

Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 9, No. 31

© 1971 Intercontinental Press

September 13, 1971

50c



What They Died for in Vietnam

Jackson Murdered,
Prisoners Testify

THIEU: Winner in U.S.-style election.

An Alternative Assembly for Northern Ireland?

Sarawak Insurgents Elude Troops

Efforts to put down insurgents of Chinese descent in Sarawak are not proving successful, according to Jack Foisie in a report from the North Borneo country published in the August 29 *Los Angeles Times*.

In recent sweeps of jungle areas near Sibu, "81 suspected Communist terrorists" were seized. Of these, one-third will turn out to be women, judging by past experience, Foisie declares.

Some 6,000 troops have been deployed against the "600 hard-core members" of the insurgents.

In apparent retaliation for the Sibu raid, the insurgents struck back with attacks on army and police units more than a hundred miles away, outside the capital of Kuching. In two ambushes, they killed five government troopers.

Tactics used successfully elsewhere in Malaysia after World War II to put down rebel movements have not worked in Sarawak.

"There are three fenced-in villages outside of Kuching which have existed for six years. They confine some 8,000 Chinese farmers to their village area except when Malaysian guards allow them to farm during daylight hours. Yet it was near these villages that the terrorists set their ambushes last week." Tactics borrowed "from the American experience in Vietnam" have been tried. "But after one air attack on a purported insurgent camp, civilian officials—who have the final say—vetoed any further army efforts to use armed planes and helicopters against the terrorists, fearing the backlash which could result from indiscriminate killing."

In view of this failure, "the army is now turning to winning the hearts and minds of the uncommitted, just as the Americans did in Vietnam."

It remains to be seen whether this will turn out any better than the American example. One of the items that is unlikely to win many hearts and minds is the following:

"A large political detention camp is located on the outskirts of Kuching, and is said to hold about 1,000 suspected Communist terrorists. Suspects can be held for two years without trial, and a large percentage apparently are held that long, or through technical variations in the law, even longer. Meanwhile the families of the imprisoned men must fend for themselves."

The Confucianists Stayed Home

A Chinese Ping-Pong team touring the United States on behalf of Chiang Kai-shek carries Bibles to emphasize its disagreement with Maoist teams that carry Mao's little red book. A tour sponsor explained: "They are trying to point up a common bond they have with many Americans that the Communists do not—their Christian religion."

In This Issue

Allen Myers	755	SOUTH VIETNAM Thieu Rules Thieu Is Only Candidate INDOCHINA WAR 755 What 45,000 GIs Died For 756 Environment Destroyed by New Weapons U. S. A. 756 800 Mayday Demonstrators Cleared 757 Teachers' Union Shows Opposition to War 765 Prisoners Say Jackson Was Murdered 774 Is It "Socialism" to Give Lockheed \$250 Million?
Gerry Foley	757	IRELAND An Alternative Assembly for Northern Ireland?
	762	BOLIVIA Last Hours of Torres Regime
	763	BANGLA DESH Refugee Total Could Reach 15,000,000
	764	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC Dominicans to Protest in Washington Over Terror
J. V. Hanley	766	TURKEY Repression Widens
	767	CANADA Quebec Frame-Up Charges Dropped
Jon Rothschild	768	SUDAN Counterrevolution in the Sudan
	770	EGYPT Sadat Opens Purge Trial in Cairo
	771	SOVIET UNION Solzhenitsyn's Protest Against Police Raid
	771	GREECE Amalia Fleming Jailed on "Plot" Charges
David Withers	772	PHILIPPINES Finger of Suspicion in Bombing Points at Marcos
	773	CEYLON 14,400 Arrested Since April
	773	Bandaranaike Proffers Aid to Yahya Khan
	773	PORTUGAL Growing Number of Political Prisoners
	775	SPAIN Workers Boycott Franco's Trade Unions
	775	ARGENTINA Former President Protests Police Brutality
	776	REVIEWS New French Economics Quarterly
	776	DOCUMENTS CMU Demands Release of Ceylonese Political Prisoners
Copain	753	DRAWINGS Nguyen Van Thieu; 764, Juan Bosch; 771, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn; 772, Ferdinand Marcos

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

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Mai-tan, Ernest Mandel, George Novack.

MANAGING EDITOR: Allen Myers.

COPY EDITOR: Ruth Schein.

EDITORIAL STAFF: Gerry Foley, J.V. Hanley, Jon Rothschild, George Saunders.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.

ASSISTANT BUSINESS MANAGER: Steven Warshell.

TECHNICAL STAFF: H. Massey, James M. Morgan, Lawrence Rand.

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 Gueme-nee, 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.

Thieu Rules Thieu Is Only Candidate

By Allen Myers

In a cautiously hopeful editorial August 31, the *New York Times* offered its prescription for salvaging something from the South Vietnamese one-man presidential election scheduled for October. Referring to the recently completed parliamentary vote, the paper's editors wrote:

"The outcome indicates that General Thieu's chances in a fair presidential race would be excellent, as most analysts long have predicted, and that it would be in his own interest now to make a bona fide contest possible. Ambassador Bunker last week reportedly threw up his hands on the possibility of bringing about such a contest in place of the sham race that now impends. But there is every reason to reopen the matter."

The *Times* proposed as a start that the name of General Duong Van Minh be put back on the ballot.

Unfortunately for the *Times* strategists, Thieu clearly did not share their view of his "interest" in a "bona fide contest." On September 1, his subservient supreme court reopened the sham race by removing even the possibility of sham.

In the court's second reversal of its own previous decisions, the name of Nguyen Cao Ky was once again barred from the ballot.

The court had been asked to rule whether Ky's name should remain despite his announced withdrawal from the campaign. The judges instead wrote a letter to Thieu, telling him to do as he pleased. Alvin Shuster reported in the September 2 *New York Times*:

"One source familiar with the letter's contents said the court 'made no ruling on keeping Mr. Ky's name off the ballots."

"The electoral law makes no provision for handling cases like this,' the informant went on, 'so the court left the decision to Mr. Thieu on whether to run alone or with Mr. Ky. The court suggested that the executive adapt the existing law to the situation."

"In short, the court provided Mr. Thieu with the opportunity to keep

the Vice President off the ballots and he took it."

Thieu appears to have taken this step after receiving private assurances from his patron in Washington. On August 31 the Saigon newspaper *Tin Song* reported that the Nixon administration had promised not to let its embarrassment over the one-man election interfere with continued backing for Thieu.

"The newspaper," Peter A. Jay wrote from Saigon in the September 1 *Washington Post*, "... is privately financed by a high-ranking aide of Thieu's and is considered authoritative on matters related to the presidency."

"Reporting on a meeting last night [August 30] between Thieu and U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, the paper quoted 'observers' as saying Bunker told the president the Nixon administration has no intention of cutting aid to protest the collapse of the Oct. 3 presidential election."

Nixon has, if anything, been increasing his military backing for Thieu. While American troops have been held back from ground combat in order to reduce casualty figures,

the firepower directed against the Indochinese revolution has increased.

Describing recent fighting around the demilitarized zone (DMZ), the August 30 issue of *Newsweek* reported:

"... in an unsettling echo of times past, they [Saigon's troops] were ultimately forced to fall back on the protection of American firepower."

The magazine wrote of "tons of explosives" striking the area from B-52 bombers and naval artillery offshore in the Gulf of Tonkin. The *New York Times* revealed on August 23 that Australian as well as U.S. destroyers were involved in the shelling.

The U.S. B-52 raids have been dropping 500 to 600 tons daily in the DMZ area alone.

At the same time, there has been an ominous but little-publicized escalation of Nixon's air war against North Vietnam. On August 30, U.S. planes attacked two antiaircraft sites in the North. This brought to at least fifty-three the number of such attacks this year acknowledged by the U.S. command. Nixon has been counting on the decreased American casualties and a show of "democracy" in Saigon to relieve domestic antiwar sentiment and permit him to go on escalating the air war. The collapse of the fraudulent election plan now offers the antiwar movement a new opportunity to reach wider layers of the American public with the demand for immediate withdrawal of all U.S. military forces from Indochina. □

What 45,000 GIs Died For

Right On, Rogers!

Thieu Election as 'Pristine' as Nixon's

The Nixon administration's embarrassment at its inability to engineer a democratic-appearing presidential election in South Vietnam produced an unexpected result September 3. Speaking to reporters at a press conference, Secretary of State William Rogers let slip a bit of the truth.

"... obviously the elections in a country like Vietnam are not pristine and pure," Rogers remarked, "but neither are ours, for that matter."

Rogers's observation, which was intended to put the best face possible on the Saigon electoral farce, is not like-

ly to win him any praise from his boss. The remark could remind the U.S. public that Nixon became president in an election in which the voters, under the two-party system, were offered a choice between Humphrey, Nixon, and Wallace. Some might regard a choice between Thieu, Ky, and Minh as considerably more "pristine."

Comparison of Saigon elections with those in the U.S. might suggest other parallels as well. The grotesque attempts of the capitalist press to portray Ky as a "peace candidate" call

to mind Nixon's claim during the 1968 campaign that he had a "secret plan" to end the war.

While Nixon has never formally announced what his plan consists of, experience has shown that it includes the invasion of Laos and Cambodia, the bombing of North Vietnam, and the indefinite presence of U. S. troops in South Vietnam. This has led many observers to conclude that Nixon's idea of peace is identical with what Thieu calls "peace through victory." All of this has been done in the name of self-

determination for the South Vietnamese, who will now be allowed to determine whether they want Thieu or Thieu as their puppet president.

This very unpurified situation is likely to give a boost to the antiwar actions scheduled for October and November. It might also have some effect on Nixon's personal future, since the bosses of the two-party system may decide that it would improve the image of American democracy to put someone in the White House who looks more pristine than Thieu. □

150 huge plows are making flat wastelands, while severely upsetting the environment."

Pfeiffer explained that the "erosion" of the topsoil is seriously affecting the water-holding capacity of the land and is preparing the way for serious floodings. For the wildlife, it has already been disastrous."

The two scientists visited areas that had been experimentally plowed three years before and found that nothing had grown back except imperata grass—a plant Westing described as "universally recognized as the worst weed problem in the world."

The 15,000-pound bombs, which explode horizontally, are used both as antipersonnel weapons and as a quick method of clearing landing zones for helicopters. The *Times* article reported:

"The concussion bomb was one of the most disturbing aspects of their study, the scientists said. 'Each time a concussion bomb is dropped, all animal life within a 760-acre area is instantly killed,' Professor Pfeiffer said. Beyond 760 acres, he added, severe damage can be done to ear-drums. The bomb, he said, is 'necessarily indiscriminating.' □

Indochina War

Environment Destroyed by New Weapons

Two American scientists charged August 28 that new U. S. weapons are causing widespread environmental damage in South Vietnam.

Professors E. W. Pfeiffer, a zoologist from the University of Montana, and A. H. Westing, a botanist from Windham College in Vermont, have been conducting periodic ecological studies in South Vietnam for the past five years. Their latest study was conducted for the Scientists' Institute for Public Information.

The scientists were particularly concerned about the widespread plowing up of vegetation and the use of giant 15,000-pound concussion bombs.

U. S. forces are now using huge

plows as a substitute for chemical defoliation. Pfeiffer and Westing reported that plowed land totals 750,000 acres — 1.5 percent of South Vietnam's land area.

"Every day from dawn to dusk," Westing was quoted in the August 29 *New York Times*, "between 100 and

800 Mayday Demonstrators Cleared

The U. S. government on August 29 dropped charges against more than 800 persons who were arrested on the steps of the Capitol during the "Mayday" anti-

war demonstrations earlier this year.

The 800 were among some 12,000 demonstrators and bystanders rounded up in mass arrests during the demonstrations. The government's police-state tactics aroused widespread protest at the time but were vigorously defended by Nixon himself.

The demonstrators at the Capitol were arrested despite the fact that they had been invited there by four members of Congress. They were virtually the only demonstrators for whom the police had filled out proper arrest forms. For this reason, the charges "were considered to be the strongest of the Government's mass-arrest cases," according to the August 30 *New York Times*. But a spokesman for the United States Attorney's Office was quoted as saying:

"In our judgment, the assembly still remains unlawful, but because of the several Congressmen who had invited these people up to the steps to present their petition, the likelihood that we would succeed in the remaining prosecutions was very slight."

At the end of July, in what was regarded as a test case, eight of the Capitol demonstrators were acquitted by a jury trial.

Of 7,800 charges filed against Mayday demonstrators, only a few hundred remain to be settled. Fewer than 200 have resulted in convictions. □

How to subscribe

If you'd rather not cut up this issue by using the subscription blank . . .

Put 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 _____

Teachers' Union Shows Opposition to War

The national convention of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), meeting in San Francisco August 16-20, demonstrated the breadth of antiwar sentiment within the U. S. labor movement.

Despite the opposition of the leadership of the 250,000-member union, the convention nearly passed a resolution demanding the immediate withdrawal of U. S. forces from Indochina and calling on the AFT to support the antiwar demonstrations scheduled for this fall.

In the September 10 issue of the revolutionary-socialist weekly *The Militant*, Jeff Mackler described the background to the vote:

"The war in Indochina occupied a full day of debate. Prior to this convention, the AFT leadership had defeated all efforts aimed at putting the national AFT on record against the war. But evidence of mounting antiwar sentiment among teachers, indicated that the leadership could no longer maintain this position. The Chicago local, for example, which represents some 25,000 teachers and is the second largest AFT local in the country, recently passed an immediate-withdrawal referendum by a three-to-one margin."

To the immediate-withdrawal resolution, the AFT leadership counterposed a motion calling for a nation-

al referendum on the union's position.

