses the name of the Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo for aims alien to those that guide our struggle will be severely punished by our Revolutionary Tribunal."

On another level, the ERP favors "signing all operations, even failures. The reason is to show that the armed struggle is not the job of a few superbly trained fighters but of all the people, and mistakes are also a part of it."

The ERP emblem is made up of two stripes—a blue one and a white one—with a five-pointed red star in the center that stands for the five continents and represents internationalist consciousness. The identical symbol is used by the Tupamaros in Uruguay.

"Among ourselves we have no distinctions of rank," the ERP proclaimed in *Cristianismo y Revolución*. "The only commander we will have now or in the future is Che Guevara, who renewed the emancipating tradition of San Martín and Bolívar. One thing alone shows our revolutionary and internationalist position—our full sol-

idity with Cuba." The ERP also acknowledged fraternal relations with the Chilean MIR [Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionaria—Movement of the Revolutionary Left], the Nicaraguan Frente Sandinista de Liberación [Sandino Liberation Front], the Tupamaros in Uruguay, the ALN [Ação Libertadora Nacional—National Liberation Action?], and the Vanguardia Popular Revolucionaria [People's Revolutionary Vanguard] in Brazil. All these are groups that support "armed struggle as the only road for the revolution."

On the world scale, the ERP guerrillas recognize Vietnam as the leader of the world revolution. They repudiate "the Stalinist bureaucracies in East

Europe" and feel solidarity "with the left oppositions that are beginning to grow in those countries."

In the Argentinian context, the ERP considers itself the "armed detachment of the revolutionary vanguard." It proposes "eliminating the professional army and replacing it with people's militias." The ERP regards a civil war as inevitable, estimating moreover that it has already started.

The points of its program are "establishing a social democracy headed by the working class; abrogating the treaties that bind us to the United States and other foreign countries; bringing the political criminals to trial; nationalizing the banks, foreign trade, and foreign companies." □

[The quotation is from the famous 1957 speech in which Mao advanced the slogan, "Let a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend." The intellectuals of the Chinese revolution did "blossom" for a time in response to that speech. More significantly, the workers responded, too, and the factory walls began to blossom with giant characters voicing grievances and criticisms. Mao brought that blooming and contending to a sudden, grinding halt.

[In the "cultural revolution" some years later, the intellectuals were special targets of Mao's massive crack-down. They were not handled in accordance with his 1957 recommendation.

[Lest there be any mistake, we repeat that we would agree that Mao's 1957 recommendation is "wise and opportune" in and of itself. It ought to be observed in practice by every government that claims to be "socialist," beginning with the two giant powers, China and the Soviet Union.]

A Puerto Rican View

The Case of Heberto Padilla

By Juan E. Mestas

[The case of the Cuban poet Heberto Padilla continues to reverberate among supporters of the Cuban revolution throughout the world. A good example is provided by the June 6 issue of *Claridad*, the weekly newspaper of the Movimiento Pro Independencia published in Puerto Rico. It contains three polemical documents on the pros and cons.

[Manuel Maldonado Denis maintains in an article, "The Writer and the Revolution," that in capitalist society writers must play a negative role, bringing the values cultivated by the ruling class under the sharpest attack. After the revolution, however, writers must give up negativism and play a "positive" role.

"Heberto Padilla," he continues, "may or may not have been sincere in his self-criticism. We don't know. What is important is not to inflate this disagreeable incident out of all proportion. To talk about Stalinism in Cuba because of an incident like this is not only dangerous but irresponsible. The Cuban Revolution continues to be the greatest historic event in the Twentieth Century history of Latin America—with all its errors and limitations. The case of Heberto Padilla is a mere rash on the Revolution. It will continue to go forward with or without Padilla and his defenders."

[On another page, *Claridad* reprints a long statement by a group of Uruguayan intellectuals. This is utterly against Padilla and his defenders. In fact it seeks to outdo Castro in condemning the intellectuals who were disturbed over the imprisonment of Padilla and over his "self-criticism"—written while in prison—so reminiscent of the degrading declarations required of the intellectuals in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe under the Stalinist bureaucrats.

[A third item, "The Case of Heberto Padilla," which we have translated below, is by Juan E. Mestas, a member of the Board of Directors of the Puerto Rican magazine *La Escalera*.

[Mestas brings out several cogent points, in our opinion. Nevertheless, in dealing with the most vital question—how to explain that such a case could occur in Cuba—he does not probe deeply enough, as we see it. This is because of the limitation of viewing the case primarily as an instance of bad management, particularly on the international level.

[Mesta's reference to Mao Tsetung, whom he cites for authority on how to handle intellectuals correctly after the revolution, is singularly inappropriate, however correct Mao's words may be in the abstract.

There is very little information available on the case of Heberto Padilla. We know the protests of the intellectuals, Fidel's attacks, the confession of Padilla himself, and this or that additional document. But the specific facts as to how and why the Cuban poet came to be jailed are not at hand, among other reasons because the revolutionary government decided that the affair lacks importance and does not warrant a detailed explanation in the press—which is unfortunate, since it is obvious that the affair is important, not so much because of the individual involved as because of the problem posed: the relations between the intellectual and the state in a socialist system. It would have been healthier to discuss it frankly than to hide behind an exchange of imprecations.

From Puerto Rico, and with such limited information, it is difficult to reach exact conclusions. Nevertheless, to look in a different direction when the reactionary press is trying to convert the Padilla case into a "cause célèbre" against the Cuban Revolution, would contribute to the confusion. Because of this, and to respond to the request of Compañero Edwin Reyes, who is in charge of the literary page

of *Claridad*, these comments are offered.

* * *

The first thing that has to be determined is exactly what transgressions Heberto Padilla committed. If, as a citizen, he conspired against the Revolution, he must receive the same treatment as any other citizen—there is no reason why the intellectuals should expect immunity—but within well-defined socialist legality (different, it is clear, in substance and form from bourgeois legality), which protects his right to self-defense, to an impartial trial, etc. And, unfortunately, this is an aspect that frequently has not been observed in the socialist countries—at times because the insecurity of the revolutionary process demanded it; but also at times because power was abused, as was the case in the "Moscow trials" during Stalin's era. (No one will gather from this that I am comparing the Padilla case with the "Moscow trials" or accusing Fidel of Stalinism. On the contrary, if anything has characterized the Cuban Revolution, it has been its humanism and its sense of justice—and even supposing that in this instance it failed, the accusation of Stalinism would be coarse and defamatory.)

It appears that the Cuban poet was jailed in addition for other transgressions that are more related to his literary duties: pessimism, defeatist attitudes, lack of revolutionary spirit, etc. And here we have to proceed more carefully; the question now involves freedom of thought and expression.

The Soviet experience following the death of Stalin was, in this sense, disastrous: Stalin handled the problem with police methods. In Cuba, up to recently Stalinist repression has been energetically rejected, and the broad extent of intellectual freedom has been specified in Fidel's maxim: "With the revolution everything. Against the revolution nothing." Now, however, it appears that what is involved is a narrowing of the limits. Thus, Juan Marinello indicated in *Granma* (May 11, 1971, page 10) that in the National Congress on Education and Culture recently held in Havana, "It was agreed that the cultural policy should be subject to a single leadership, exercised by the revolutionary leaders. This defined in a definite and clear manner the guidelines for creative activity." The danger is evident: the bu-

reaucratization of culture and its consequent petrification. Despite Marinello's declarations, I do not believe that the Cuban compañeros claim to have solved this difficult problem with a resolution by a congress. More discussion, more experimentation, and more flexibility in practice are required before a genuinely satisfactory solution can be reached.

