

# Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 10, No. 6

© 1972 Intercontinental Press

February 14, 1972

50c



DUBLIN WORKERS demonstrate outside British embassy February 1. On following day, crowd of 50,000 burned building to

ground. Scale of mass protests following massacre by British troops in Derry January 30 was largest in recent Irish history.

## Mass Mobilization in Ireland Challenges British Rule

## Dollars From Blood

Bleeding the poor is a normal operation for capitalist firms, but few do it quite as literally as Hemo Caribbean, an American-owned company operating in Haiti.

For the past eight months, Hemo Caribbean has been extracting 350 liters of plasma a day from the blood of poor Haitians. The donors are paid \$3, while the company reportedly shows a profit of \$4 to \$5 a liter.

The company's operations were described by Richard Severo and Francis B. Kent, writing respectively in the January 27 *New York Times* and *Los Angeles Times*.

The plasma extracted in Haiti is frozen and shipped to the United States, where it is sold to three pharmaceutical firms. It is usually broken down into gamma globulin, albumin, and other substances sold by the firms.

Once the plasma has been extracted from whole blood, the red blood cells are returned to the body of the donor. Unlike whole blood, plasma may be taken from a donor as often as once a week. Werner Thill, a technical director for Hemo Caribbean, told Kent that the whole operation was of great benefit to the Haitians involved:

"I don't think you can criticize what we are doing on ethical grounds. We are saving lives. We are providing a source of income in a country where the per capita income is no more than \$75 a year."

Plasma, however, is rich in protein, and those persons so poor as to be forced to sell their blood are likely to be malnourished to begin with.

The Haitian government reportedly receives no payments from Hemo Caribbean, but Luckner Cambronne, the minister of the interior and of defense, is said to have an interest in the company. In addition, the frozen plasma is flown to the United States by Air Haiti, which Cambronne owns.

Hemo Caribbean's operations have been so profitable—and Haiti has so many poor—that plans are under way to expand its capacity by another 500 liters a day. The company is also planning to open branches in other Caribbean islands. □

### In This Issue

	138	<b>HAITI</b> Dollars From Blood
		<b>IRELAND</b>
Gerry Foley	139	Mass Mobilization Challenges British Rule
	141	Massive Protests in Twenty-six Counties
Gerry Foley	146	How Derry Fights British Troops
		<b>INDOCHINA WAR</b>
	142	Reporter Exposes Second Massacre at Son My
	143	Nixon Shows Fear for Indochina Puppets
		<b>CEYLON</b>
	144	A New Coalition Government?
		<b>JAPAN</b>
Wataru Yakushiji	145	Japanese Capitalists Look to China
	150	Students Fight Tuition Increase
		<b>CHINA</b>
	145	"Street of Great Leap Forward" Takes Leap Backward
		<b>IRAN</b>
Javad Sadeeg	149	Military Court Sentences Six to Death
		<b>BANGLADESH</b>
Jon Rothschild	150	Rahman Collecting Mukti Bahini Arms
		<b>PAKISTAN</b>
	151	Nixon, Mao Promise Aid to Bhutto's Army
		<b>POLAND</b>
Michel Reval	152	Gierek's Attempt to Remodel the Communist Party
		<b>ARGENTINA</b>
	154	Police Blame Guerrillas in Bank Robbery
		<b>NAMIBIA</b>
	155	Ovambos Continue Resistance
		<b>ZIMBABWE</b>
	155	Commission Finds No Backing for Sellout
		<b>SOUTH KOREA</b>
	156	Fifteen in Seoul's Prisons Face Death
		<b>GREAT BRITAIN</b>
	157	"Socialist Woman Groups" Hold Conference
		<b>REVIEWS</b>
	158	Yugoslav "Popular Front" of Stalin and Churchill
	159	Commercial Publishing's Feminist Venture
		<b>DOCUMENTS</b>
	160	Kidnapping, Torture, and Murder in Argentina
		<b>PHOTOS</b>
	137	Dublin workers demonstrate at British embassy
		<b>DRAWINGS</b>
Copain	144	Sirimavo Bandaranaike; 153, Mieczyslaw Moczar; 156, Park Chung Hee; 158, Josip Broz Tito

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

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.