"In a dramatic standing count," Mackler reported, "the immediate-withdrawal resolution lost by one vote, 397-396. After a requested roll-call vote, the final result was announced: 1,648 for immediate withdrawal and 1,880 against. This left only the resolution calling for a referendum on the floor to be voted on, but it too was defeated.

"When the roll-call vote was analyzed, it was revealed that more than 75 percent of the 241 locals voting supported the immediate-withdrawal position. What was even more revealing was that the Chicago delegation had cast its entire allotment of 209 votes against immediate withdrawal despite the referendum in its own local in favor of the immediate-withdrawal position. Had the Chicago delegates followed their mandate, the immediate-withdrawal position would have carried by almost 200 votes." □

A Key Question for Irish Revolutionists

An Alternative Assembly for Northern Ireland?

By Gerry Foley

"Jack Lynch has now crossed the Rubicon," the moderate Dublin fortnightly *Hibernia* said in its August 27 issue. "He has pledged his support for a policy of passive resistance designed to bring down the Stormont [Belfast] regime. He is willing to participate in 'political action' aimed at 'bringing to an end' the elected administration North of the border. Where exactly this policy will lead his administration—and the country—is of course difficult to foresee. Passive resistance leads to confrontation which inevitably leads to violence. Where will Jack Lynch stand then? He is launched now, however cautiously, on an adventure in uncharted areas, and at a time when emotion is running high. But is he the skipper for such a perilous voyage or will the strong men in the crew take over when the going gets really rough?"

The August 27 *Hibernia* in fact had not been on the stands long before Lynch was given another powerful push into "uncharted areas." On August 29 two British armored cars crossed the border at Crossmaglen,

penetrating into the Twenty-Six Counties [Dublin-ruled territory]. The British government estimated the depth of the incursion at only a hundred yards; Irish officials and local eyewitnesses, at one mile.

A clash occurred between the armored unit and a crowd of civilians, as well as an unidentified commando group. One soldier was shot dead. There were conflicting accounts of the incident. According to a cable from Bernard Weinraub in the September 1 *New York Times*, some young men in the area parked their automobiles around the two armored cars on the country road and boxed them in.

Then: "A growing crowd of youths poured buckets of water over the army vehicles, attempting to soak the engines. They let the air out of the tires, and finally began setting fire to the cars."

The soldiers threatened to fire on the crowd, which quickly retreated. Then, according to Weinraub, "as many as 50 armed men, hiding in the bushes" began shooting at the armored cars.

Irish officials claimed that the shooting did not begin until the armored cars had returned across the border. According to the British army press release, gunfire came from both sides of the border. The August 30 *Irish Times* reported that six armed men attacked the armored unit and exchanged fire with it across the border. According to this report also, an Irish army unit watched the battle without intervening.

In the wake of this incident, Lynch sent his strongest note yet to London, referring to thirty violations of the border by British troops in the last two years. Although such occurrences had been reported in the Irish press, Dublin had generally kept rather quiet about them. Thus, Lynch's statement that "a strong complaint" had been conveyed to the British authorities "about their failure to control movements of their troops in border areas which could be prejudicial to the peace" seemed to mark a sharp increase in tensions.

It was evident that the weak, neo-colonialist Dublin regime was re-

sponding reluctantly to irresistible pressures. Despite the sharp public exchanges between Dublin and London over Lynch's threat to support the campaign of civil disobedience in the North, the actual support he was prepared to offer seemed little more than a few gestures. On August 23 he met with the representatives of the Catholic community who have withdrawn from the Stormont parliament. The communiqué issued after this discussion was extremely vague. Its most substantive points were as follows:

"It was agreed that all should work toward the objective of obtaining equality of treatment for everyone in Northern Ireland irrespective of political views or religion and that in stating this immediate objective there is no departure from the intention of the great majority of Irish people to achieve the unification of Ireland. It was also agreed that this objective should be pursued by non-violent political means.

"The current situation in the North was examined in depth and it was agreed to have regular consultations. The Taoiseach [premier] indicated that the Government acknowledged the role of the Northern Opposition members as the principal representative body of the non-Unionist community."

Hibernia commented: "The outcome of the much publicised meeting of August 23 in Government Buildings, which included 15 Stormont opposition M.P.s and senators and senior members of the cabinet (with the notable exception of Erskine Childers) shows that the Taoiseach hopes to move cautiously. He will not give financial support. Nor will he provide active leadership. Rather does he propose to confine the Southern participation to moral support and diplomatic activity."

The August 23 meeting was the outcome of the escalation of the conflict in Northern Ireland that began with a series of British attacks on the nationalist population in early July and was catapulted to a new and explosive stage by the mass arrests and pogroms in the nationalist communities August 9.

The moderate Catholic politicians threatened to walk out of parliament unless the British authorities made an official inquiry into the deaths of two men shot by troops in the Derry City ghetto at the start of July. When the imperialist government refused to

make even this formal gesture to maintain the credibility of the moderates in the nationalist community, the Catholic parliamentarians were left with no choice but to carry out their threat—much to the consternation of Dublin.

"The decision of the S.D.L.P. [Social Democratic and Labour party, a coalition of the old clerical Nationalists and Independents and Labourites representing Catholic constituencies] to withdraw from Stormont and to establish an alternative assembly has been received by all parties in Dublin with reserve and some anxiety . . ." the political correspondent of the *Irish Times* wrote in the July 17 issue of the Dublin daily.

"It is now realised also that, combined with the direct appeal to Britain of the Taoiseach [for a commitment to reunification of Ireland] on July 11th, the S.D.L.P. action now places Nationalist—or Catholic—Ireland into one sectarian camp, with all the consequences which that has. . . .

"While official policy has not been made public it is known that the S.D.L.P. move is viewed as one of near despair. . . . Some people also look at the move as an effort to wrest political leadership from the Republicans [the revolutionary nationalists]."

In a statement August 12, Lynch again indicated that the action of the SDLP was a desperate move, a desperate gamble taken in response to crushing pressures. The August 13 *Irish Times* reported:

"The Northern Government, Mr. Lynch emphasised, was not a Government in any Democratic sense. It had no Opposition. The Opposition had been driven out of Stormont: 'You know many of them, men of moderation . . . They have been driven out.'"

The August 27 issue of *Hibernia* reported how the Northern Catholic establishment had been pushed into sharper confrontation with the British imperialists and their allies by the explosion that followed the internment of anti-Unionist militants.

"Since there was no other political card to be played, the S.D.L.P. had to devise new non-political tactics. Their initial tactic was to issue a call for withdrawal from public life and indeed from employment in the public service. The response was mixed. Local government representatives, both S.D.L.P. and others, quickly indicated their support for such a withdrawal. Roy Bradford [a member of

the Unionist cabinet] on television however pointed out gleefully that there had been practically no response from other public figures or public servants. The sacrifice it seemed was too much to ask.

"Meanwhile however spontaneous demands at local level were being made for rent and rates strikes. The S.D.L.P. supported these moves but gave no clear indication of what procedure they supported and in the ensuing confusion there was considerable doubt about the effectiveness of the tactic."

The decisive push came when British troops brutally dispersed a nonviolent demonstration in Derry City August 18 led by John Hume and Ivan Cooper, the leading moderate spokesmen of the Catholic community. Then, the conservative Catholic leaders had no choice but to "launch" themselves, like Lynch, "on an adventure in uncharted areas." On August 19 the Catholic officials in Derry resigned, including the chairman of the local police committee.

"Such men are not reckless anarchists or bomb-toting gunmen," *Hibernia* commented. "They represent the Catholic Establishment of the North West and they are now solidly behind the S.D.L.P."

Despite the evident discomfiture of the conservative Catholics, the left forces seemed to discount the importance of the shift or to regard it as an attempt pure and simple to co-opt the resistance movement in the nationalist community and direct it into conservative channels.

In a statement quoted in the July 20 *Irish Times*, the official Sinn Féin said that the "withdrawal of the S.D.L.P. from Stormont shows the complete bankruptcy of that party. . . . It has the insolence to call for an alternative assembly when it has done nothing to build the necessary base for such an assembly."

By this assertion, Sinn Féin apparently meant that the SDLP had not mobilized people in action at the grass-roots level. The Republicans did not seem to consider the possibility that once the conservative leaders were driven from the parliamentary arena they might be compelled to seek wider and more active support, be compelled to make their alternative assembly more representative of the struggling nationalist communities.

Sinn Féin expressed the view that

the alternative assembly would have little authority, saying that if it ever materialized, it would become a "rump Roman Catholic group, sitting in the wilds and ignored by everybody, especially by the Roman Catholic section of the Northern community."

In the same statement, Sinn Féin said: "If Stormont was normalised and democratised, pressure could be brought on it to oppose the E. E. C. [Common Market membership for Ireland] which is the most important issue to face the Irish people since the Treaty [the Anglo-Irish agreement that ended the 1919-21 war of independence]."

The Communist party gave guarded support to the SDLP boycott, saying: "Such a step could bring the people of Northern Ireland along the road proposed by the Communist Party programme in 1962, when the call was made for a 'Progressive Government' at Stormont. To carry this out, and to ensure the success of an alternative Government, there must be established the widest alliance of all the forces opposed to Unionism on the political and trade union front, allied to the mass organisations of the people which have proved themselves in struggle over the past decade in defence of the ordinary people. An alternative assembly or Government must have a united leadership and a common programme of action. The latter must correspond to the immediate needs of the moment and also provide the platform for the advances that have to be made on the fundamental issues facing the whole country. Such must be the perspective—not a 'Catholic' assembly as counterpoised to a 'Protestant Parliament.'"

After the August 9 explosion, the Republican position on the alternative assembly seemed to become less clear. In a special broadsheet published after the outbreak of the crisis, the Sinn Féin organ, the *United Irishman*, said: "Opportunists like the SDLP must not be allowed to assume a leadership on the backs of interned men. They must be forced to accept the discipline of the mass movement of the CRA [Civil Rights Association], for only by such mass involvement of the people through a rent and rates strike to hit the pockets of the Unionist overlords and through street demonstrations to apply political pressure and expose the failure of internment as a policy to curb the people can

we hope to be in a position to prevent a final sell-out by Jack Lynch or by the Haughey/Blaney group."

This statement seemed to counterpose the Civil Rights Association to the alternative assembly of the SDLP. In a declaration issued by the Army Council of the IRA in Belfast August 26, the demand was raised for a "caretaker government consisting of representatives of democratic organisations: the trade unions, the civil rights movement, farmers and tenants organisations, etc., nominated from below."

But the SDLP assembly was not categorically condemned. Nor did the Sinn Féin Northern organizer Malachy McGurran condemn it outright in his interview in the August 25 *Irish Times*. His remarks were summarized as follows: "He said that any such assembly as that proposed by the S. D. L. P. must be based on the organisation of the people and that the elected representatives of such groups as trade unions, tenants' associations, civil rights groups—chosen on a Proportional Representation basis—should be involved. The policies and programmes of such an assembly should be related to the needs of the people, and should be seen to be non-sectarian in structure, administration and outlook."

In practice, the left seemed divided about what attitude to take toward the reformist leadership now thrown into confrontation with the imperialist authorities. In the August 24 *Irish Times*, correspondent Dick Walsh wrote: "His [Hume's] successful meeting at Brandywell on Saturday [August 21] was attended by about 5,000, mostly middle-class and impeccably behaved, thus reminding observers of the halcyon days of the Civil Rights Movement in 1968.

"But there was absent from that meeting the radical element which has, so often before, offered tougher leadership to Bogside and Creggan and more detailed analysis of the Northern Revolt. While the meeting celebrated Mr. Hume's renewed strength, members of People's Democracy, Derry Labour Party, Young Socialists and the Official Republican Movement were considering what approach they should adopt to the alternative assembly proposed by the S. D. L. P. and the Provisional I. R. A. [the Provisionals have presented a plan different from that of the SDLP]. They dis-

agreed, according to reports, about the S. D. L. P. proposal."

The Strabane Young Socialists categorically opposed the idea: "We believe that this assembly is simply a Catholic Parliament and can only develop on these lines. As socialists, we believe that the problems of Ireland, North and South, can only be solved by a united working-class and the creation of a 32-county, socialist, workers' republic. . . .

"We believe the middle-class leaders of this alternative assembly will use it only as a lever in their struggle for power and the opportunity to exploit more effectively the working-class, both North and South."

Eamon McCann, who has been the most influential figure on the left in Derry City, seemed to support this position. He told *Irish Times* reporter Donal Musgrave (August 17): "It is clear that the Fianna Fail strategy is to co-opt the resistance movement in the North and we see that as the greatest danger of the immediate future."

Thus, although the evidence is still far from complete, there are grounds to fear that the left in Ireland is still suffering from the principal weakness it demonstrated in the period of the civil-rights marches leading up to the ghetto explosions of 1969—failure to understand the inexorable logic of the national struggle in Ireland, and along with that, a narrow economic concept of class struggle.

The militant groups that provided the leadership of the Civil Rights Association seemed to have viewed this movement as a step toward building a popular force that would quickly draw the poorer strata of the Protestant population into a united struggle with the Catholics against the Unionist regime. Some hoped that the example of militant agitation would catch on rapidly with the Protestants; others that the movement could win democratic rights necessary for carrying on political and organizational work to win both communities to radical ideas. All were taken by surprise and disappointed by the actual results.

What the Civil Rights movement actually represented, it quickly became clear, was a united front of the Catholic population led by militant fighters. In direct confrontations with the Unionist authorities—which were and are supported to one degree or another by the overwhelming majority of Protestants—the Civil Rights move-

ment propelled the nationally oppressed Catholic community into violent struggle against Unionism itself—that is, into a national revolution. At the same time, it provoked a violent counterrevolutionary response from the Protestants.