In addition, the Padilla case and the declaration of the congress must be viewed in the context of the present situation in Cuba. On the one hand the country has just emerged from a traumatic experience: all the economic, political, ideological, and moral resources were thrown into the ten-million-ton harvest, in which—to quote Fidel himself—the honor of the Revolution was at stake. And the harvest failed. It is natural that this failure should lead to a certain uneasiness, a certain frustration, even a certain demoralization. Hence it is the duty of the government to take the necessary measures to avoid defeatism at a time when a more resolute fighting will is required.

There are two ways of carrying out this duty. One consists of tightening the controls, severely punishing deviations, and stressing discipline. The other consists in democratizing the proceedings, so that the people participate in the decisions and become more closely linked with the revolutionary process. The first is less agreeable, but unfortunately it is inevitable to resort to this to a certain degree. The second, however, has more permanent results. Mao Tsetung's recommendation is wise and opportune: "In settling matters of an ideological nature or controversial issues among the people, we can only use democratic methods, methods of discussion, of criticism, of persuasion and education, not coercive, high-handed methods." ("On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People.")

* * *

On the international level, I believe that the Cuban government has handled the case of Heberto Padilla badly. The first letter that was sent by intellectuals of various countries could not have been more balanced and respectful: it expressed their solidarity with the Revolution and only asked that an explanation be given on what had happened with relation to the imprisonment of their Cuban compañero.

Among the signers were persons like Carlos Fuentes, Vargas Llosa, García Márquez, Cortázar, Moravia, Sartre, Carlos Franqui and Simone de Beauvoir. Individuals of clear leftist affiliation who had served the Revolution well on numerous occasions, above all on the important terrain of ideological propaganda. The same Cuban government had given them eulogies and acknowledgments. Why not respond to them as compañeros, discussing the situation frankly and serenely? It is not possible to believe that it is a matter, as Marinello affirms, of "writers and artists of apparent fidelity to our revolution who in reality are its worst enemies." And if this were true, it is not sufficient to say so; it is necessary to prove it.

The Cuban government responded violently, accusing them of "intellectual colonialism," of trying to impose norms on Cuba from Europe, and accusing them of not being immersed in the revolutionary processes.

With regard to the first point, I believe that this is not correct. Marxism is an internationalist ideology that considers any revolutionist in any corner of the world to be a comrade. Marxism is, in addition, a science that not only recognizes the right but imposes the duty of critically observing the social processes. From Europe one can and one must—not impose norms on Cuba (something which, in all justice, the intellectuals did not try to do); but criticize the Revolution in a fraternal way.

With regard to the second point, I believe that there is a good measure of truth in it. Frequently the intellectuals of the left in the capitalist countries accept the bourgeois concept of their role in society and limit their responsibility to solidarizing with those who are making the revolution. This must be pointed out and corrected, but they should not be totally rejected because of that. Because although they may not be doing all they ought to, they are contributing in a valuable way. The movie director Costas Gavras, for example, sincerely admitted: "There are those who have the courage to give their lives for their political convictions and become revolutionists. I do not yet have the courage to pick up a gun and go to Greece now, as so many guerrillas do in Latin America, or as Che Guevara did." (*Claridad*, May 30, 1971, p. 22.) Clearly, Costas Gavras does not merit the admiration due a Che Gue-

vara, but this does not make his political contribution to films any less efficacious. One should even ask if he would be more useful to the revolution carrying a gun in guerrilla warfare than making films like *Z*.

Even supposing that these intellectuals are all irredeemable bourgeois, their statement must be viewed *per se*. And this is precisely what we should note and take up in the debate over the case of Heberto Padilla. The opportunity was lost to open a rich and fruitful discussion on subjects of genuine importance for the Cuban Revolution and for all the socialist

revolutions of the present and the future: What is the function of the intellectual in socialist society? How to harmonize the necessities of the people with freedom of creation? How to make culture a popular patrimony?

* * *

Socialism is young—measured historically, almost a child. We are learning. In the process of apprenticeship, errors and at times injustices have been committed. Cuba is carrying forward a revolution in conditions of scarcity and menace. This does not mean that everything is justified be-

cause imperialism is ninety miles away or because of the burden of the bad heritage of underdevelopment. Criticisms must be made—and the Cuban government has given magnificent examples of self-criticism. But perspectives must not be lost: genuine revolutionists are not disenchanted with the revolution, they do not abandon it either in its crises or in its errors, they are always with it and in it. We who live in the decaying bourgeois societies, before fulminating against the Cuban Revolution because of this or that badly handled affair, must take a look at our surroundings. □

Bolivia's Next Government?

Put the People's Assembly on the Road to Socialism!

[The following article, entitled "The People's Assembly Must Grow From the Grass Roots," was published in the May 1-15 issue of *Combate*, the paper of the POR (Partido Obrero Revolucionario — Revolutionary Workers party, the Bolivian section of the Fourth International), from which we have translated it.]

* * *

At the time of the crisis last October [the attempted military coup October 4 and the popular mobilization that put Torres in power], we were the first to pose the need for creating an organ representing the masses. We called for a body through which the masses could express their thoughts and their aspirations, which could serve as a focus for their creative initiative and their revolutionary power. Our party's slogan was echoed by the rank and file of the unions and from there the idea reached the COB [Central Obrera Boliviana—Bolivian Labor Federation] and the Comando Politico del Pueblo [People's Political Command, a united-front formation that sprang up during the mobilization in October]. Today the Asamblea Popular [People's Assembly] is beginning to function. No matter what its limitations, the formation of this body represents a victory for the workers.

We must defend the Asamblea Popular from its external enemies, those who are trying to minimize it or refuse to recognize it, like President Torres.

But at the same time we must defend the Asamblea Popular from those inside it who want to run it bureaucratically and make it into a populist version of a bourgeois parliament.

The Asamblea Popular can have no role except as an organ of dual power. That is, it must not simply debate and watch over government functions; it must—as the expression of the power of the great masses of our people—decide the basic questions facing the country and the workers. The Asamblea Popular must become a workers' and peasants' government, and we must fight both inside it and outside of it to achieve this. In this process, a political-military instrument will grow up alongside the assembly which can serve as the power it still lacks to enforce its decisions.

Therefore, the Asamblea Popular must be deeply rooted in the people itself. Delegates or representatives to the Asamblea Popular cannot be handpicked by the present bureaucratized leaderships. In every sector of the working class, among the peasants, students, and white-collar workers, assemblies must elect the members of the Asamblea Popular by direct vote. And the ranks must have the right to recall their representatives when they do not do their revolutionary duty.

But at the same time, the Asamblea Popular must be a forum open to all the workers, to all the revolutionary activists. Only in this way can the entire people participate, expressing

their concerns and their initiative. In this way the revolutionary dynamism of the masses will be the locomotive pushing the Asamblea del Pueblo [Assembly of the People] along the road of the socialist revolution. If this link to the living body of the masses is cut, the Asamblea Popular will become one more bureaucratized leadership, one more petty-bourgeois talk-shop.

We must surround the Asamblea Popular. We must impart to it the revolutionary heat of the masses and the proletarian force and aggressiveness needed to give the coup de grace to the moribund capitalist system. If the Asamblea Popular acts with this firmness, it will be the only government the masses will recognize.