Young socialists who wanted to lead a united working-class movement found themselves talking to exclusively Catholic crowds, which they berated for their anti-Protestant feelings. On the other hand, those who saw the civil-rights struggle as a way of democratizing the six-county state were surprised by the sudden outbreak of virtual civil war and the rise of repression and the threat of fascism.

The most consistent of those who sought to unite Protestant and Catholic workers by economic demands, Eamon McCann, reacted to this polarization by trying to turn the Civil Rights Association into an unimpeachably proletarian movement. Repeatedly he posed ultimatums to the movement designed to drive out the "green Tories." Ultimately he and those influenced by him came to regard the civil-rights movement as intrinsically reactionary because it "alienated the Protestant workers."

McCann's attitude was resisted by the official republicans, who were the major organized force in the movement. But they did not pose a clear alternative. They also apparently feared that a purely Catholic movement could be co-opted by the conservatives and the Dublin government.

Because of the IRA's lack of a political program or concrete political analysis, the movement had in fact been co-opted and used by Fianna Fáil in the 1930s and, as a result, virtually destroyed. Realization of this fact played an important role in the turn of the IRA leadership toward Marxism.

Furthermore, a wing of the Southern bourgeoisie had used nationalist and militarist demagoguery to break off a section of the republican movement, the group that formed the leadership of the Provisionals.

In response to this challenge, some leaders of the republican movement tended to counterpose a specifically socialist perspective to a nationalist one. In his speech at Bodinstown June 20, Malachy McGurran denounced the Provisionals for calling "for an alliance with gombeenmen [Catholic petty capitalists] and landlords for a 'green flag' republic."

The Army Council statement of August 26 seemed to reiterate the fear that a movement purely Catholic or 'sectarian' in composition would be counterrevolutionary.

I saw this line tested on the streets of Derry in August 1970 and it failed miserably. The crowds of youth on the streets simply could not see the revolutionary potential in the Protestant workers that McCann and the Derry republicans under his influence continually pointed to, or they saw it as too remote a perspective.

The Irish situation is peculiar but it is not unique. Similar cases have been seen in other countries. The Protestants as a whole are a privileged caste imbued with a caste mentality and thus conservative. They react to any mobilization of the more oppressed Catholics as a threat.

The fact that the difference in the living standard of Catholic and Protestant workers may be small does not change this, any more than similar conditions have made the poor whites in the American South the allies of the Black movement. In reality the struggle of the Blacks in America has produced the same polarization along caste lines as the civil-rights struggle in Northern Ireland. This is a normal stage in the process of radicalization. The most oppressed layers begin to struggle first, and they may have to fight for a time against the relatively better off and more conservative layers of the working class itself.

Even in revolutionary situations, there has not yet been a case in which all sectors have joined in the struggle before the defeat of the capitalist regime. In some instances where a caste mentality was deeply ingrained, as in the case of the Cossacks in Russia, popular sectors have put up prolonged resistance to revolutionary change.

Most importantly, not an inch of progress toward revolution can be gained by trying to hold back the oppressed strata once they begin to move, by trying to force a national struggle into "more progressive" economic channels. In particular, it is unlikely at this point that anyone can persuade the desperate and cruelly oppressed ghetto dwellers in Northern Ireland to put off hope of liberation until the success of some projected campaign of economic agitation or until the appearance of their long-promised Protestant allies.

It is important also for the Irish

left to grasp the change in the character of the struggle brought about by the entry of the broadest and relatively backward masses of Northern Catholics. The influence of John Hume and other conservative and moderate Catholic leaders is bound to be strong in these strata.

To think otherwise would be to misunderstand the way the bourgeoisie exercises control over society. Its rule is supported by the press, the institutions of society, and traditional education and training, as well as by its overwhelming financial and material resources. If the bourgeois politicians and political apparatuses are not present in day-to-day economic and social agitation, that does not mean that they cannot suddenly become a powerful, if not decisive, factor in a conflict where their interests are threatened.

In the beginning of deepgoing popular struggles, it is virtually inevitable that large sections of the masses will not have thrown off bourgeois influences, will still look to the bourgeoisie in some degree for leadership. If this were not so, the task of socialists would be a simple one of propaganda and routine agitational activity.

In reality, this task is much more complicated. A revolutionary leadership must know how to show the masses by their own experience that their bourgeois leaders cannot lead them to victory. At the outset of deep social crises, every revolutionary organization in history has been confronted with the problem of winning the leadership of the masses away from bourgeois or reformist forces. When existing conservative organizations, or new opportunist groups thrown up by crises, try to take the lead of popular struggles, this does not simply represent an attempt to head off revolutionary leaderships. To think this would be dogmatism of the worst kind. These groups are subject to conflicting pressures and can be thrown into "perilous voyages" whose destinations they cannot determine. If that were not so, given the normally overwhelming power of the bourgeoisie, revolutions would be impossible.

The most successful revolutionary leadership to date, the Bolshevik party, was distinguished by its flexibility and realism in facing the problem of dealing with opportunist forces. The tactic they used to remove this road block was "critical support." That they recognized the actual authority

the opportunist-led Provisional Government and soviets had over the masses. They did not simply counterpose their own "purer" organizational forms to these and "denounce" the opportunists, trying to keep their followers away from contamination. The Bolsheviks called on the existing, *real* leadership of the masses to act consistently in the interests of the masses they led.

For example, Lenin and Trotsky called on the Kerensky government to make peace, since it had come to power through a rebellion against the war. But since the regime remained under the control of Western capital, which was locked in a bitter conflict with its mid-European rivals, Kerensky could not do this.

The Bolsheviks called on the soviets, which represented the people directly, to assume the role of the government. The opportunists who controlled these organs, however, could not do this. Like all opportunists they lived by balancing between the masses and the fundamentally conservative forces in society. They could not act in a way that would cut them off from their conservative supporters.

The indigenous bourgeoisie in imperialist-dominated countries also balances between the fundamental conservative force, that is, the imperialist overlords, and the masses of people. Both the Northern Catholic establishment and the Dublin government are alike in this sense. Both exercise authority in the name of a nationally oppressed people and can be forced at times to represent the interests of the people in fairly sharp confrontations with imperialism.

The failure of the IRA in the 1930s was not simply that it failed to denounce De Valera hard enough and to keep its supporters from backing Fianna Fáil on the political front. The failure of the IRA was that it had no scientific understanding of society. It did not understand the dynamic of a phenomenon like Fianna Fáil; it did not understand the limits within which an opportunist "nationalist" party could respond—and not respond—to the pressures of the nationalist people. That is, the IRA did not understand the pressures that were at work in society and how to take advantage of them. Such an understanding is, among other things, essential for using the tactic of critical support successfully. You must know

what an opportunist leadership can and cannot do and the *real* direction in which the masses are moving.

In the Irish case, this means two things. First: The fighting capacity of the Northern Catholic establishment and the Southern bourgeoisie is extremely limited. It can expect nothing from a head-on collision with British imperialism but total ruin. Secondly: The struggle of the Irish people is essentially a national one and is taking this form more and more clearly.

But the indigenous bourgeoisie has no interest in a national revolution; no section of the Catholic bourgeoisie has the capacity for carrying out such a struggle. Only the workers and the poor strata have the capacity for such a struggle. Since they will have to wage this fight independently in the last analysis, the battle will be for national liberation and socialism at the same time.

When the working class and the poor strata fight by and for themselves, they must inevitably fight for socialism. That is what socialism is, the workers acting by and for themselves. Otherwise it would be only a utopian scheme.

Since the struggle in Ireland is developing along national lines, it is almost inevitable, because of long historical conditioning, that the polarization between Catholic and Protestant will increase. And if the present crisis continues to deepen, it will bring the nationalist population of the entire island in conflict with imperialism and its allies, which for the present and some time to come means the Protestants.

However reactionary the ideas of Catholicism, however reactionary its institutions, the Catholic population of Ireland is not oppressing anyone, it is not the accomplice in any oppression. It is inevitable that the conservative or backward elements will try to give the conflict a religious character, to reinforce the authority of the traditional institutions or simply by way of provocations. But this runs diametrically counter to the direction of the Catholic, nationalist people struggling for liberation, a struggle that these conservatives cannot lead and which represents a mortal threat to them.

Fears of "sectarianism," of "Catholic parliaments," of the Dublin government co-opting the struggle betray a lack of confidence in the nationalist

people, an attempt to hold back their struggle and direct it into "more progressive" channels. Perhaps this is why the republican proposal for an assembly of democratic organizations convened by the CRA seems so unreal. Is the CRA a mass organization in reality when it has been unable for two years to conduct any mass actions, except one march in a remote town?

What are the democratic organizations that represent the "wee boys" who have fought the British troops in the streets with stones and bottles for years? Are they the unions? When 30 percent of the male population of the Bogside are unemployed? The Gaelic League perhaps? What about the Derry Labour party and the Derry republican club? They each had about five activists when I was in Ireland last summer. Have they been transformed since? Become mass organizations? How many politically unaffiliated people are really involved in tenant associations? Will they accept political leadership from such formations?

In America, those who have feared independent struggles by the most oppressed strata, "Black racism," for instance, have been dyed-in-the-wool dogmatists or else fundamentally conservative. That is not the case with the Irish republicans. Their revolutionary instincts and dedication are beyond question. Whatever mistakes they make are due to the rigors of living in a brutally oppressed country or the confusion caused by the complex ups and downs of a long-isolated struggle.

The official republicans have done much to develop the socialist implications of the long history of Irish nationalism. They have only to look a little deeper into their tradition and listen a little more intently to the voice of the risen people. What it says, loudly enough to be heard across the Atlantic, I think, if not around the world, is that anyone who fights consistently and without compromise for Ireland fights for socialism and for humanity.

Doctors Drum Up New Business

The Associated Press reported recently that one source of water pollution in Lago Maggiore, a Swiss lake, was discovered when skin divers saw surgeons from a local hospital dumping human intestines into the water.

Last Hours of Torres Regime

"On Saturday morning [August 21] Luis Reque Terán—who, twenty-four hours earlier when the Colegio Militar [Military Academy] mutinied, had gone to the palace to confirm his 'absolute loyalty' to Torres—visited the president to demand his resignation," Ernesto González Bermejo writes in the August 27 issue of the Montevideo weekly *Marcha*.

González Bermejo continues: "Torres ordered Reque Terán arrested, and Rubén Sánchez [commander of the presidential guard regiment, the Colorados] told him—'It is we who are giving an ultimatum to the fascists.'"

At this very moment, however, the rightist officers were backed by all the military units in the rest of the country and the troops in the capital were going over to the rebels.

The main hope of the loyal forces and the popular resistance, according to González Bermejo, was to capture the arsenals in the Colegio Militar and the Gran Cuartel [Central Military Headquarters]. At this point, according to the Uruguayan journalist, the Torres government had no weapons with which to arm the people.

"For the moment the 'Colorados' had to fight alone. The people had hardly any weapons.

"The bloody afternoon began to race by. The cadet 'Castrillo' regiment defended itself as best it could, but it was forced to give way.

"The small but strategic Laikakota hill had been taken by the fascists. From this height they could dominate all of Miraflores. Foot by foot the hill was retaken by the revolutionists—despite three or four ineffective passes by the traitor air force."

The Cuban weekly *Bohemia* (August 27) wrote: "Major Sánchez took to the microphones of the Revolutionary Radio network and announced: 'The Miraflores headquarters, where the Castrillo regiment is located, is totally surrounded. I appeal to the people to have confidence in their regiment [i.e., the Colorados]. We will die side by side with you workers.'

"It was 2:30. At 3:40 dynamite explosions could be heard at various

points in the capital. Shots and intermittent volleys. . . . Again Major Rubén Sánchez came on the radio: 'The order has been given for an attack on the general army headquarters under the command of President Torres. First soften up the objective with supporting fire. Next, an attack in regular order. Thank you, until the victory.'

"Students and workers flung themselves against the general headquarters of the Miraflores regiment and Laikakota hill, where the soldiers of the Castrillo regiment were holding out."

González Bermejo picks up the story: "By 8:00 at night the revolutionists had climbed a bloody road to the top of Laikakota hill.

"The Castrillo regiment was on the retreat, appealing for immediate reinforcements. The Gran Cuartel was on the verge of being taken. 'The victory of the revolution is near and will be won more easily with the participation of all the people,' Torres said in a radio broadcast."

But then, "an incredible thing happened. Luis Reque Terán was released, it must be assumed, with Torres's consent."

Shortly after that, the Tarapacá regiment, which had been specifically built up as a bulwark of the regime, went over to the side of the rebels. From the El Alto military base on the slopes overlooking La Paz, its seven tanks advanced toward the presidential palace, covering the distance in half an hour.

"Something happened," reports González Bermejo. "Either the maneuver was too rapid, or the revolutionary forces were not sufficiently on their guard and prepared to stop the tanks in Vunaipata or Villa Victoria, the working-class areas that were victorious in the 1952 revolution. The road was not blown up, no barricades were erected, there were no attacks with Molotov cocktails.

"The tanks passed without any difficulty, without firing once until they reached the city. Then they began firing intimidating cannon shots.

"Torres had left the palace a quarter of an hour before for an unknown destination. A lieutenant and six soldiers remained.

"When the armored unit arrived at nine in the evening, it encountered no resistance.

"Seven tanks carefully preserved since the second world war decided the fate of the country."

Bohemia's account continues: "At 8:45 the president left the Palacio de Gobierno [Government Palace] with his escort, saying that he was going to join the Colorado regiment. He was accompanied by the ministers of foreign affairs and defense.

"At the same time, the loyal radio station appealed to the people to stop the armored cars of the Tarapacá regiment from entering the city, to intercept them with Molotov cocktails.

"At 9:00 the Revolutionary network went off the air. The armored cars appeared in the Plaza Murillo. The soldiers and officers who remained in the Palacio Quemado [the official name of the government palace] left.

"The men of the armored unit seized the building.

"At 10:00 a new station, Radio Nacionalista [Nationalist Radio], came on the air, announcing the fall of Torres. But it admitted that the Colorado regiment, supported by the Ejército de Liberación Nacional [National Liberation Army—the guerrilla force led by Che Guevara in 1967], was still holding out on the surrounding hills.

"At 11:00 p.m. fascist groups managed to take the university, ending a bloody battle that lasted for many hours. . . .

"Beginning early in the morning of August 22, armed members of the MNR [Movimiento Nacionalista Revolucionario—Revolutionary Nationalist Movement] and the Falange patrolled the streets, taking prisoners at will. . . .

"Fascist gangs were scouring the city for revolutionists, invading the offices of the leftist parties, the unions, the student associations, and the homes of revolutionary journalists. . . .

"General Luis Reque Terán turned up as the commander of the troops guarding the central areas of the city. Inexplicably the revolutionists themselves had released him after he had been captured. Today he is an important figure in the new regime, just as he was in the old." □

Bengali Refugee Total Could Reach 15,000,000

With appropriate fanfare, the Nixon administration on August 27 announced that the Yahya Khan regime in Pakistan had "been trying to develop new criteria for development programs."

State Department spokesman Robert J. McCloskey went on to explain the significance of the claim:

"I myself and perhaps others have said that when they do that the United States stands ready to continue economic assistance within whatever limits are appropriate for us. The President said roughly that in his last press conference. . . .

"For the future, we look forward to resuming our support for what was a promising development effort prior to events in March, but that [sic] we could only do so in the context of a revised national development plan covering both East and West Pakistan."

McCloskey's remarks were a rather transparent attempt to create a justification for U.S. financial aid to the Pakistani dictator in his war against the people of Bangla Desh. Yahya himself appeared to be yielding to the view that token concessions ought to be made to world public opinion. During the first week of September, he took two steps designed to make it easier for Nixon to claim that a measure of normality had been restored in East Bengal.

On September 1, Yahya appointed a civilian, Dr. A.M. Malik, to replace General Tikka Khan as governor of the occupied province. The change at the top did not signify any change in the war being waged against the Bengali people, but it will undoubtedly be cited before the U.S. Congress as justifying economic aid to Yahya.

Yahya followed this up on September 5 by proclaiming an "amnesty" for most Bengali survivors of the army's attacks. The amnesty was not extended to Sheikh Mujibur Rahman or the hundreds of other officials of the Awami League who have been charged by Yahya with an assortment of crimes.

However, on September 4 a "highly placed source" told the *New York Times* that Rahman's secret trial be-

fore a military court had been temporarily adjourned.

The proclamation of an amnesty was in keeping with past attempts to persuade the world that nothing but baseless fears and Indian interference prevent the return of Bengali refugees to their homes.

The number of refugees who have crossed the border into India is now 8,250,000 and may soon reach 10,000,000, according to the Indian minister of labor, the September 1 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde* reported. After what they have experienced at the hands of Yahya's army, it will take considerably more than proclamations to persuade them to return peacefully—particularly since the genocidal war is still going on. After touring the border areas and talking with refugees, Harji Malik wrote in the August 28 *Far Eastern Economic Review*:

"And still the atrocities continue with a brutality, almost unbelievable, almost perverted. Eyewitnesses reported seeing three bodies, naked young women, lying along the road-side near the border just a few days before. They had been raped and killed, one of them shot through the female organs. Others tell of women raped and bayoneted in the same way. A Bangla Desh doctor described West Pakistan soldiers ripping open the stomach of pregnant women, pulling out the unborn bodies, and holding them in the air while they forced the people to shout: 'Long live Bengal.' A young Bengali Pakistan air force officer, who has deserted to India, cried during his interrogation, unable to continue his recital of atrocities he had witnessed. As a foreign journalist commented: 'There is something sick in these people.' But comment is inadequate."

In an accompanying article, Malik described the insuperable problems the tide of refugees has created for the Indian government.

"In [West] Bengal each refugee receives 800 grammes [28 ounces] a day of foodstuffs, cereals, vegetables and pulses, with a small cash payment for extras. This costs the government one rupee [7.5 rupees equal

US\$1] a day. Rations elsewhere are approximately the same. This is a minimal amount, but the government cannot afford even this, and already there is resentment because millions of Indians live on less."

Because of the army's offensive, normal harvesting and planting of crops in East Bengal have not occurred, and famine is imminent, Malik reported. The number of refugees could rise to 15,000,000 within a few months.

"Care of the present numbers of 'evacuees'—as the Indian government insists on calling them officially—is achieved at the cost of Indian development. Even normal programmes in fields such as education, health, family planning are suffering. If the number of refugees remains fairly static, which is highly unlikely, the total expenditure on them for this financial year will be at least 20% of the entire Indian budget. The refugees have already been here five months, and so far only a tiny handful have gone back. India is already drawing on its foodstocks, especially rice, to meet their needs. The economy has been seriously disrupted and the five-year plan will inevitably be affected."

The Indian government, Malik wrote, has prevented major explosions in the Indian population only by maintaining the fiction that the refugees will be able to return to East Bengal within six months.

"If the refugees keep coming," he warned, "and if there is no way for them to return, war—even with the calming influence of the Indo-Soviet security treaty—may become India's only way to solve its dilemma." □

The Statesman

In a speech to the ultrarightist Young Americans for Freedom September 5, California Governor Ronald Reagan indicated that he's not worried by Nixon's planned trip to Peking:

"He hasn't said he's going to desert any of our friends. . . . This American President who is going to China is the same man who, as Vice President, stood in the glare of television lights and told Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev if he and his Russians tried any rough stuff with America, we'd kick the hell out of them."

Dominicans to Protest in Washington Over Terror

Although the Joaquín Balaguer government continues to formally deny the existence of police-sponsored rightist armed squads known as La Banda (the Gang or Band), reports appear almost daily of kidnappings, beatings, tortures, and murders of members and supporters of leftist organizations in the Dominican Republic.

Prominent among the targets is the Dominican Revolutionary party (Partido Revolucionario Dominicano—PRD), headed by former President Juan Bosch. The PRD denounced the officially tolerated "climate of criminal disorder" in a statement issued August 19 over Bosch's signature.

The PRD statement, summarized in the August 20 issue of the Santo Domingo daily *El Caribe*, declared that the nation is being "lashed by assassinations, absolutely illegal jailings, criminal charges made against working people to conceal political persecutions, disappearances followed by appearance of mutilated bodies, and persecutions and threats against citizens who are not breaking the law." The statement also noted the phenomena of "deportations and denials of entry into the national territory without the sanction of any law, and the intensification of the activities of a group of thugs acting under official protection."

Another PRD leader, José Francisco Peña Gómez, announced on August 24 that he will lead a September protest march on the United States Capitol to protest U.S. complicity in the terrorist attacks.

The demonstration's demands, as reported in *El Caribe* on August 25, will include "withdrawal of the U.S. police mission from the Dominican Republic; support of notables and the U.S. people for the struggle we are waging against the terror; condemnation of the North American police and military missions set up as a result of the 1965 military invasion; repudiation of the activities that 'the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) carries out in the Dominican Republic'; and rejection 'of political continuism.'"

A simultaneous demonstration will



JUAN BOSCH

take place at the Dominican embassy in Washington, Peña declared.

The terror has become so severe that reports are beginning to appear in U.S. publications that usually refrain from mentioning a phenomenon whose existence the Balaguer government continues to deny.

On August 28, the *New York Times* published a Santo Domingo dispatch from correspondent Alan Riding reporting that "some diplomatic and local political sources" insist the terror is real.

"At least 50 leftists have reportedly been murdered and many more jailed, beaten or harassed since the formation in April of an anti-Communist terror organization known as the Band," Riding noted.

According to his sources, there is "overwhelming evidence of the Band's existence as an organization formed and armed by the police specifically

to repress the extreme left and terrorize other opponents of the government.

"They said that the organization's members are often accompanied by policemen on their raids and that persons detained by the organization frequently are handed over to the police for questioning. In one recent case, it was reported, a police official was quoted as saying that a missing person was in the hands of the Band 'for punishment.'"

Riding described the Band as "the creation of Maj. Gen. Enrique Pérez y Pérez, who became the national police chief on Jan. 1 with instructions to put an end to the activities of the extreme left that have troubled the Dominican Republic for the last two years.

"Leftist sources," Riding continued, "believe the organization has some 400 members in Santo Domingo under the command of Lieut. Oscar Núñez Peña, a close aide of General Pérez y Pérez. The members are described as mostly strong youths in their late teens or early twenties who wear tight trousers, vests and sneakers and are trained in the use of arms." (See *Intercontinental Press*, July 19, pp. 684-85, for background on the Band and earlier atrocities it committed.)

The *Times* correspondent indicated that "principal targets of the right-wing terrorists have been the Marxist Popular Dominican Movement [Dominican People's Movement—Movimiento Popular Dominicano, or MPD, a "Marxist-Leninist" pro-Peking group], which has a following of several thousand people, and the smaller Maoist Communist party of the Dominican Republic [Partido Comunista de la República Dominicana—PCRD].

"Many of the Band's members have reportedly been recruited from these two groups after their lives have been threatened."

Victims of the most recently reported assassination by the Band were Ascanio Pérez Delgado, a twenty-five-year-old PRD activist, and Danilo Alcántara Magallanes, a seventeen-year old amateur boxer.

The two men were kidnapped on

the evening of August 24 in the Guachupita slum district of Santo Domingo, by three members of the Band, two of whom were known to neighborhood residents by the nicknames "El Chino" and "Fellito," according to the account published August 25 in the Santo Domingo daily *El Nacional de Ahora!*

"The bodies of Pérez Delgado and Alcántara Magallanes were found at about five a.m. today in the first-base dugout of Juan Pablo Duarte stadium," the account stated. A total of nine bullets had been fired into the bodies.

The paper added that indiscriminate

raids had been carried out in the same neighborhood by the Band for several days. The apparent aim of such attacks is to intimidate Santo Domingo slum-dwellers, many of whom support the left-wing groups.

"In the past, the police were afraid to enter slums such as Guachupita and Gualay, where large supplies of arms are still held from the civil war in 1965," according to the August 28 *New York Times* dispatch. "But constant raids and arrests by the police and the Band appear to have had an effect on these areas. Many poor people now express fear of the Band."

den said, he had been shot dead by a guard in a tower. When guards returned to the cellblock fifteen minutes later, they found three guards and two prisoners dead, their throats cut, and three guards wounded.

The public was asked to believe that Jackson had accomplished this mayhem at superhuman speed. Reuters reported:

"From the time Jackson entered the cellblock until he came running out it has been estimated that 30 to 40 seconds elapsed." (Emphasis added.)

On August 23, associate warden James W. L. Parks gave reporters a somewhat different story. Wallace Turner reported in the August 24 *New York Times*:

"Mr. Parks gave this account of the affair:

"At 2:35 P.M. Jackson came back to the cellblock and took control of it when the gun was discovered hidden in his hair.

"At 2:50 Sergeant Graham went to the cellblock to get Officer DeLeon. Jackson fired a shot at the guard who opened the cellblock door, and this officer gave the alarm.

"Sergeant Graham was taken to Jackson's cell and murdered by a gunshot in the head," Mr. Parks said. "Graham's body was found on top of the pile of bodies in the cell."

"At 2:55 P.M. Jackson and Larry Spain, 22, a prisoner, ran out the door. Jackson was killed and Spain hid in some shrubbery until guards seized him."

This new version of the events was also contradicted. At a hearing for the surviving Soledad Brothers on August 26, Doris Maxwell, John Cluchette's mother, pointed out that she had visited her son the day Jackson was killed. She checked out of the prison at 2:55—twenty minutes after Jackson allegedly took over the cellblock and five full minutes after a guard had supposedly given the alarm.

At an August 24 hearing, Cluchette charged that Jackson had been murdered in cold blood: "They shot George in the back and then when he wasn't dead, they came up and shot him in the head."

The coroner's report, which Cluchette could not have been aware of when he spoke, confirmed that Jackson had wounds in the head and back, although the coroner attempted to ac-

'Soledad Brother' Shot Down by Guard

Prisoners Say Jackson Was Murdered

"I can tell you exactly what happened," Georgia Jackson, mother of George Jackson, said of her son's death at the hands of prison guards August 21. "They set him up to kill him and they killed him. They'd been trying for 10 1/2 years to do it and they did it."

"They killed him," she added, "and set him out in the yard and photographed him, and then said he tried to escape. . . . There's no way he could have left that room with a gun, because when he takes one step out of that room, they put those chains on his feet and his hands. As soon as they open that door and let him out, the first thing they do is search him."

Jackson, militant Black nationalist and author of *Soledad Brother* (a collection of his prison letters), was killed, San Quentin prison officials claimed, during an unsuccessful escape attempt.

This was denied not only by Jackson's family but by his attorney, John E. Thorne, who was quoted in an August 22 Reuters dispatch as saying, "I cannot conceive of him trying to escape.

"He had a trial facing him in which he was positive his innocence would be established."

[Jackson and two other prisoners—Fleeta Drumgo and John Cluchette—were accused of killing a guard at Soledad Prison in January 1970. The

three "Soledad Brothers" became nationally known in August 1970 when Jackson's seventeen-year-old brother and three other persons were killed outside the San Rafael courthouse. This incident, in which Jonathan Jackson apparently hoped to exchange a judge for his brother's freedom, later led to the charges on which Angela Davis now faces trial. See *Intercontinental Press*, January 18, p. 27.]