Reformism, no; socialism, yes! A bourgeois army, no; a revolutionary people's army, yes! A bourgeois parliament, no; the People's Assembly, yes! □

Prison Reform

The pastry department at Durham jail in England has been asked to bake lighter cakes. The request followed an incident in which a prisoner, apparently irritated by their weight, threw one at a jailer, sending him reeling and cutting his face. One jailer explained: "We want them to be less lethal weapons."

Master of Simplicity

Chinese followers of Mao Tsetung Thought have calculated that a knowledge of 600 characters is sufficient to read 92.6 percent of the words in Mao's most popular works. To read newspapers or magazines requires a knowledge of 2,500 to 3,000 characters.

Bringing Up the Rear Behind Jules Moch

Paris

"There were no less than three separate demonstrations this last weekend [May 22-23] by left formations to commemorate the 'bloody week' of the Commune [the week of executions and massacres that followed the defeat of the Communards by the counterrevolutionary forces]," the Paris daily *Le Figaro* noted in its May 24 issue.

"There was the demonstration Saturday morning of the CFDT [Confédération Française et Démocratique du Travail—French Democratic Confederation of Labor, an independent labor federation with Catholic origins] and the PSU [Parti Socialiste Unifié—United Socialist party, a left Social Democratic formation]. On Saturday afternoon there was a demonstration by the Parti Socialiste [Socialist party], FO [Force Ouvrière—Workers' Force, a right-wing Social Democratic union], and the FEN [Fédération de l'Éducation Nationale—National Federation of Educators]. And on Sunday, there was one by the Communist party."

The conservative bourgeois daily stressed the disunity of the left. It also took note of some strange alliances.

"Particularly striking was the attitude of the Convention des Institutions Républicaines [Republican Institutions Covenant, a petty-bourgeois liberal formation]. Through its representative Claude Estier, it participated in the Communist march yesterday but not in the Socialist march Saturday. Only three weeks ago, the Parti Socialiste and the Convention des Institutions Républicaines held a fusion congress."

Le Figaro also pointed out that competition had spurred some groups to make a greater exertion to commemorate the Commune. "The main objective of the demonstration organized Sunday by the CGT [Confédération Générale du Travail—General Confederation of Labor, the CP-controlled union] and the CP was to show that the Communists were capable of mobilizing more activists rapidly than Krivine's Ligue Communiste [Communist League—the French section of the Fourth International]. From the purely numerical standpoint, they suc-

ceeded. There were more Communists at Père Lachaise yesterday ["more than 50,000" according to *Le Monde*] than there were Trotskyists there a week ago ["more than 30,000" according to the press]. But was the CP satisfied? In the opinion of observers, enthusiasm was somewhat lacking yesterday."

By far the smallest demonstration was the one on the afternoon of May 22 led by Social Democrats and assorted petty-bourgeois liberals ("3,000 to 5,000 participants"). It also had the most varied composition.

"At the head of the procession we noticed Alain Savary, first secretary of the Socialist party; Jules Moch [who as Social Democratic minister of the interior formed the infamous French riot police in 1947 for use against striking Communist workers]; Daniel Mayer; André Bouloche; André Bergeron, general secretary of FO; James Maranger, general secretary of the FEN; Geffen, from the Convention des Institutions Républicaines; and [last but not least?] Charles Berg, general secretary of the AJS [Alliance des Jeunes pour le Socialisme—Alliance of Youth for Socialism]."

Although the AJS, the youth group of the OCI [Organisation Communiste Internationaliste — Internationalist Communist Organization], seemed relatively inconspicuous to *Le Figaro*, it is to be hoped that it provided the most militant note in this at best pale-pink demonstration.

By their own lights, the ultraleft sectarians of Pierre Lambert's OCI-AJS are not only 100 percent pure revolutionists but virtually the only significant group of Trotskyists in the world, except for their sister organization in England, the Socialist Labour League.

"Further on," *Le Figaro* continued, "we recognized by their banners the Libre Pensée [Free Thinkers Association], the Masonic Grand Lodge of France, Témoignage Chrétien [Christian Testimony] and next, behind a few black banners, the Fédération Anarchiste [Anarchist Federation], the Zionist Socialists, etc."

Although the sectarians of the OCI-AJS did not seem to have been ac-

corded a large role in the demonstration, *Le Figaro* noted that they performed one important function. "As the crowd left the cemetery, some young Socialists seized a black flag and trampled on it. The anarchists' tempers rose. Some blows were exchanged. The AJS monitors managed to hold back the anarchists while the crowd flowed out. Then the CRS [Compagnies Républicaines de Sécurité—Republican Security companies, the riot police organized by Jules Moch] stepped in to disperse them."

The OCI-AJS was perhaps not the most bizarre of the groups in this demonstration, which was dominated by right-wing, petty-bourgeois groups apparently trying to revive some of their faded leftish luster. After all, the demonstration included the conservative Masonic Grand Lodge, as well as their somewhat more progressive cousins, the Eastern Rite Masonic Lodge, to say nothing of the "Zionist Socialists."

Of all the groups that took part in the parade of fossils May 22, however, the followers of Pierre Lambert have been the noisiest in proclaiming their "revolutionary heritage." In particular, they have made a special point of attacking the Ligue Communiste for "Pabloism," by which they mean adaptation to reformism and opportunism in the workers' movement.

For example, there were two mass demonstrations in Paris May 1. In the morning there was a united demonstration of the far left. In the afternoon there was a march organized by the CGT. The Ligue Communiste participated in both demonstrations. After the other far-left organizations refused to support a united revolutionary contingent in the CGT demonstration, the Ligue Communiste decided to participate on its own.

The OCI refused to take part in these two demonstrations, which included tens of thousands of persons. Instead they organized a meeting in the university district under the label of the UNEF [Union Nationale des Étudiants Français—National Union of French students].* It drew about 1,500 persons.

In the May 5-12 issue of its paper *Informations Ouvrières*, the OCI de-

* One of the splinters of this largely defunct organization is highly responsive to the Lambertistes.

nounced the Ligue Communiste for participating in these two mass demonstrations:

"Here is Pabloism in action — simultaneous capitulation to the anti-Communist petty bourgeoisie [like the French Stalinists, the Lambertistes label the far left as "petty bourgeois"] and the anti-Communist Stalinist apparatus. A real feat!"

Capitulating to the anti-Communist petty bourgeoisie and the Stalinist apparatus would, in fact, be quite a lot in one day.

Two weeks later the Ligue Communiste and the other European sections of the Fourth International, as well as *Lutte Ouvrière* [an independent Trotskyist organization], held a specifically Trotskyist demonstration to commemorate the Paris Commune. It drew more than 30,000 persons and was a major political event, as shown by the reaction of the bourgeois press and the fury of the Stalinist organ *l'Humanité*.

But the OCI-AJS press fell strangely silent. It gave no coverage to the demonstration.

Moreover, at the same time the big press was talking about the importance of the Trotskyist rally, a report appeared that another demonstration was being planned for May 22. The organizing group was the Comité National pour la Célébration du Centenaire de la Commune [National Committee to Commemorate the Centennial of the Commune], which included, besides the Social Democrats, the Free Masons and "the Trotskyist organization, the OCI."

After this report appeared, the Convention des Institutions Républicaines, hardly a proletarian group, withdrew from the committee and decided to join the CP demonstration. But the AJS announced that it was still supporting the May 22 action.

The OCI-AJS chose to participate in the relatively tiny and unimportant Social Democratic-liberal-Masonic demonstration May 22, one supposes, so as to avoid the contamination both of Stalinism and "Pabloism." In this they provided one of the clearest examples of the logic of sectarianism seen in France for some time.

In their dead-end factionalism, the OCI-AJS have built a Chinese wall separating themselves not only from the Ligue Communiste, the largest or-

ganization of the young revolutionary vanguard, but also from the majority of French workers who still support the Communist party.

Thus, while the Trotskyists brought forces onto the streets almost as large as the well-drilled battalions of one

of the largest CPs not in power, the OCI-AJS found themselves following a pitiful handful of Masons and Social Democrats (including a hangman like Jules Moch). And not only did they follow them, but they acted as their bodyguards. □

University Journal Confiscated

Yugoslav Student Sit-In Protests Jailings

Some 500 students sat in May 26 at the University of Ljubljana in the Yugoslav province of Slovenia. The action protested the continued impris-

are suspected of insulting President Tito and disseminating hostile propaganda."

The Tito regime has taken other steps recently in an effort to curtail student political activity, particularly around the issue of the proposed new constitution, which would grant increased autonomy to the six provinces that compose Yugoslavia.

The proposal has triggered opposition both from nationalists, primarily Croatian, who believe that the plan is a form of continued Serbian domination, and from "centralists," who feel that the proposal is a capitulation to regional chauvinism. National disagreements within the Communist party were papered over at the end of April at a special meeting of the leadership called by Tito.

Following the establishment of a unified front in the party, Tito moved against the students.

The April 30 edition of the University of Belgrade student union's official publication was banned because it contained extracts from discussions on the national question that had taken place at the university. Nearly 40,000 copies of the paper were confiscated.

Later, a Belgrade prosecutor tried to prevent distribution of the law faculty's journal, which contained similar material. The faculty opposed the move and was upheld by a district court judge. □

And What About Their Boss?

A young man in Baltimore who aroused the FBI's interest in a nonexistent plot to bomb the federal courthouse in Chicago was ordered to take a mental examination after he pleaded guilty to providing the agency with false information.

The judge made no provision for the agents who accepted the young man's story.



TITO: "Insulted" by students who want to discuss political issues.

onment of three students arrested April 24 when police broke up a demonstration against French Premier Jacques Chaban-Delmas, who was visiting the province.

The 500 students demanded the conclusion of an "investigation" that has required the jailing of the suspects for more than a month.

The only concrete charge the police have mentioned in the case, Albert Friendly Jr. reported from Belgrade in the May 30 *New York Times*, is that "the three young men being held

Sweden Moves Against Portuguese Exiles

"There are now 130 Portuguese deserters and draft refusers in Sweden; none of them has been granted political asylum and many are threatened with being deported to France and other places," Anders Johansson reported in the May 13 issue of the Stockholm daily *Dagens Nyheter*. "Awaiting them in Portugal is the certainty of five to eight years in prison and after that 'disciplinary frontline service' in the colonial war in Africa. In many cases this is the same as a death sentence."

On May 6, Uppsala police officials deported the deserter Amadeu Alvarenga to Denmark. He was flown to Copenhagen under guard before the king was due to rule on his appeal.

"Being deported to Denmark, which is a member of NATO, can be dangerous," one of the Portuguese deserters told Johansson. "Portugal is also in NATO and the treaty countries are supposed to have an agreement about returning deserters from each other's armies."

Before Alvarenga's expulsion, two other Portuguese refugees, living in Lund and Göteborg respectively, were deported to Denmark. On May 12 the deserter Germano Barros was refused political asylum, and he may be ordered to return to France.

"Somewhere in Sweden," Johansson continued, "the couple José and Maria Rocha are in hiding. Their appeal for asylum has already been rejected by the immigration department. Severe penalties await them in Portugal, where they were active in opposition student groups and in the underground resistance movement."

Although France is no longer a member of NATO, it has a special arrangement with the fascist dictatorship in Lisbon: "Portugal and France recently signed a treaty whose ostensible purpose is to regulate and restrict migration between the two countries."

A deserter told Johansson: "There are 700,000 Portuguese today living in France, more or less illegally. The government in Lisbon wants to get its hands on the politically active ele-



CAETANO: Dictator gains Swedish support in dirty colonial war.

ments, including draft resisters and deserters. The treaty is being used against them."

After the May-June 1968 events, the reactionary and frightened Gaullist regime in France showed its attitude toward political dissent and the French tradition of offering asylum to the victims of repression. It arbitrarily expelled large numbers of foreign radicals. Many of the deported oppositionists risked imprisonment or worse at the hands of dictatorial regimes in their homelands.

Since 1961, when Portugal began its campaigns to stamp out rebellion in its African colonies, an estimated 6,000 men have fled the country to escape conscription and compulsion to fight in these wars. In order to get the manpower to maintain its hold in Africa, Portugal drafts men for five years. In Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau, this nation of less than 10,000,000 inhabitants has a minimum of 130,000 soldiers on active duty, Johansson noted.

Obviously a bitterly poor country

like Portugal could not continue its wars in Africa without the support of its NATO allies, chiefly the United States. Now reports of other West European countries returning opponents of these wars to the fascist government in Lisbon indicate a high degree of cooperation among the capitalist powers in support of Caetano's repression at home and abroad.

Even the supposedly neutral and "humanitarian" Swedish government, it seems, is implicated in supporting fascist repression in Portugal.

In face of the international revulsion against the U.S. war in Indochina, Prime Minister Olof Palme has taken measures to dissociate his government from Washington's policies. By this he may hope, at least in part, to avoid the sort of radicalization among the youth that has developed around this issue in other European countries. In regard to the less publicized Portuguese wars in Africa, the Palme government's hypocrisy is clear.

"The exiles wonder," Johansson wrote, "'How can Sweden give economic help to the liberation movements in Portugal's colonies and at the same time behave the way she has toward us who have protested actively against these colonial wars by deserting and refusing the draft? Why can't we get political asylum like the American deserters?'" □

Prize-Winning Sentence?

"The historic report made by Comrade Kim Il Sung, an outstanding Marxist-Leninist and the brilliant Leader of the revolution, at the 5th Congress of the Workers' Party of Korea is an encyclopedic Marxist-Leninist work of immortal monumental significance which gives a new and all-round systematization and consummation of the genius ideas and theories and pre-eminent strategic and tactical lines of the great Leader Comrade Kim Il Sung giving original answers to all the problems of principle which were newly raised by the present times and the development of revolution today and whose solution was urgently awaited for the victory of the cause of socialism and communism; it is a powerful ideological, theoretical and practical weapon for our Party and people and an infinitely valuable world historic contribution to developing Marxism-Leninism onto a new, higher plane and enriching its treasure house."—*The People's Korea*, April 7, 1971.

Nobody asked us, but we'd like to recommend that sentence for a Stalin Prize in journalism. □

Roots of the American Socialist Revolution

Towards an American Socialist Revolution by Jack Barnes, George Breiman, Derrick Morrison, Barry Sheppard, and Mary-Alice Waters. Pathfinder Press, New York, N. Y. 207 pp. \$1.95, £0.80. 1971.

"What we are seeing in the United States is new," Gus Horowitz writes in his introduction, "but not inexplicable. We are seeing the development of new methods of struggle against the capitalist class, new ways in which the capitalist system is being challenged, new aspects and new forms of the class struggle. The process is still far from reaching its full development, but it is leading in the direction of deepening mass struggles of the oppressed and exploited and points toward a socialist alternative to the inhumanities of capitalism."

The articles in this book provide a revolutionary Marxist analysis of specific aspects of these new processes at work in American society. Topics covered include the international roots of the current radicalization; the role of the national struggle in the American socialist revolution; the student movement; the feminist movement; similarities and differences of the present radicalization compared with those in the past; and the meaning of the current radicalization for the revolutionary party.