The day after the alleged escape attempt, San Quentin warden Louis S. Nelson told reporters that Jackson had been given a pistol by a visitor, later identified as Stephen M. Bingham, a lawyer. The extent to which the authorities believed their own story can be judged from the fact that they waited ten days, until August 31, to bring charges against Bingham.

According to the official version, Jackson hid the pistol—at first described as a .38-caliber, later as a 9-mm. Spanish weapon—in his hair. Later, prison officials declared that Jackson had hidden the pistol under a wig. The change made the story no more plausible, and required one to believe that Jackson had smuggled a wig, in addition to a pistol, past the prison's tight security.

Nelson said that after Jackson was taken back to his cellblock, he had pulled out the pistol, fired at a guard, released the other prisoners, and then tried to escape by running across the prison yard. As Jackson ran, the war-

count for them within the official story. Turner reported in the *New York Times* article quoted earlier:

"Jackson was hit on the top of the head by a rifle bullet that went through the base of his skull, down his back alongside his spine, fracturing a rib and leaving from his lower back."

In the September 3 issue of the revolutionary-socialist weekly *The Militant*, Michael Schreiber wrote from San Francisco that the Soledad Brothers

gave the following account of what happened on August 21:

"According to the prisoners, the events began when 'they [the guards] ordered us from our cells. We refused to leave and then the shotguns were heard. . . .' Silliman [Cluchette's attorney] said that Cluchette told him Jackson ran into the courtyard to draw fire from the other inmates. 'George realized he was the one they wanted,' Silliman said. 'George sacrificed his life by drawing fire.'" □

'Separatist Agitation' Alarms Regime

Repression Widens in Turkey

By J. V. Hanley

The rightist military repression against Turkish political dissidents widened in mid-August with the trial of leading members of the Workers party.

The Workers party was previously the only legal leftist party in Turkey. Although it was divided into several tendencies, it remained influential enough to win fourteen out of 450 seats in the October 1965 National Assembly elections.

The party was "dissolved" July 20 by the Constitutional Court on grounds of its alleged support for the nationalist struggle of the country's Kurdish minority. Most of the party's executive committee had previously been imprisoned. [See *Intercontinental Press*, June 14, p. 546, for details on this and other repressive measures taken against left-wing activists and publications.]

On August 18, an Ankara military tribunal, set up under the state of siege that was declared April 26, began proceedings against Workers party chairwoman Behice Boran and other members of the party's executive committee on charges of being involved in "Communist plots." The leaders were also accused of being active in a movement "tending to impose the domination of one class over another," according to an Agence France-Presse dispatch carried in the August 19 edition of the Paris daily *Le Monde*.

The party denies the government's charges, while defending its position

on the Kurds. Chaban Yildiz, acting chairman of the Workers party in Mrs. Boran's absence, gave an interview to *Le Monde* that was published July 27. "If we have taken a position on this question," he declared, "it is that there exist in the country people—and not only the Kurds—who are treated as second-class citizens. But it is also the case that there is in that region a majority that does not speak Turkish—due to the lack of sufficient schools—and that is thus excluded from our society from birth.

"This situation helps maintain feudalism, and the big bourgeoisie makes sure to take advantage of this. To state that the Kurdish people exist is not to be a separatist, but to acknowledge an existing reality that everyone can see. To cure a sickness, one must first diagnose it. We believe we have done so in the real interest of Turkey," Yildiz concluded.

On August 17 a group of sixty-six students from Hacettepe Medical University in Ankara were brought before another, similar tribunal on grounds of having taken part in resisting a police invasion of campus dormitories on February 19. *Le Monde* reported August 19 that the students involved in the February 19 "riots" were members of Dev Genç [Revolutionary Youth], the country's largest militant youth group, which was one of several organizations banned by the government at the end of May.

Still another tribunal was set up in Istanbul under the state of siege. It

began proceedings August 16 against twenty-seven alleged members of the Turkish People's Liberation Army, a group initiated in part by a faction of Dev Genç. The defendants were accused of complicity in the May kidnapping and murder of Israeli consul Efraim Elrom in Istanbul. Elrom's death was seized by the government as the pretext for its expanded campaign of repression.

Several activists among the thousands arrested or hunted by police have already been sentenced by the military tribunals. An Istanbul court condemned columnist İlhan Selçuk to a year in prison for criticizing the government, according to an Associated Press account published July 7 in the *Christian Science Monitor*. "Oktey Kurtboke, managing editor of the daily Istanbul *Cumhuriyet*, also received a one-year sentence for approving the column's publication," AP reported.

Only piecemeal reports have gotten past Turkish censors to the foreign press thus far on the outcome of other political trials. *Le Monde* reported August 14 that "Yashar Kemal, considered to be a Marxist nationalist, whose arrest was deplored by all government ministers available for comment, was condemned nonetheless to eighteen months in prison for translating a study on socialism by British author Emile Burns."

Six prisoners in Izmir, a major city on the Aegean coast, drew sentences ranging from six months to three years on charges of disseminating "Communist propaganda," according to an Agence France-Presse dispatch appearing in the August 27 *Le Monde*.

It has been reported widely that the government will demand the death penalty for dozens of prisoners accused of membership in the Turkish People's Liberation Army and of plotting violent insurrection.

The "strong regime" under Prime Minister Nihat Erim, which was installed in March under pressure from the army, has been especially anxious to suppress popular unrest in the predominantly Kurdish rural areas.

Reporting from the eastern town of Diyarbakir, *New York Times* correspondent Alfred Friendly, Jr. described the temporary calm imposed on the region through the use of harsh military measures. Friendly, in an article published July 2, summarized the of-

ficial explanation for the government's resort to brute force:

"Explaining the emergency measures here and in the neighboring province of Siirt, Justice Minister Ismail Arar told members of Parliament that separatist agitation among the nation's Kurdish minority in eastern Turkey had raised a grave threat to internal security. His statement was the first official expression of concern about the allegiance of the approximately three million Kurds among Turkey's 36 million people."

Friendly contended that "while there is clearly a Kurdish separatist movement here, it appears to be based on economic and social discontent, not ethnic resentment."

The *Times* reporter noted that "with half the 600,000 inhabitants of Diyarbakir Province without land, with the average annual income here half that of the national level and with giant wheat-harvesting machines doing in five minutes the work that would take a man two days, the number of rural poor is rising. . . .

"The situation was ripe for the agitators from the left,' a conservative landowner remarked. 'The peasants were angry at us and at the Government and ready to listen to extremists from the towns.'"

Besides continuing its supposedly temporary state of siege, the Erim regime is seeking to push through the National Assembly a series of constitutional amendments which would strengthen the executive branch and restrict popular participation in elections.

The most controversial of the proposed constitutional changes is an amendment to Article Eleven, "which envisions the restriction of individual liberties in cases where they are exercised in an effort to 'strike a blow against the indivisibility of the State and the nation,' or to 'provoke conflicts between races, religions, or classes,'" reported *Le Monde* correspondent Ali Kazancigil in an Istanbul dispatch published August 29. This clause is being opposed not only by the left and the labor movement, but also by the large, bourgeois Republican People's party, according to the *Le Monde* account.

The "strong regime" has achieved a surface calm in Turkish politics. Yet the long-term effect of the most recent trials and parliamentary maneuvers,

and of other wholesale arrests and trials perpetrated since February of this year, may be to sharpen opposition to the military regime among broad layers of the proletariat and intelligentsia.

Correspondent Paul Balta, in a lengthy report serialized in *Le Monde* August 13 to 18, reported that the regime's "systematic repression against the left" is having deep repercussions

Vallieres, Others Still Held

Quebec Frame-Up Charges Dropped

[The following article is reprinted from the August 23 issue of *Labor Challenge*, a revolutionary-socialist biweekly published in Toronto.]

* * *

The Québec government has dropped most of the remaining charges laid last fall under the War Measures Act. Thirty-four of the accused received the news August 14 by registered mail—the only formal "announcement" the embarrassed Justice ministry could muster itself to make. The rest was a telling "no comment" from Premier [Robert] Bourassa.

Both Trudeau and Québec Justice Minister [Jérôme] Chôquette were conveniently out of the country. Pressed by reporters' questions, the latter's ministry finally issued a statement saying that the expiry of the Public Order Act made it difficult to continue judicial procedures.

No further charges are pending against three of the leading defendants — Michel Chartrand, Robert Lemieux, and Charles Gagnon. But Pierre Vallières, now seriously ill, still faces a charge of seditious conspiracy and Jacques Larue-Langlois is charged with assault and membership in the Front de Libération du Québec [FLQ — Québec Liberation Front], even though the FLQ is no longer an illegal organization since the expiry of the Public Order Act.

The withdrawal of charges marks a further victory for the mass movement in both Québec and English Canada that developed in opposition to these witch-hunt trials and the Trudeau government's repressive legislation.

on sectors of the population beyond the activists of Dev Genç and the Turkish People's Liberation Army.

The repression "is hitting the leftists and anyone who supported their causes, be they teachers, writers, journalists, students, workers, or leaders of the trade unions or the Workers party, who had nothing in common with the terrorists and who rejected the latter's methods," Balta declared. □

The governments concerned have been utterly incapable of sustaining their claims of "apprehended insurrection" last October. Five hundred were arrested, but most of them were later released. All five of fourteen persons charged with seditious offenses who have come to trial have been acquitted. Six of the seven persons tried for membership in the FLQ have been acquitted.

As defense lawyer Bernard Mergler stated, "Probably in every single one of the cases that has been dropped the accused would have been acquitted."

The Citizens' Commission of Inquiry into the War Measures Act, slated to hold its first press conference in Ottawa August 19, now has before it the most damning indictment of all — the evidence of judicial conspiracy against democratic rights by Ottawa and Québec City.

The slate is not yet clean. What about Côme Leblanc, behind bars for "promoting the aims of the FLQ" (he distributed leaflets outside a high school)? And François Mercier who was jailed in Granby for "membership in the FLQ"? What about the jail sentences for "contempt of court" meted out to Michel Chartrand and Jean Boisjoly when they protested the unjust proceedings?

The sentences against Leblanc and Mercier must be revoked. The contempt sentences must be reversed.

Drop all proceedings against Larue-Langlois and Vallières. Compensate all those accused under this frame-up legislation. Reveal the truth about the real conspiracy behind the October crisis — the conspiracy of Trudeau and Bourassa. □

Counterrevolution in the Sudan

By Jon Rothschild

On August 5 the Sudanese newspaper *Al-Sahafa* reported that a high-level Sudanese government team would visit China in the near future to discuss ways of improving relations between the two countries.

On August 23, Sudan foreign minister Mansour Khaled announced that an economic and technical agreement would soon be signed with the Mao regime.

Two weeks earlier, Khaled had revealed that the Sudanese-Chinese Friendship Society in China had organized demonstrations in support of General Nimeiry, while the latter had been in the custody of rebel army officers July 19-22.

On August 5, United Press International reported that Nimeiry had sent a note of "thanks" to Mao and Chou En-lai, because of China's refusal to join in the widespread condemnation of the Sudanese witch-hunt against the left initiated by the Nimeiry regime.

Thus, the Mao regime has compounded its support of Yahya's slaughter of the Bengali people with support to the military clique that has just completed the physical destruction of the largest Communist party in the Arab world.

On July 19, Nimeiry was overthrown by a leftist military coup. Three days later, he returned to power in a counter coup. His government publicly declared its intention to annihilate not only the Communist party but all other enemies of god, the fatherland, and General Nimeiry.

At a July 24 press conference, Economic Affairs Minister Mohammed Idris declared: "In a few days there will not be a single Communist at liberty. We will try them for high treason. We will liquidate forever this party of foreign agents."

And how many people will be so dealt with? "They [the Communists] represent a miniscule minority of perhaps twenty or thirty thousand."

Radio Omdurman broadcast repeated appeals to the population to denounce to the police all "Communists,

traitors to the fatherland, and enemies of God."

After the first three days of the witch-hunt, arrests had already reached into the "hundreds, if not the thousands," Eric Rouleau reported in the July 27 *Le Monde*. The entire leadership of the CP, most of the leaders of the mass organizations—trade unions, students' organizations, women's organizations, and peasant unions—had been arrested. A twelve-hour curfew was in effect.

During the last week of July, the regime began executing many of these leaders.

The regime turned to the most reactionary sectors of the population to effect the elimination of the left—the reactionary Muslim Ansar sect and the Muslim Brotherhood, a fanatical grouping that is outlawed in most of the Arab world. The remainder of the population, according to Rouleau, displayed something less than enthusiasm for the repression, expressing their fear of the Brotherhood, the Ansars, and the army by staying indoors as much as possible. In the absence of any organized opposition, the purgers carried on their bloody mission with impunity.

The witch-hunt and the concomitant destruction of the Sudanese CP were the outcome of the continued rightward evolution of Nasserism, following the defeat of the Palestinian resistance in September of 1970.

The Sudan events began on July 19, when the government of General Nimeiry was overthrown by a military coup led by three pro-Communist-party army officers.

The coup was a response to the progressive degeneration of the regime and to the attack of that regime on the Sudanese mass organizations.

Nimeiry himself gained power in May 1969 through a military coup. He was supported at that time by the CP, which characterized him as a progressive anti-imperialist. For nearly two years his alliance with the CP continued. He granted legal existence to the CP for four basic reasons.

First, the CP was the only force in the country capable of backing up Nimeiry's attempt to eliminate, or at least drive underground, the extreme right-wing political and religious organizations.

In utilizing this tactic, Nimeiry was following his mentor, Nasser, who had successfully used CP support to destroy the opposition of the rightist army officers and large landholders, only to turn on his erstwhile allies once his own position was secured.

Second, the Sudanese CP, which was led by Abdel Khaled Mahjoub, a capable organizer with a significant following among the Sudanese people, had, unlike the Egyptian CP, a mass base. It was thus not a party that could be eliminated merely by arresting a few top leaders.

Third, the Nimeiry regime, like its predecessors, had to deal with the rebellion of the Black non-Arab population in the South. An oppressed national minority, the people of the South had initiated a guerrilla war against Northern domination. (Nimeiry, in fact, had established his reputation as a general in combat against the Southerners.)

The CP, rather than supporting the right of the South Sudan to self-determination, called for a vague "regional autonomy" for the South. Nimeiry thus found the CP useful as a left cover in his war against the South.

Fourth, the upsurge of the Palestinian liberation movement had radicalized large sections of the Arab world and had created a climate of severe hostility toward the suppression of left-wing movements and organizations.

The September counterrevolution in Jordan, the rightward evolution of the Egyptian regime of Anwar el-Sadat, and the U.S.-Soviet "peace offensive" in the Arab East altered the political situation throughout the Arab world, encouraging reactionary forces to act with increasing boldness.

In February, Nimeiry said: "The Communists have no place in our revolution; they will be crushed and exterminated."

Three months later, he outlawed the Sudanese national trade-union, the Federation of Students, the Youth League, and the Democratic Movement of Women. Mahjoub was imprisoned, and a "bloodless" witch-hunt against the CP and other leftists was initiated.

Although the onset of this campaign

was determined fundamentally by gains of the counterrevolution throughout the Arab world, two immediate disagreements between Nimeiry and the CP leadership precipitated their split.

The CP opposed the Sudan joining the federation that had been established by Egypt, Libya, and Syria. Nimeiry, determined to affiliate to the federation, fired all members of the government opposed to affiliation.

Also, the CP refused to dissolve itself into the "Sudanese Socialist Union" proposed by Nimeiry. The SSU was to be patterned after Nasser's Arab Socialist Union. That is, it was to be the sole legal political formation in the country.

The Soviet Union had enthusiastically supported the federation, viewing it as a useful instrument for achieving stability and peaceful coexistence in the Middle East.

Furthermore, the Soviet bureaucracy had counseled the CP to enter the SSU; in the past it had convinced the Egyptian CP to dissolve into the ASU.

The leadership of the Sudan CP prided itself on its independence from Moscow (it had been referred to in the West as the Italian CP of the Arab world).

But rather than organizing mass mobilizations against the Nimeiry repression, the CP relied on "progressive" generals to rectify the situation. It sought another, more reliable, Nimeiry.

On July 19, while several leaders of Nimeiry's regime were out of the country either on assignments or vacations, armored troop divisions under the command of Hashem el-Atta surrounded the presidential palace, arrested Nimeiry, seized the government radio station, closed the capital's airport, and announced the creation of a new regime of "political democracy."

El-Atta had been a minister in the Nimeiry government until he, along with Farouk Osman Hamdallah and Lt.-Col. Babikr el-Nur, were fired by Nimeiry in November of 1970, on the ground that they were Communist sympathizers.

El-Atta announced the formation of a new Council of the Revolution, composed of seven members and including, besides himself, el-Nur, and Hamdallah, four others, two of whom were also known as "sympathetic" to the CP.

The Council of the Revolution in turn announced the formation of a

new "Democratic National Front," composed of "the revolutionary forces, that is to say, intellectuals, soldiers, free officers, workers, peasants, and representatives of national capitalism."

The new regime freed the leftist political prisoners, lifted the ban on the CP and the other four mass organizations, and declared its support to the Palestinian revolution. It was committed, it said, to a "noncapitalist" road of development. How the "representatives of national capitalism" were to fit into the "noncapitalist" economic plan was not explained.

The el-Atta group further stated that it would grant the South "autonomy." The "personal dictatorship" of Nimeiry was denounced.

A demonstration of several thousand took place in Khartoum under the slogans "We are with you, Hashem!" "Down with the revolution of May!" [the 1969 coup that brought Nimeiry to power] and "Long live the revolution of July!"

The leaders of the coup apparently assumed that popular disgust with Nimeiry would assure them of support. There seemed to be no force within the country that would fight for the return of the old regime. Thus, their position could be easily consolidated.

In these assumptions the el-Atta group committed a triple mistake.

First, although the majority of the army officers had declared their loyalty to the new regime, the army was not known either for its political principles or for its leftist tendencies. Three days later, the army deserted en masse to the Nimeiry camp.

Second, the leaders of the coup did not make any serious attempt to mobilize the masses. The vast bulk of civil servants continued to function as usual; the masses were not armed. This fact, combined with the similarity in rhetoric of the el-Atta group with the Nimeiry group, convinced many people that merely another "progressive" military clique has seized power. The Southerners in particular had seen enough of "autonomy" under Nimeiry.

Third, el-Atta vastly underestimated the determination of the Nasserite regimes in the area to prevent any development that would interfere with their rightward drift.

In the absence of mass mobilizations, the Egyptian and Libyan governments were able to overturn the

new regime within seventy-two hours.

This was done through a double-edged operation. El-Nur and Hamdallah were both in London at the time of the July 19 coup. As they were flying back to Khartoum, the Libyan government of General Muammar Qaddafi ordered the BOAC plane carrying them to land in Benghazi. The two coup leaders were placed under arrest. News of their capture was widely broadcast throughout the Sudan—as a signal to Nimeiry supporters that all was not lost.

At the same time, two to three thousand Sudanese troops stationed in Egypt on the Suez Canal front were flown, in Egyptian planes, to Omdurman, just north of Khartoum.

At 5:30 p.m. July 22, the radio station was seized by Nimeiry supporters. It began broadcasting patriotic hymns, and inciting the religious fanatics to take action against the "Communists."

A military attack which the August 20 *Le Monde* asserted was directed, according to "well-informed sources in Beirut," by Egyptian officers, was mounted against the presidential palace and strategic points in the capital city of Khartoum.

The Egyptian officers came from the Egyptian military academy, which Nasser had moved from Cairo to a site about twenty-seven miles from Khartoum to protect it from Israeli air strikes.

Within two hours the countercoup was complete; Nimeiry was back in power and the witch-hunt began.

Within the next several days, the leaders of the coup, of the CP, and of the mass organizations had been arrested, tried, and shot.

Although it is on a much smaller scale numerically, the Sudan repression has been compared to the slaughter that took place in Indonesia in 1965, under similar circumstances.

It is still unclear whether or not the Communist party really organized the July 19 coup, as has been charged by Nimeiry and generally accepted by the Western press.

There is some evidence that it did not (Mahjoub had declared himself against putsches and military adventures). But those who led the July 19 coup were fully and uncritically supported by the CP, and apparently the CP leadership was aware of their intentions in advance.

At his trial, Mahjoub did not repent

but asserted that he had no regrets about having supported the coup.

The Sudanese CP had split from Nimeiry and had declared itself opposed to popular-front political formations of the Arab Socialist Union variety. But it had not broken from the Stalinist notion that social transformations are possible through the timely intervention of "progressive" members of the national bourgeoisie or the army.

The Sudan events represent the latest stage in the evolution of Nasserism. Historically, the opposition of the Arab bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie to Marxism and the transformation of society along socialist lines has rested on two largely separate ideological currents: pseudonationalism and religious fanaticism. Politicians adhering to the former current (Nasser is the clearest example) have in the past taken pains to distinguish themselves from the latter.

The popular appeal of Nasserism has rested on its anti-imperialist rhetoric and the fact that its most consistent exponents have opposed reactionary religious movements like the Muslim Brotherhood. To maintain that popular appeal, they have been

compelled to carry out significant measures against imperialism and to grant concessions to the masses.

But in the past several years, especially since the Jordanian civil war and the setback suffered in it by the vanguard of the radicalizing masses in the Arab world, the Nasserites have moved progressively to the right.

The new demands of the Arab masses cannot be met by the Nasserite regimes—hence the repressions, the acceptance of the Rogers peace plan for the Palestine question, the denationalizations carried out by the Sadat regime, etc.

That the shrill fanatical anti-Communism of the Muslim Brotherhood has now become indistinguishable from the real policies of Nimeiry, Sadat, and Qaddafi, indicates that Nasserism, as a political current, has been forced to shed its progressive facade.

The counterrevolutionary victories in the Arab world today are thus self-limiting. A new upsurge of the Arab revolution, which is only a question of time, will show that the lessons of the failure of Nasserism, assimilated by the masses, will make possible great new advances in the direction of socialism. □

guard. The Socialist Vanguard was established under Nasser's regime as a means of integrating and advancing young cadres within the ASU. Sadat has charged that the grouping became the nucleus of the conspiracy.

While attempting to eliminate political opposition within the government and the ASU, Sadat was faced with a new source of dissent.

He revealed to the central committee of the ASU on August 9 that, during the previous week, a strike had occurred at the Helwan ironworks factory. Strikes are illegal in Egypt, and the disclosure of the work stoppage created a major stir in the Egyptian press.

According to an account in the August 31 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde*, the workers demanded higher wages and improved working conditions.

When the president of the union came to the factory, the strikers seized him and held him overnight, stating that he would be released if their demands were met.

After the strike was broken by the government, Sadat told the ASU central committee that although he was willing to investigate the social conditions of the workers, strikes were "antidemocratic," and measures would be taken against the workers.

On the night of August 29, Aziz Sedki, vice prime minister and minister of industry, fired the director of the factory, the local union leaders, and the workers who had led the strike. □

In Face of Ironworkers' Strike

Sadat Opens Purge Trial in Cairo

Egyptian Prosecutor-General Mustafa Abu Zaid announced August 22 that 91 persons, arrested last May for conspiring against President Anwar el-Sadat, would be tried for high treason beginning August 23.

If convicted, the defendants face a possible death penalty.

The major target of the indictment was former Vice President Ali Sabri, a long-time associate of the late president Nasser. Sabri is known for his pro-Soviet leanings.

Others charged in the indictment include Sharawy Gomaa, former minister of the interior; Sami Sharaf, former minister of state for presidential affairs; Mohammed Fayek, former minister of information; Abdel Mohsen Abul-Nur, former secretary-general of the Arab Socialist Union; Diaddin Daoud, member of the exec-

utive committee of the ASU; and Labib Shukair, former president of the national assembly.

The 91 are charged with having plotted, under the direction of Ali Sabri, to overthrow the Sadat regime.

Whether or not the charges are true (conspiracies, coups, rumors of plots, etc., have long been a feature of Egyptian political life), the trial indicates a determined effort by Sadat to purge the government apparatus of all potential opposition.

Most of those charged are considered to be "left" Nasserites.

The trial was adjourned after two days and is scheduled to resume on September 4.

The *Washington Post* of September 1 reported that fifteen of the major defendants were members of a semisecret grouping called the Socialist Van-

Report Cuban Airlift to End

The U.S. State Department announced August 31 that it had been informed of Cuban plans to discontinue the regular airlift of Cuban self-exiles from Havana to the United States.

Since 1965, ten flights per week have carried a total of 246,000 persons to the United States.

The State Department said that there were still 33,000 names on a "master list" of Cubans approved for the airlift by both the Cuban and U.S. governments. But a department spokesman added that it was unknown how many of these might have changed their minds or have gone to Spain. □

Soviet Pollution

Oil pollution of the Volga River is so great that it periodically catches fire, and firemen have to "put out the river," reported the September 4 *New York Times*.

Solzhenitsyn's Protest Against Police Raid

In an open letter to the head of the Soviet political police, KGB, novelist Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn has protested an illegal search of his country cottage and a brutal assault on a friend of Solzhenitsyn's who accidentally interrupted the search.

The letter was written on August 13, one day after the incident. It was addressed to KGB chief Yuri V. Andropov. The novelist also sent a copy to Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin.

Excerpts from Solzhenitsyn's protest were reported from Moscow by Bernard Gwertzman in the August 15 *New York Times*.

"For many years," Solzhenitsyn wrote to Andropov, "I have borne in silence the lawlessness of your employees, the inspection of all my correspondence, the confiscation of half of it, the search of the homes and the official and administrative persecution of my correspondents, the spying around my house, the shadowing of visitors, the tapping of telephone conversations, the drilling of holes in ceilings, the placing of recording apparatus in my city apartment and at my cottage, and a persistent slander campaign against me from speakers' platforms when they are offered to employees of your ministry.

"But after the raid yesterday, I will no longer be silent."

Solzhenitsyn said that he had been ill in Moscow and had asked a friend, Aleksandr Gorlov, to go to the novelist's cottage in the village of Rozhdestvo to get a part for his car. When Gorlov arrived, he found the cottage occupied by some ten men in civilian clothes. He asked them for their identification cards.

"On command of the senior officer — To the woods with him! — Silence him! — they bound Gorlov, knocked him down, and dragged him face down into the woods and beat him viciously. Simultaneously, others were running by a circuitous route through the bushes to their car, carrying packages, papers, objects (perhaps also a part from the apparatus they had brought themselves).

"However, Gorlov fought back vig-



ALEKSANDR SOLZHENITSYN

orously and yelled, summoning witnesses. Neighbors from other garden plots came running in response to his shouts and barred the robbers' way to the highway and demanded their documents. Then one of the robbers presented a red identification card and the neighbors let them pass.

"They led Gorlov, his face mutilated and his suit torn to ribbons, to the car. Fine methods you have, he said to those who led him. We are on an operation and we can do anything, he was told."