The authors are not armchair commentators on the phenomena they analyze, but activists in the struggles. All are leaders of the Socialist Workers party for whom the understanding of social processes is a guide to action.

Their articles were originally prepared as speeches for a Socialist Activists and Educational Conference held at Oberlin, Ohio, last August, and were later reprinted in the *International Socialist Review*.

The conclusions the authors draw from their examination of the processes at work in the U. S. are profoundly optimistic for the future of the revolutionary movement. *Towards an American Socialist Revolution* is an entirely appropriate title for the perspective they outline.

In his article, "The New Radicalization and the Revolutionary Party," Jack Barnes predicts:

"... there will be no reversal of this radicalization before the working masses of this country have had a chance to take power away from the American capitalist rulers. There will be ebbs and flows in the struggle; there will be class polarizations; there will be partial defeats and partial victories. There will be all sorts of stages,

Oil: The Stakes in the Middle East

"In 1968, North Africa and the Middle East supplied 68.1 per cent of the world's oil exports (including those of Communist nations). This region accounted for 90 per cent of the oil consumption in Japan; 70 per cent of oil consumption in Britain; 80 per cent in France; 90 per cent in West Germany; almost 95 per cent in Italy. These statistics spell out an organic dependence of the advanced capitalist nations of Western Europe and Japan on Middle East and North African oil. Oil accounts for almost half of all international sea trade, in terms of tonnage."

In the May issue of the *International Socialist Review*, from which the above quotation is taken, Dick Roberts documents the role of U. S. imperialism in the exploitation of the oil reserves of the Middle East. He has gathered together in one article a wealth of information to illustrate the interests at stake in the area, which holds 76 percent of the capitalist world's known reserves of crude petroleum.

Of the world's seven major oil companies—whose assets total \$69,500,000,000—four are controlled by two American families, the Rockefellers and Mellons. U. S. companies own 23.75% of the oil in Iraq, 40% in Iran, 50% in Kuwait, 75% in Libya, and 100% in Saudi Arabia.

From 1900 to 1960, Roberts shows, foreign petroleum monopolies remitted profits of \$14,600,000,000 from the Middle East after all deductions for costs, royalties, taxes, and reinvestment. The profit rate after taxes for U. S. oil companies in the area is more than 50 percent.

some rapid, others drawn out, as the ruling class uses different methods, up to and including the attempt to use fascism to try to prevent the workers from winning power. But the important thing for us to see is that *this radicalization will not be reversed until we have had our chance.*" (Emphasis in original.)

This book should be considered a must for anyone seriously interested in understanding the forces at work behind the coming American socialist revolution.

—David Burton

Roberts traces the process by which U. S. interests have gradually replaced British. The latter controlled 72 percent of the Middle East's reserves in 1940. Today, U. S. holdings are twice as large as those of British companies.

The article shows how the overthrow of the Mossadegh government in Iran in 1953, the attempt by Britain, France, and Israel to seize the Suez Canal in 1956, and the landing of U. S. marines in Lebanon in 1958 have all contributed to American displacement of the British.

While the interimperialist struggle for dominance continues, no other capitalist power appears capable of supplanting the U. S. monopolies. That task, Roberts concludes, will be accomplished by other forces:

"The struggle of the Arab and Iranian peoples to win this resource for the development of their economies inevitably runs up against the same interests that misrule the United States. The Arab and Iranian revolutions, and all those forces standing up against the monopolists and militarists in this country, have a common enemy and a common cause." □

And Even Longer for Congress to Act

A U. S. biochemist told a Congressional subcommittee May 20 that it might take 5,000 years for natural processes to remove all the mercury that has been dumped into the river system between Lake Huron and Lake Erie.

If the Air Doesn't Get You . . .

At least 2,700 buildings in western Colorado are known to have been constructed with radioactive tailings—materials left over from uranium ore processing. The decay products can produce lung cancer.

Socialism, Nationalism, and Revolution in Ireland

By John Garland

[John Garland, author of the following article, was one of the most prominent leaders in the guerrilla campaign waged by the Irish Republican Army (IRA) against British rule in Northern Ireland 1956-1962, although he was a very young man at the time. The May issue of *The United Irishman*, from which we have taken this article, notes that he has recently been appointed National Organiser of the republican movement.

[The "border campaign" that began in 1956 was abortive and disastrous in many respects for the Irish revolutionary vanguard. However, the republican tradition is deeply rooted in the history and reality of the country. Perhaps precisely because of this long tradition and the organizational continuity of the republican movement maintained by a devoted cadre, the survivors of the "physical force" campaigns of the 1950s were able to draw some deepgoing conclusions from their experience. Some of these conclusions are expressed in Garland's article.]

* * *

The objective of any movement dictates or determines its activity, its work, its demands. It follows, therefore, that for a movement to be a revolutionary one, or aspire to be one, it must have a revolutionary objective.

For us of the Irish Republican Movement we have declared our revolutionary objective to be the establishment in Ireland of a Democratic Socialist Republic. In simple terms this means that without a revolutionary objective there cannot be a revolutionary movement and without a revolutionary movement there cannot be a revolution.

A revolution cannot take place as the result of the desires, dreams or ideals of revolutionary minded people. A revolution requires a level of social/economic contradictions which makes it possible to overthrow the ruling class. A revolution needs the presence of another social class, which because of its place in society, its place in the process of production and its political potential, is able to successfully achieve this revolution.

The most important instrument in the struggle for National Freedom and Socialism is, as we have said, a revolutionary Movement and the most important task a revolutionary movement has is to organise the working class and their allies in order to win the Revolution. Capitalism is a system that can and has absorbed and integrated many reforms and it automatically rejects all reforms that run counter to the logic of the system (such as completely free public services which cover social needs). The structure can only be abolished by overthrowing it, not by reforming it. Here it is that all who belong to the revolutionary movement should fully understand what this revolution is going to mean, in short, to know precisely what a revolution is—**THE CHANGE OF STATE POWER FROM ONE CLASS TO ANOTHER CLASS.**

The central point of any revolution and particularly in a Socialist revolution, is that the key positions in the State, in Government, Army, Police, Civil Service, Judiciary, Unions, many National Organisations, T. V., Radio and Press should pass out of the hands of those who are

loyal to the Establishment and into the hands of those who represent the vast majority of the people who will use this power to build socialism where the means of production, distribution and exchange are socially owned.

At this point of time in our history as a Revolutionary Movement it must be accepted and understood that our Movement must have a national liberation and socialist character. In the past the Republican Movement through concentrating all its energies and resources on the question of national liberation alone, neglected the task of organising the people in their everyday struggles. We left this most important task to those politicians who time after time sold the people out. We, for our part, confused popular sympathy for our cause, the freedom of Ireland, with popular support.

Active and Mass Support

It was only when we were beaten to the wall and almost annihilated as a political force that the true meaning of revolution began to dawn on us. We know now, and have begun to organise ourselves on the correct lines, that in order to succeed we need and must have the active and mass support of the people. This support has to be won by helping the people to fight their immediate struggles for jobs, houses, lands and civil liberties and by explaining to people how all of these issues affecting their lives are connected with the nature of capitalism, the need for socialism and above all, gives them leadership in the fight for a revolutionary change.

It is, perhaps, easy to see that many errors were committed over the years from the twenties and that little or nothing was done to correct these errors until the sixties.