Led by a Captain Ivanov, the

agents took Gorlov to the local police station.

"Then Ivanov asked Gorlov for a written explanation of what had happened. Although he had been fiercely beaten, Gorlov put in writing the purpose of his trip and all the circumstances. After that the senior robber demanded that Gorlov sign an oath of secrecy. Gorlov refused.

"Then they set off for Moscow, and on the way the senior robber kept telling Gorlov, 'If Solzhenitsyn finds out what took place at the dacha, it will be all over with you. Your official career — Gorlov is a candidate of engineering sciences, has presented a doctoral dissertation for defense and works in the State Institute of Experimental Housing Design and Research — will go no further, you will not be able to defend any dissertation. This will affect your family and children and, if necessary, we will put you in prison.'

"Those who know our way of life are aware that these threats can be realized. But Gorlov did not give in to them, refused to sign the pledge, and now he is threatened with reprisal.

"I demand from you, Citizen Minister, the public identification of the robbers, their punishment as criminals and an explanation of this incident.

"Otherwise I can only believe that you sent them."

In the copy of the letter sent to Kosygin, Solzhenitsyn added that "unless the Government of the U.S.S.R. had a part in these actions of Minister Andropov, I will expect an investigation." □

Greece

Amalia Fleming Jailed on 'Plot' Charges

The Greek junta refused, on September 4, to transfer Amalia Fleming, who suffers from diabetes, from jail to a hospital.

Fleming, the Greek-born widow of the codiscoverer of penicillin, is a vocal critic of the junta's dictatorship. Because of the prestige of her late husband, the junta had refrained from arresting her for four years. But on September 1 Fleming, along with three

others, was arrested on charges of having conspired to help Alexander Panagoulis escape from prison.

Panagoulis was convicted by the junta's courts in 1968 of attempting to assassinate Premier George Papadopoulos. He was sentenced to death, but international protest forced the regime to commute the sentence to life imprisonment.

The others arrested with Fleming

were Athina Psychogios, forty, who was reported to hold dual U. S.-Greek citizenship; John Skelton, a twenty-six-year-old American theology student studying in Greece; and Constantine Androutsopoulos, twenty-eight.

The junta claimed that Panaghoulis formulated an elaborate escape plan involving drugging or killing all the prison guards, and that he slipped a

written version of the plan past the prison censors to Androutsopoulos.

Androutsopoulos supposedly contacted Panaghoulis's brother and the other three "conspirators."

The plot was engineered, according to spokesmen for the junta, in Italy and England.

To substantiate the charges, Under Secretary to the Premier in Charge

of Press and Information Byron Stamatopoulos produced photographs of pills, chisels, and a pistol. These were to be used, he said, in the escape.

British embassy officials have not been allowed to visit Fleming. American consular officials applied to the junta for permission to speak to Skelton and Psychogios, but this has not been granted. □

Philippines

Finger of Suspicion in Bombing Points at Marcos

By David Withers

"I hold President Marcos personally responsible for the brutal and senseless carnage," Liberal leader Senator Gerardo Roxas said from a hospital bed in Manila, following the August 20 bombing of the speakers' platform at an election rally. Ten were killed and seventy wounded, including almost the entire leadership of the Liberal party, the major parliamentary opposition to the ruling Nationalist party. Among the injured were all eight Liberal senatorial candidates in the off-year elections scheduled for November.

Marcos blamed the bombing on Maoist "terrorists," who, he asserted, planned to burn Manila and kidnap Government leaders as part of a Communist rebellion backed by an unnamed "foreign power." The reference was obviously to China.

"I intend to prevent the sacrifice of innocent lives by quelling the Communist rebellion before it progresses any further," he said. Marcos suspended constitutional guarantees for those accused of "rebellion" or "insurrection." This allowed police to search without warrant and to detain suspects without charges.

The cancellation of democratic rights came under fire in the Senate from the Liberal party's general secretary, Benigno S. Aquino. Aquino charged that President Marcos had more than Communists in mind when he suspended constitutional guarantees. "This is part of a sinister plot to obliterate the opposition," he said.

Marcos responded by accusing Aquino of having aided the Communists by supplying them with weapons. During a TV appearance on August



FERDINAND MARCOS

24, the president displayed two firearms—a rifle with a telescopic sight and a nickel-plated submachine gun—saying that they had been captured from Communist Huk guerrilla leaders.

Marcos also read excerpts from what he claimed to be an intelligence dossier on the senator's alleged meetings with local Communist leaders.

According to the August 28 *Far Eastern Economic Review*, Marcos accused Aquino, who is the most likely Liberal candidate in the 1973 presidential elections, of plotting to burn down the capital. "The president's

charges," the magazine noted, "failed to explain why Benigno should have begun his alleged plot by the attempted murder of the party machine which could win him political power."

Aquino went on radio to deny these accusations. He challenged the Marcos government to file charges against him. Marcos, however, explained that Aquino would not be arrested for the time being, since he was the only opposition senator not incapacitated by the bombing.

By August 26 more than 100 persons had been arrested, including labor and student leaders, the head of the Philippine College of Commerce and other professors, and at least two political commentators.

On the heels of the government's announcement of the discovery of the "plot" came reports of further bombings in Manila. Announcements were also made of guerrilla activity in the Philippine countryside.

Special importance was placed on a reported raid on the headquarters of Task Force Lawin, 185 miles from Manila. Two air force helicopters were said to have been destroyed. The Task Force was on antiguerrilla operations.

The international capitalist press has remained skeptical of Marcos's claim of a Peking-backed rebellion in the Philippines.

For example, the August 28 *Far Eastern Economic Review* commented:

"Marcos' announcement on Monday that an armed insurrection was being mounted by Maoist-type extremists seemed too simple an answer." And, "... why should the communists try

to wipe out the opposition rather than the government? Filipino political life and elections are notorious for their violence. Murder is the traditional solution for a candidate who looks like losing the polls. And a suspiciously high proportion of those injured were actively campaigning for election."

Cesar Aguila, writing in the August 24 *Christian Science Monitor*, referred to "the now classic lament that Philippine elections are decided by the three g's—guns, goons, and gold."

Ceylon

14,400 Arrested Since April

An indication of the extent of the witch-hunt unleashed by the Ceylon government of Sirimavo Bandaranaike last April appeared in the August 14 issue of the *Far Eastern Economic Review*.

B. H. S. Jayewardene reported from Colombo that 14,400 people have been arrested since the beginning of April. Most of these are "educated unemployed, peasants, and a few hundred teachers and university students."

Home Affairs Minister Felix Dias Bandaranaike has estimated that 5,000 of those arrested will be tried for offenses ranging from murder and treason to unauthorized possession of arms and ammunition.

Jayewardene named three figures in the Lanka Sama Samaja party (LSSP—one of the parties of the ruling coalition) who have been implicated as being directly involved in the rebellion: Vasudeva Nanayakkara, a youth league leader of the party; S. D. Bandaranayake, a former member of parliament; and Susil Siriwardena, a senior civil servant.

While the Bandaranaike regime proceeds against the rebel youth, there are signs of a rift appearing between the government and the Communist party.

The CP has one minister in the government—the party's secretary-general Pieter Keuneman. He fully supported the campaign against the youth.

On August 28, the government announced that it had decided to cease sending official statements to the CP's daily paper, because of criticisms of the regime that had appeared in its columns.

He continued: "Behind most of the violence is the continued existence of 'private armies'—armed bodyguards, fanatical ward leaders, and even ex-convicts—which many moneyed politicians employ."

The conclusion to be drawn is quite clear. The responsibility for the August 20 attempt to annihilate the Liberal party leadership lies squarely with the potential losers in the November elections—Marcos and his Nationalist party. □

Ceylon

Bandaranaike Proffers Aid to Yahya Khan

Prime Minister Sirimavo Bandaranaike wrote a letter to Yahya Khan some weeks ago inquiring if the services of the Ceylon government could be used "to ease tensions resulting from the general situation in East Pakistan and the proposed trial of Awami League leader Mujibur Rahman," according to a report in the September 2 *Ceylon News*.

"There has been a positive response from Pakistan's President who, it is understood, has said he would welcome any concrete proposals from Ceylon to ease tensions," the *Ceylon News* continued.

The newspaper indicated that Bandaranaike would reply within the week to the butcher of the Bangla Desh masses. Bandaranaike's views are as follows, according to the same source:

"It is understood that while Ceylon feels that the situation in Pakistan is basically an internal matter, there are certain humanitarian aspects to the problem, such as the question of refugees and resultant difficulties, that must be taken note of. This situation has caused a threat to peace in the region and Ceylon feels that definite steps should be taken to arrive at a solution to the present problems."

A fitting climax to this bit of political theater would be a letter from Yahya Khan to Bandaranaike discreetly noting that while it was "basically an internal matter," still the massacre of Ceylon's youth recently conducted by the Ceylonese prime minister was not without "certain humanitarian aspects" which had led him to ask how his services could be utilized "to ease tensions." □

Portugal

Growing Number of Political Prisoners

The number of political prisoners in Portugal has more than doubled during the course of this year, according to a statement released September 1 by a prisoners' aid organization in that country.

The National Commission for Aid to Political Prisoners, which is not illegal, said that there were seventy-nine political prisoners in January. As of August 15, the number had increased to 160, seventy of them sentenced by courts and ninety under preventive detention.

The commission made no estimate

of the number of prisoners held in Portugal's African colonies.

The commission, which attempts to provide legal aid for prisoners and financial aid to their families, stated:

"The brutal wave of arrests by PIDE-DGS [the political police] in the last few months has greatly changed the picture of police repression in our country not only in number but also in the type of people they arrest.

"Indiscriminate jailing, torture and beating, the systematic refusal of legal aid as well as other illegalities to those detained is a constant policy of the government." □

Is It 'Socialism' to Give Lockheed \$250 Million?

[The following column, listed as "A Commentary" by Nicholas von Hoffman, appeared in the August 13 issue of the *Washington Post* under the title "Nixon Isn't a Very Good Marxist."

[The article is about the debate in Congress over donating \$250,000,000 to Lockheed to save the airplane manufacturing corporation from bankruptcy. As against the idiotic arguments made by both sides, von Hoffman thought it worthwhile to contrast the voice of sober reason. He chose to cite some points made by Ernest Mandel about present-day capitalism which seemed pertinent to the Lockheed case.]

* * *

No matter what, Nixon's Secretary of the Treasury, John Connally, was going to take some hard shots here in Washington. He invites suspicion, this man who seems to personify the mouth-flapping flak of the oil interests, this friend of the tax deductibles and the accelerated depreciators. He's the kind of politician that an aggressive newspaperman yearns to catch but knows he never will. Yes, Connally, who takes a high noise level to be a sign of leadership and a voluble self-confidence to be a substitute for candor, was going to take some hard shots.

But Lockheed gave his detractors a specially good opening. They could taunt Nixon's Democratic boy with having a weakness for solving American economic problems with Bolshevik solutions. Connally the Communist, Nixon the Socialist. It feels so good to catch the free enterprise canters in an indefensible contradiction. Tower of Texas and Humphrey of Minnesota locked in a collectivist alliance with Dole and Stennis and Eastland; while Dominick and Goldwater pair with McGovern and Ribicoff to defend free enterprise and stop Nixon's leftward leading drift toward the Marxist state.

Nixon, Connally and their fellow Reds supplied their opponents with evidence of their disloyalty to the free enterprise system by pleading that Lockheed must be saved because of the number of jobs it gave people and because the national economy could take government intervention better than the company's bankruptcy. If that doesn't sound like Russian-type talk, what does?

The whole episode is part of a long, long struggle about the role of government. The people pushing for the government action always talk pragmatics; and the people opposed always warn that, bit by bit, we are replacing capitalism with Marxism.

The reason the argument takes the form it does is because none of the major figures in the debate are Marxists. Nixon isn't a socialist, but only confused and reaching for expedients like the Democratic Presidents before him and the one who may replace him.

All sides in this long, on-going debate

might be even more alarmed than they are if they got a real Marxist view of our incorrigible economic troubles. But Marxism has been so thoroughly shot down in Washington that there isn't one major Marxist economist in town. No Marxist regularly appears before congressional committees to give his views because Marxism isn't regarded as either philosophy or social science but as religion.

That being the case we must look to a European Marxist to see what this school of thought might say. One of the most distinguished members is the Belgian Mandel, editor of the weekly, *La Gauche*. Mandel is an independent Marxist, not a mouthpiece for the Russian government, but still he writes, "In present day capitalist economy, the 'managed economy,' the increasing fusion of state and economy, the violation of sacrosanct private property, all exist for the benefit of monopoly capital (italics are Mandel's), for defense, protection and guaranteeing of its profits. The merging of the state with the economy is at bottom nothing but the total domination of the economy by private monopolies, which make use of the state machine." (Marxist Economic Theory, translated by Brian Pearce, Monthly Review Press, New York and London, 1968.)

In other words, a contemporary Marxist doesn't regard what we're doing as going toward him at all. He sees something like the Lockheed loan guarantee as the capitalist system using the power of the government to level off the constant disequilibria of our economic mechanisms. So what strikes us as a glaring similarity to the Soviet way of doing things, seems to him to be a superficial resemblance.

Conversely, he disagrees with those who think that a country like Russia is gradually taking up American business institutions: "... it is erroneous to regard the Soviet economy merely as the 'culmination' of developmental tendencies which can be seen in present-day capitalist economy: tendencies towards total monopolization of industry; abolition of 'classical' private property; merging of the economy with the state, growing 'state interference' in the economy and so on."