In the thirties, in Ireland as in other parts of the world, there was a rise in working class consciousness. More than at any other period in recent Irish history and especially since the end of the civil war was there an opportunity to create out of the Republican Movement a revolutionary organisation with the backing and support of the working people of all Ireland than at this time. The history of the Republican Congress* proves this. This struggle to create a revolutionary movement of all Ireland was lost for two reasons:

1. The recognised leadership of whatever revolutionary group or potential that was there was not good enough and they were unable to take advantage of the crises in capitalist imperialism and the rise of the workers' consciousness.

2. The grave error that was committed by this leadership and others in separating the National question from the social questions of the people.

From the period from the end of the Civil War until our day Republicans virtually neglected to organise the people who are ultimately going to make the revolution in this country—the workers. We must be conscious and careful that we do not go to the other extreme and forsake

* The main organization of the IRA left wing in the 1930s.—IP

or neglect the national question, as happened in the '30s. There is a danger that in our fight to establish ourselves among the people, and in the fight to establish the rights of the people in the everyday issues, we would tend to ignore or not continue to place enough stress or emphasis on the question of National independence.

The centuries old struggle of the Irish people to establish an independent nation is still, today, one of the most potent weapons in the revolutionary arsenal, is in fact the one single issue on which all Irishmen can come together. We must continue to insist on linking the question of national freedom with the question of social justice and socialism.

For those Irish people who, because of their religious upbringing or particular environment with its background of support for British influence and control in Ireland—we must show and prove to them by our words and, more important, our actions in all the other issues that affect them, as well as all other working class people in Ireland, that it is the Republican Movement they have most in common with and least to fear from. We must continue to demonstrate to this large number of people that we stand for the emancipation of all men and women and that our aim is to end forever the exploitation of man by a small exclusive class.

It is regrettable that we still have people in Ireland today, who have not learned from former experiences, who still insist that it is possible to achieve freedom with the weapons and instruments of former times. We have several distinct elements made up of some very sincere and dedicated people who follow this trend. Some on one hand are attempting to re-create the historical period of the twenties, attempting to translate the type of movement and the form of struggle that was partly successful in the twenties. This attempt to have the same in the seventies is doomed to failure.

Those other people who wish to impose 'freedom' on people, who form themselves into an elite without any contact or support from the mass of the people, those elements who make the question of shooting the central point of the struggle are going to find themselves isolated from the people and will surely fail, as other efforts of a similar nature failed in the past. Unfortunately, because of our history as a movement committed to force, we are liable to be brought down along with these elements, for the establishment will have little difficulty in dealing with any movement unless the Irish people are made aware that there is a deep and fundamental difference between the Republican movement and these elements.

Physical Force Tactic

As with the failures of the past the enemies of freedom will be delighted at this failure and we can hear their voices now telling the people that force as a solution to the problems of the Irish people was a failure and that it is now finally discredited and rejected by the Irish people. Here it is important that the true voice of the Irish Revolution be heard to point out to the people, to state to the establishment and most important to keep insisting to the revolutionaries, as we have done in the past, that the tactic of physical force fails for certain specific reasons.

We must first recognise that physical force is a tactic and that despite all the errors, all the shortcomings over the years, the history of all successful revolutions proves

that the road of armed struggle was and is the only correct one. What we learned and some didn't was that armed struggle on its own is doomed to failure, just as political action or demonstrations on their own are doomed to failure. Force must be linked with, must be integrated with, all the other forms of struggle, legal and illegal that are available to the movement.

We must understand that in all areas of revolutionary work it is often no less imperative to know what not to do as to what to do and how to do it. Such knowledge is acquired as the result of earlier trials and experiences and errors.

If our history and experience have already exposed what ways and means are inadequate to complete our task then it is obvious that correct measures should be applied as soon as these errors become known. It is in this light that we should see the past few years. What had failed in the fifties and sixties was a tactic, not a strategy. What we had to do, and must continue doing, was to correct the tactic in the course of the struggle itself. Over the past few years we have begun to take this tactical turn, to correct our methods of struggle, to deepen and expand our political organisation among the people. To begin to organise the people not for revolt, not for rebellion, not for insurrection but for revolution. A revolution that will change the entire political and social system in the country.

A point I would like to make here is that any revolutionary movement must base itself and their programme on its own people and their needs, the conditions in their own country. We have a lot to learn from many other countries in the world who have made a successful revolution or in some cases are like ourselves, trying to make a revolution. But as I said, if we cannot translate conditions and movements from our own past then it should be just as obvious that we cannot borrow or get a carbon copy of revolution from other countries. We must deal with the situation as it is today in Ireland, and build our movement accordingly.

The only hope the ruling class has is if it can isolate the revolutionary completely from the rest of the people. That is why the number one task today for those revolutionaries who really want to change the system is to know how to reach people. We must build a movement of people who are aware and conscious of all the many avenues that are open to the movement; a movement with the realisation that we need to get involved in and build on these issues to that final confrontation with the forces of the establishment. This will be a long road but if we build our foundations on a conscious people we cannot but succeed.

We do not know what will be the spark for the Irish revolution but it is certain as I said before, that unless there is a revolutionary movement there to lead the people and direct them towards that central goal—'Political Power' for the working class—it will fail as it failed so before. This is a fundamental, the key role played by the building of a revolutionary movement. There is another key and this is that there must be a certain level of class consciousness and revolutionary self activity. Without this a revolutionary movement cannot transform a struggle for immediate demands into a struggle challenging the very existence of the system.

One of the basic problems of revolutionary strategy today is this lack of class consciousness among the people of Ireland and elsewhere. We, as revolutionary socialist

republicans do not believe that capitalist imperialism will suddenly collapse as a result of some miracle or inner contradictions. We do not believe that the task of revolutionaries is to sit on the sidelines and interpret current events hoping for some happening. We believe in the conscious intervention, in the key teaching role that struggle has and of the experience born from such struggles. We believe that it is only by trying to expand actual living working class struggles towards an incipient challenge against the authority of the employers and of the capitalist system, can a rise be achieved in working class consciousness. Only through such struggles can the workers build the actual organs through which they can tomorrow take over the administration of the economy and the State, freely elected workers committees at factory or street level which will federate themselves afterwards locally, regionally, and then nationally. That is what the conquest of political power by the working class really means.

You cannot build a revolutionary movement without a revolutionary programme for, in fact, in time the programme will create the movement, but it is here that the role of conscious leadership enters into it, to save time.

The present generation of Irish revolutionaries has the supreme duty now to examine the past and take note of

the many tragic mistakes committed, in order to avoid them in the future and to replace haphazard methods by a conscious theory and a deliberate design.

Conclusion

To conclude, over the past five years many changes have taken place in the Republican Movement. During that time we have clarified our objective, we know where we want to go, we know what we must do, what action we must take in order to achieve this objective. We must continue to learn from the past and our experiences, but not allow ourselves to be bound or tied to the past. Above all, it must be borne in mind that whatever actions we engage in, housing agitations, land and fishery agitations, civil rights or cultural agitations, all are bound up with and must be linked with the fight for freedom and socialism, and that in all of these fights to establish the rights of the ordinary people there is a class fight. We must demonstrate to all the Irish people that our movement expresses the interests of that most exploited class, the working class, and that we have the programme and the policy, the aim to make that class victorious at last, in the long struggle for Freedom and Socialism. □

Australian Communist Party Discusses Trotskyism

[The following item appeared in the May 26 issue of the *Tribune*, the weekly newspaper of the Communist party of Australia, under the title "Aarons on Trotsky." The first five paragraphs, which we have printed in italics, were set in bold type in the original to indicate that it constituted editorial comment on the following extracts from a speech made by Laurie Aarons, the national secretary of the CPA.]

* * *

The bogey of Trotskyism has once again been stalking the Communist movement. For more than 40 years it has been pronounced the source of all evil on the Left in country after country but particularly in the Soviet Union under Stalin.

Recently it has been raised in Australia in charges by Communist Party member W.J. Brown against CPA national secretary L. Aarons who, he alleged, had under Trotskyist influence secretly subverted the policies of the Party.

Leon Trotsky was, of course, a Russian revolutionary who, in the year 1917, became known throughout the world for his leadership during and after the revolution, second only to that of Lenin himself. Although—like other leading Bolsheviks—he was at times in serious disagreement with Lenin on particular issues, he nevertheless remained in top responsibilities until Lenin's death. Subsequently he was exiled and finally murdered in Mexico, in the course of Stalin's systematic and successful struggle to eliminate nearly all the surviving Old Bolshevik leaders.

Meanwhile an international movement had developed in support of Trotsky's ideas, expressed in his voluminous writ-

ings, which were sharply critical of the Stalin leadership in the USSR. "Trotskyism" was outlawed in that country to the point where huge numbers were "purged" and died following allegations of their Trotskyist tendencies.

Towards the end of the recent Sydney hearing Laurie Aarons, replying to the allegations concerning himself, made these comments about Trotskyism. . .

"I want to say a few words on the question of Trotskyism which is really the whole ideological foundation on which Comrade Brown has based his allegations against me.

"This allegation of a subversion of the Communist Party by the Trotskyists—it is not very clear what Comrade Brown means by Trotskyism—is to be the explanation for all that has happened: the 'conspiracy theory', in other words.

"What do you mean by Trotskyism? Trotskyism can mean a theoretical and ideological trend, it can mean organisation, a movement, and it can mean, in Stalin's phraseology, a counter-revolutionary conspiracy. I want to give a few ideas about this matter.

"I think it is an important question, because it has been made an issue to explain everything. Previously there were other explanations; but now Trotskyism is put forward, certainly in Australia and also internationally, as the explanation for everything that is wrong in the revolutionary movement.

"What is required here is an examination of the history of the Soviet Union and the CPSU, particularly between the time of Lenin's death and the exile of Trotsky. I am not equipped to do this, it requires examination of the material

from all sides, not just Stalin's Short History of the CPSU.

"Before Lenin died he wrote a testament in which he characterised all the main leaders of the Communist Party in Russia and he said that, of all the leaders of the Communist Party, Trotsky was the most able and he made also qualifying critical remarks.

"But he warned very sharply against Stalin and said he should be removed from the position of general secretary.

"When I joined the Young Communist Movement in 1932, I read Stalin, who said that there was no such thing as Lenin's Testament, that what the Trotskyists had put out as Lenin's Testament was a fabrication. I believed Stalin's statement.

"But everyone now knows, including Comrade Brown, that it was not a forgery by the Trotskyists but a document that was ignored by the Congress after Lenin's death. That was a tragedy, and many, many tragedies flowed from that, but these are swept aside by Comrade Brown as 'errors, even crimes, of Stalin.'

"The whole concept of Trotskyism as a counter-revolutionary conspiracy is based upon Stalin's fabrication.

"To say that horrifies some people—their minds are closed, they won't accept it. That is unfortunate. From that, you can then say that because Aarons says this, then Aarons is a Trotskyist. That is the Brownian metaphysics, but it just is not so, either metaphysically or in fact.

"I think that Trotsky's ideas about building socialism in one country are not as incorrect as Stalin's distortion of them would make out. And there is much to be studied and written about that.

"I think that Trotsky's theory about permanent revolution is not as incorrect

Ceylon Mercantile Union to Discuss Reply to Prime Minister Bandaranaike

as it is made out. I recall that Marx said something very much along these lines in his concept of the revolution and Mao Tse-tung has developed some ideas on this. But certainly the way it was developed (by Trotsky), for example his concept of refusing to sign the Brest Litovsk treaty—that was wrong and, 'objectively', I would say I agree with Comrade Brown that it was a crime.

"But after all many people do things that are objectively crimes, even little things like factionalism in the Communist Party of Australia. But one does not say to them: 'this proves you are counter-revolutionary conspirators.'

"But after Lenin's death, everything that Trotsky ever did—including signing the Brest treaty—was used as 'proof' that he was already in the pay of the imperialists at the time of Brest in 1918.

"Some of Trotsky's analyses in my view are correct. I recommend to the timid and conservative a re-reading of Trotsky's *Defence of Terrorism*. From this I hope you do not think I am advocating terrorism. And I would recommend that you read Trotsky's *History of the Russian Revolution*—but read it critically, as you should read everything.

"Certainly let us argue and work with Trotskyists and let us study Trotskyism but do not let us proceed from the old concept that Trotskyism is a counter-revolutionary conspiracy.

"There is one item of the Trotskyist creed with which I am in strong disagreement. This is the view that factionalism is permissible within a revolutionary party. Some of the Trotskyists have retreated from that position, certainly in their own organisation. For example those that work in the Socialist Youth Alliance don't believe in factionalism. They believe in the factional struggle within the Left but in their own organisation they believe in Lenin's principle of democratic centralism as I do.

"But who in the CPA is advocating factionalism? Comrade Brown, Comrade Ross, Comrade Watt and a number of other people, more than advocating factionalism, are practising it openly and proclaiming as justification for this that Laurie Aarons has organised a faction. The evidence proves that this is completely false." □

Amazon at Bottom?

Princess Anne launched her first ship April 26 when she broke a bottle of sparkling Empire wine over the bow of the warship *H. M. S. Amazon*.

At a luncheon following the ceremony, she said she had no sympathy with the aims of the Women's Liberation Movement. "The original Amazons were at least reputed to have been more formidable on horseback," she quipped.

Sir David Brown, gallant chairman of the British shipyard, responded in kind. He said he hoped the crew of the *Amazon* would have as smooth and as safe a ride as the Princess had enjoyed at the Badminton horse trials over the weekend. He added that she should certainly be made a member of Britain's equestrian Olympic team.

[The following is the text of a notice sent June 2 to all members of the Ceylon Mercantile Union by the union's Executive Committee. The notice, signed by Bala Tampoe as general secretary, was entitled "The Union and the Situation That Has Arisen Under the Emergency."]

* * *

All Union members should be aware by now of the decisions of the General Council pursuant to which letters dated 30th March, 30th April and 14th May 1971, respectively, have been addressed to the Prime Minister.

The General Council met on 24th May 1971 and considered a letter dated 18th May 1971, sent to the Union by the Secretary to the Prime Minister, on her directions, in reply to the Union's letter to the Prime Minister of 30th April.

The General Council decided that the various statements contained in the reply given to the Union on behalf of the Prime Minister, should be discussed in all Branches of the Union, and that a full statement should be made to the Prime Minister thereafter, as to the Union's position in relation to the current situation in the country.

The statements requiring consideration are as follows:

1) That the General Council appears to hold the opinion "that the persons who attacked Police Stations on the night of the 5th of April with guns and hand-bombs, who disrupted communications, damaged public and private property, intimidated and murdered innocent people, raped and looted, and who indulged in kidnappings and arson, are innocent young people", and that they deserve our "sympathy".

2) That we cannot expect others to take our views "seriously".

3) That it is clear that our views "are not shared by the vast majority of the workers, both in the public and private sectors", and "by the overwhelming majority of the peasants of this country".