Mandel rejects the notion of the seeming convergence of the forms of the two states for many reasons but the cardinal one is that the Soviet system excludes profit. That means the Russians may plan how they are going to invest money regardless of its profitability. They can put it where they think the need is greatest in their society. Without profit as we know it, they don't have prices as we know them and that sometimes causes them a lot of trouble. We operate differently. We say that a competitive market creates a situation in which the most socially desirable and the most profitable coincide. Our system causes us trouble, too, but most Amer-

icans have thought the better outweighs the bitter of it.

Now we have the Lockheed loan guarantee, but it's not just that, it's innumerable other government programs. All of them tend to destroy the price system while retaining profitability, but pricing is the mechanism of the market, the mechanism which we use to vote economically for some things and against others. When that goes you get something like a Lockheed Tri-Star airbus for which there is virtually no commercial market. Another company has already sewn up the business with its plane.

But having lost our own old free enterprise method of arriving at socially desirable investment decisions, we still haven't gained the advantages of a planned economy. A socialist, planned state could have saved the workers' jobs by saying, all right, we'll put Lockheed to work building something we do want. Not only are we unable to do that, we are not even able to capture the maximum number of jobs that the government's intervention should have afforded: the Tri-Star's engines are still being built by Rolls Royce workers in England.

A big, rich country like ours can afford a certain amount of this kind of mishegas, but there comes a point where this jerry-built, ad-hockish fusion of capitalist and socialist elements becomes too costly even for us. Mandel believes a somewhat analogous hybrid—"the contradictory combination of a non-capitalist mode of production and a still basically bourgeois mode of distribution"—has had a ruinous effect on Russia.

Well, we're far, far richer so it will, presumably, take longer for us to accomplish our own ruin, but something bad must certainly happen to us if we don't resolve the contradictions we have created for ourselves. For example, it is now proposed we escape wage and price controls in key industries like steel by prohibiting foreign imports, or, that we escape from foreign trade barriers by imposing wage and price controls. Either way the losses and wastes are going to be enormous without any concomitant gains in our ability to control our system or make it produce what we want.

So it is that when we tweak Nixon and tease Connally with leading us toward the socialist state, the Marxist would tell us that we're indulging in false optimism, and that what awaits is much worse than the non-capitalist society we so much fear.

Unqualified

A U.S. army officer who has accused other officers of war crimes in Vietnam has been transferred from a job in which he was responsible for recruiting soldiers.

Lieutenant Colonel Anthony Herber told the Associated Press that his superiors had said his viewpoint made it "hard to enlist people."

Workers Boycott Franco's Trade Unions

Brussels

In mid-May "elections" were held in Spain for workers' delegates to be seated in the corporatist-fascist "trade unions"—unions that represent both workers and employers. These unions are rigidly controlled by the Franco regime.

The effort over the last ten years by certain anti-Franco groups—most notably the Spanish Communist party (Partido Comunista de Espana—PCE)—to operate inside these unions has been neutralized by a heavy counterthrust of repression.

Opposition groups could, of course, "take advantage of the legal opportunities," and even hold meetings in the halls of the fascist unions. Yet they did so under the subtle but ever present control of the fascist police, who, after allowing the protest movements to move into legal channels, always ended up arresting the oppositionist worker-activists when they figured the time was ripe—thereby periodically wiping out entire networks of workers' organizations, networks set up with enormous effort.

Drawing lessons from these developments, and taking advantage of a clearly changed relationship of forces within the working class between the vanguard groups and the reformist tendencies, most of the extreme left-wing organizations have called for a boycott of this year's Francoist trade-union elections. The Spanish CP and official Francoist propaganda have both sought to attract the biggest possible election turnout—the CP in hopes of electing opposition delegates, the Francoists as a way of bolstering the pro-government candidates.

The results available thus far point to a remarkable victory for the boycott, representing a defeat for Francoism and revealing the growing politicization of the Spanish working class—a process that came to the surface with the strikes in defense of Basque political prisoners sentenced in Burgos at the beginning of this year. [See *Intercontinental Press*, January 11, p. 7; January 18, p. 33; February 1, p. 82; and February 15, p. 134.]

In the Basque country, even the Francoist press had to report "50 percent abstaining." The real picture is quite different. In the main Basque industrial center, Bilbao, average abstentions topped 70 percent, with the key factories reaching the following totals: 80 percent at Naval (shipyards), 80 percent at Altos Hornos (smelting), over 80 percent at Firestone and General Electric, and so on. In Madrid nearly half the workers at the two biggest factories, Pegaso (autos) and Standard Electric, boycotted the elections, despite strong government pressure and the fact that these are CP strongholds.

In Catalonia, and especially in Barcelona and its industrial suburbs, abstentions surpassed the 66 percent mark, going over 77 percent in some instances: 70 percent at Harry Walker, 100 percent at factory No. 5 of SEAT (Fiat), 100

percent at Telefonica, 90 percent at Indo, 80 percent at Faema, and so forth.

In many towns "boycott committees" were set up in the shops, forming a united front of representatives from most far-left groups. Comrades of the Liga Comunista Revolucionaria (LCR—Revolutionary Communist League, formerly called the "Comunismo" group, a sympathizing organization of the Fourth International) took part in these committees. They also called on these groups to organize street demonstrations during election week urg-

Argentina

Former President Protests Police Brutality

[The Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation Ltd has made public a letter received from Professor Richard A. Frondizi of Buenos Aires concerning police brutality in Argentina. Professor Frondizi is the brother of Dr. Arturo Frondizi, former president of Argentina. The text of the letter is as follows.]

* * *

Here in this country the Press is on the American side. They do not even publish the crimes here perpetrated by the agents of the tyrannic government we have in our country. That is why I have to resort to you for moral help, because the murdering of young people is revolting.

The systematic killing of students began with the murder of two boys: Carlos Rodriguez Fontan and Luis Seijo, 17 and 15 years old respectively, killed by secret police agents Rene Araujo, Alberto Zocchi and Juan Pedro Niz. The three assassins were given 11 years penitentiary by the judge. The following boy was killed in the city of Cordoba: his name was Santiago Pampillon. The student of medicine Juan Jose Cabral was killed in the city of Corrientes on May 15th, 1969. Emilio Jau-regui, student and writer, was murdered in our capital by six members of the political police, because he informed about the crimes of the police. Alfonso Bello, student of Law in the Faculty of Santa Fe, was murdered by the local police in the little town of Hurlingham.

Here, in the capital, Dr. Nestor Martins was kidnapped, together with his client, in broad daylight by some members of the Federal police, because this known lawyer of our forum defended political prisoners. The lawyer and his client were not heard of again.

On March 8th, 1971, political police

ing a boycott, thereby encouraging the workers by showing that the fascists no longer controlled the streets.

Although several groups responded favorably to this call, the LCR comrades were almost alone in taking to the streets on May 18. Yet they were amazingly successful. They carried off demonstrations of 500 people in Madrid, 400 in Barcelona, 200 in Valencia and 100 in Bilbao—spirited demonstrations under red banners, guarded by self-defense squads who managed to keep all demonstrators from being arrested.

This was the first time since the Franco victory that Trotskyists succeeded in organizing a nationwide demonstration in Spain. To have mobilized more than 1,000 revolutionaries in the streets, while operating as a clandestine movement, signifies a remarkable accomplishment by our comrades of the LCR. □

murdered three young men, one of them a son of mine, Diego Ruy Frondizi, a student, honourably discharged from the Army last year with very good certificates. The other boy, Manuel Belloni, a student of the Faculty of Philosophy, son of a poet, the third boy was the driver of the car my son had hired to go to a barbecue party, where only roast beef is eaten.

I naturally protested, but the police qualified the murder as "homicide in a quarrel" so that the criminals will only get five years in prison. My brother, Dr. Arturo Frondizi, former president of the Republic, protested vehemently: "The government is responsible for the murder of the three boys. I will not stop accusing the government. If they want to shut me up, they must kill me as they did with my nephew Diego." The police then changed their theory: they said the three boys were killed by a fatal and lamentable mistake. I then wrote some articles in Argentine and foreign magazines asking if the other boys and Dr. Martins were also murdered in a fatal mistake. I am still waiting for the answers.

Would you mind helping us in doing justice. You know the Russell Foundation is respected all over the world and we would be very grateful to you if you mentioned the facts as I told you. □

As New as the 'New Economic Plan'

The Office of Emergency Preparedness, which rules on the fine points of Nixon's wage-price freeze, announced August 31 that a manufacturer who adds a pocket or a monogram to a shirt has created a "new product" and may therefore raise its price. However, the worker who makes the shirt is not considered a "new worker" and will have to continue working at the old wage.

New French Economics Quarterly

French revolutionary Marxism has scored a new success over both Stalinist revisionism and what Marx called the "vulgarity" of bourgeois pseudoscience. A quarterly theoretical magazine devoted to political economy, launched at the end of last year, has moved to the forefront of publications of this kind.

The first issue of *Critiques de l'Economie Politique* (September-December 1970) took up the subject of inflation, the second dealt with the crisis of the international monetary system, and the third with the structure of underdevelopment.

The first two numbers were, of course, of exceptional timeliness. They were greeted not only by specialists in the field but also by hundreds of students, teachers, and workers who have become "sensitized" on economics.

As the reception given to the pocket-book edition of Ernest Mandel's *Marxist Economic Theory* had already

shown, a considerable public exists for something better than the drivel put out by the Stalinists on the evil-doings of the big monopolies. (The French Communist party has issued two volumes of a "Manual of Political Economy," summarizing in a rather clever way the "best background" articles written by the Stalinist economists in the past period on "state monopoly capitalism.")

The editor of *Critiques de l'Economie Politique* is Jacques Vallier of the University of Nanterre. The editorial board includes various members of the Ligue Communiste (the French section of the Fourth International). It is published by Maspero.

Single copies are listed at 8.70 francs (about \$1.57). A one-year subscription can be obtained by sending 34 francs (about \$6.12) to Editions F. Maspero, 1 Place Paul Painlevé, Paris 5, France.

— Jean Ravel

Documents

CMU Demands Release of Ceylonese Political Prisoners

[The following resolutions were adopted by the general council of the Ceylon Mercantile Union on August 13.]

* * *

This meeting of the General Council of the Ceylon Mercantile Union takes note of the fact that the Imperialist-controlled International Monetary Fund was reported to have approved of the grant of a loan of \$24,500,000 to the Ceylon Government in Washington on 17th March 1971, the very day after the entire population of this country was subjected to Emergency rule by the Government. The General Council also notes with grave concern that the loan has been granted on conditions which appear to have led the Government not only to increase bus and train fares and to ban the import of various foodstuffs, but also to prepare to inflict further blows upon the already lowered living standards of the masses of the people, in terms of a so-called economic package, which may even include not only cuts in rice and sugar consumption, but also the freezing of wages and

salaries, or even wage cuts and other so-called sacrifices or savings, whilst the people are kept subject to the conditions of a police state under the Emergency.

The General Council considers that Ceylon's policy should be:

**NO SACRIFICES FOR CAPITALISM!
FOR SOCIALISM—YES!**

The General Council accordingly calls upon the Government—

(1) to restore the freedom of speech and public assembly, the freedom of the press, and the right of workers to strike, and all safeguards provided under the normal law for the protection of persons against arbitrary arrest and detention in custody, and the proper disposal of dead bodies of persons who may come by their deaths at the hands of the Police or the Military, or whilst in their custody,

(2) to make a full and frank disclosure to the people of "the current and prospective economic and financial policies" of the Government of Ceylon, as already arranged with the International Monetary Fund,

(3) to take over all coconut, rubber and tea estates and all other assets of the

capitalist and imperialist exploiters of our people, for the development of the economy in the interests of the masses of the people,

(4) to consult all mass organisations of the people, and not only those whose leaders are subservient to the Government, as to all other measures that may be necessary to break Ceylon free of the stranglehold of Imperialism upon it, and thereby to enable the people to set about the establishment of a genuine socialist democracy in Ceylon.

The General Council resolves that in that event the General Council will mobilise the entire membership of the Union to make whatever sacrifices that the mass organisations of the people may consider necessary to that end and will call upon all other sections of the people to do likewise.

* * *

This meeting of the General Council of the Ceylon Mercantile Union concludes from the Prime Minister's statement of 20th July that earlier reports of the so-called insurgent uprising of April 1971 appear to have been grossly exaggerated, especially having regard to the casualties said to have been inflicted upon the Police and the Armed Services, since the total number of casualties amongst these forces has now been revealed as having been extremely small, with only sixty killed and just over 300 injured; whereas the number of persons admitted to have been killed by these forces is over a thousand, at least, and the number of those injured has not even been mentioned.

This General Council meeting also notes from the Prime Minister's latest statement that about 10,000 persons in custody are said to have been arrested or to have "surrendered outside the period of amnesty", and that "almost 2,500 persons have been recommended for release out of about 7,000 cases which have been processed so far."

In view of these and other facts, this General Council meeting believes that there has not only been killing of civilians by the Police and the Armed Services on a massive scale under the Emergency, but also a massive witch-hunt for so-called insurgents, in which thousands of innocent persons have been rounded up and been deprived of their liberty for several months already, for no good reason.

This General Council meeting accordingly calls upon the Government to release forthwith all persons now held in custody, who have been already recommended for release by the investigating officers of the Government, as well as the thousands of other persons who are still being held in custody, without any evidence having been found up to now to charge them in a court of law, merely because their cases are still said to be under investigation. □

Market Report

A much-heralded campaign against the narcotics traffic in South Vietnam, launched earlier this year by Nguyen Van Thieu, has little to show in the way of results, Henry Kamm reported in the August 30 *New York Times*. The lack of progress, he wrote, is indicated by the fact that there has been no rise in the price of heroin.