4) That it is also clear "that the Government has the overwhelming support of all classes of people who constitute the vast majority of the people of this country".

5) That "the declaration of the Emergency, as well as the steps taken by the Government to restore law and order has (sic) also been overwhelmingly endorsed by the people's elected representatives".

6) That "the Emergency has been nowhere used to deprive any worker of his legitimate rights or interests".

7) That it has been "noted" that the General Secretary and the General Council "clearly seem to condone the acts of the terrorists and seek to condemn the acts of the Government in maintaining public peace and order".

The Executive Committee suggests that the following questions should also be

considered, in view of the statements made in the reply sent to the Union on the directions of the Prime Minister:—

1. Would it be proper to regard the thousands of young people of both sexes, who participated in the armed uprising that began on 5th April, as "terrorists"?

Or, would it be more correct to regard them as rebels, who had no hope of a decent life under the prevailing social system in Ceylon, and rose up in arms when they were being subjected to naked repression under the Emergency that was declared on 16th March?

2. Is it likely that the uprising would have taken place in the districts of Galle, Matara, Hambantota, Kurunegala, Anuradhapura, Polonnaruwa, Amparai, Moneragala, Kegalle and Matale, had there not been widespread disillusionment in and active discontent with the Government amongst the youth, who had contributed in large measure to the sweeping victories of the Sri Lanka Freedom Party in those very areas in the general elections, a year ago? In the circumstances, whatever may have been the political ideas or objectives of the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna, and whoever may have been behind it, is it not necessary for the Government to face up to the fact that large sections of the youth had become alienated from it, and had even become bitterly hostile to it, as a result of the Government's own actions in relation to them, in the context of its failure to satisfy their legitimate aspirations?

3. In assessing the nature of the uprising that has taken place, does it serve any useful purpose to regard the rebels as criminals, who have "intimidated and murdered innocent people, raped and looted, and indulged in kidnappings and arson", even if some of them may be proved to have committed such acts? Or, on the other hand, would it not serve a really useful purpose for a full public investigation to be made as to the nature and extent of any "excesses" that may have been committed by the so-called security forces themselves, taking advantage of the special powers given to them over the civilian population under the Emergency?

4. Would it not have been an act of inhumanity for a concerted military offensive to have been launched against the rebels who had taken to the jungles and did not surrender themselves in response to the Prime Minister's broadcast appeal on 24th April, considering the fact that "many young people on the threshold of their lives" would have been "killed or maimed" by such an offensive, as the Prime Minister herself declared?

5. Is the view that the young rebels should not be regarded as "terrorists", and that they are deserving of humane treatment, a view that cannot be taken seriously in a country where the teachings of the Buddha are revered, or by a gov-

ernment that professes to uphold those teachings?

6. Whatever view may be taken with regard to the nature of the uprising that began on 5th April, or the acts of those who participated in it, was there any justification for the declaration of an Emergency on 16th March, three weeks BEFORE the uprising took place, and for the promulgation, at the same time, of emergency regulations whereby ALL CIVIL LIBERTIES AND THE DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS OF THE ENTIRE POPULATION were made subject to ARBITRARY SUPPRESSION OR RESTRICTION by the Prime Minister, or by government, police and military authorities, appointed by her or specified in the regulations?

7. Whatever reason there may have been for the Government to have anticipated acts of armed violence by adherents of any political organisation before the uprising took place on 5th April, what good reason could there have been for the POLICE to have been empowered on 16th March itself, and even thereafter,

to arrest any person without a warrant, and to remove that person to any other place in Ceylon; and

to detain any person in custody, in a place authorised by the Inspector-General of Police, for up to fifteen days, without producing that person before a magistrate within 24 hours, or even having to report the arrest to a magistrate thereafter, as required by the normal law of this country; and furthermore,

to take possession of and burn or bury "any dead body", without having to comply with the provisions of "any other written law relating to the inquest of death or burial or cremation"?

8. What good reason could there have been or now be for the complete suppression of the fundamental right of workers to strike, through essential services orders, both in the public and private sectors, even though no section of the working

class as such has taken part in the uprising?

9. How can it be clear that our views are not shared by the vast majority of the workers, when only the views of the leaderships of unions that are considered acceptable to the Government have been made public, and when all sections of the working class, together with the rest of the population, are subject to arbitrary suppression of the right to meet in public, and to arbitrary suppression of the right to publish any news or even comment on matters pertaining to the uprising or the actions of the Government, under the Emergency?

10. Can it be correctly stated that workers have "voluntarily contributed" to the Fund "that had been inaugurated to help the victims of the terrorists", as is stated in the reply given to the Union, even though workers may have consented to deductions being made from their salaries to the Fund, at the request of their Managements, for fear of being "noted" for failure to contribute?

In any case, since workers have been called upon to contribute at least a day's pay to the Fund, can even a significant proportion of the working class, which numbers over three million, have contributed to the Fund, considering the fact that the total collections amount to less than a million rupees, inclusive of the large contributions made by big capitalist companies and businessmen, and by various anonymous donors?

11. Since the millions of peasants of this country, like the workers, have no means of knowing the views expressed by our General Council to the Prime Minister, or of publicising similar views, can it be correctly claimed that the overwhelming majority of them do not share our views?

Furthermore, since most peasants are living in districts that are still under military control, what would be their fate, if they were to give expression to views

similar to those of our General Council, in those areas?

12. If the Government "has the overwhelming support of all classes of people who constitute the vast majority of the people of this country", how was it possible for an uprising of any serious magnitude to have taken place at all?

In any case, what justification can there have been or now be for the subjection of the entire population to a curfew and to the conditions that prevail only in police states, if the Government enjoys such support?

13. Do the views that have been expressed in the Union's letters to the Prime Minister amount to condonation "of the acts of the terrorists" and condemnation of "the acts of the Government in maintaining peace and order"?

Or, would it be correct to say that the views of the General Council clearly amount to criticism of the use of Emergency powers to subject the entire population of this country to the conditions of a virtual police state, and refusal to endorse the view that the young people who have risen in armed revolt under the Emergency are "terrorists", who should be "killed or maimed" by a military offensive, if they do not surrender themselves to the Government?

14. Can any organisation of the people that is seriously concerned with the defence of the interests of the exploited and oppressed masses in Ceylon, endorse the suppression of the right of workers to strike, as well as the subjection of all other democratic rights to the arbitrary control of government, police and military authorities, and the removal of fundamental safeguards of life and liberty, under the Emergency, because the Government has been faced with an armed revolt of a section of the youth of the country, which had been subjected to naked repression under the Emergency?

15. Since the question of condemnation of the acts of the Government has been raised, should we not condemn the use of helicopters and other aircraft, as well as armoured cars and other military equipment supplied by foreign powers, including the imperialist governments of Britain and the United States, the government of the Soviet Union, the military government of Pakistan, and the government of India, for the purpose of killing or maiming young people of both sexes in this country, merely because they have resorted to an armed revolt, with no more than hand-bombs and shot-guns?

Any Branch, Branch Committee or individual member is completely free to express any opinion, in support of the views of the General Council or of the Government, or otherwise. The General Council will meet on 7th June, and again thereafter, if necessary, to consider all points of view, before deciding on the statement to be made to the Prime Minister.

But What About Earth?

A Gallup poll shows that 53 percent of "international leaders" think life is possible on other planets.

How to subscribe

If you'd rather not cut up this issue by using the subscription blank . . .
Jot your name and address on any old piece of paper and send it with
\$7.50 for a six-month subscription.

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

Enclosed is \$7.50 for a six-month subscription.

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____