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

MANAGING EDITOR: Allen Myers.

COPY EDITOR: Ruth Schein.

EDITORIAL STAFF: Gerry Foley, 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 Guemeene, 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 © 1972 by Intercontinental Press.

## Mass Mobilization Challenges British Rule

By Gerry Foley

"British out, North and South!" a crowd estimated by the police at more than 50,000 chanted in front of the British embassy in Dublin February 2. The march, organized by the trade unions, "took more than an hour to go through the center of Dublin," the *New York Times* reported. Before the eyes of the intimidated police, the crowd burned the British embassy to the ground.

In Cork, the second largest city in the formally independent part of Ireland, 10,000 people demonstrated on January 31. They burned a British flag. Protests against the British massacre of civil rights marchers in Derry January 30 were organized in cities and towns throughout Ireland, in a popular upsurge unequaled since the "monster rallies" of Daniel O'Connell in the first half of the nineteenth century.

The explosion was touched off by the cold-blooded, ruthless attack of British paratroopers on the peaceful march in Derry, an attack obviously designed to terrorize the Irish people.

"There hadn't been one petrol bomb thrown at them [the paratroopers]," the Italian journalist Fulvio Grimaldi reported in the February 1 issue of the *Irish Times*. "They just jumped out, and, with unbelievable murderous fury, shot into the fleeing crowd.

"I have travelled in many countries. I have seen many civil wars and revolutions and wars. I have never seen such a cold-blooded murder, organized, disciplined murder, planned murder."

Grimaldi told of incidents of calculated savagery, the news of which was already spreading around the small country: "I saw a man and his son crossing the street, trying to get to safety, with their hands on their heads. They were shot dead. The man got shot dead. The son, I think, was dying.

"I saw a young fellow who had been wounded, crouching against the wall. He was shouting 'don't shoot, don't shoot.' A paratrooper approached and shot him from about one yard.

I saw a young boy of 15 protecting his girl friend against the wall and then proceeding to try and rescue her by going out with a handkerchief and with the other hand on his hat. A paratrooper approached, shot him from about one yard into the stomach, and shot the girl into the arm."

More people have been killed, and perhaps even more brutally, in the various anti-Catholic pogroms over the last fifty years than were shot down in Derry. These atrocities, however, never evoked such a strong nationwide response.

The cold-blooded murderousness of the imperialist troops seemed to have touched a special cord in the Irish people—reminding them of their country's humiliating subservience to British economic and military power, reminding them of the frustration of their national hopes.

In the London parliament, Bernadette Devlin, representing her Northern Irish constituency of Mid-Tyrone, told the British MPs that she and the other speakers at the January 30 rally in Derry had been forced "to crawl . . . on our hands and knees in our own city.

"The Government, by its activities on Sunday, may well have lit a fire in Ireland, the flames of which may not die out until the last vestige of British rule has gone from that country.

"It is not our first bloody Sunday at the hands of the British Army. We will be in Newry . . . and we will be marching. We have been imprisoned and interned, and finally we have been slaughtered by the British Army. But we have yet to be defeated."

In the crisis touched off by the Derry massacre, the British ruling class dropped its pseudocivilized mask. When the neofascist, bible-pounding demagogue Ian Paisley defended the paratroopers in Westminster February 1, the *New York Times* of the following day reported: "He drew Tory cheers."

The imitators of the British bourgeoisie, the American ruling class,

again emulated their idols on the other side of the Atlantic. In its editorial February 1, the most authoritative capitalist paper in the U. S., the *New York Times*, tried to put the blame for the massacre on the unarmed protesters:

"Yet, even the brief clips of the Catholic demonstration shown on American television prove beyond doubt that the provocation for the troops was deliberate and great. The demonstration itself was a self-advertised exercise in civil disobedience; a calculated violation of the ban on all parades ordered two weeks ago by the Stormont Government."

A week later, on February 5, the pompous editors of the *Times* were forced to negotiate with hundreds of angry Irish-American demonstrators, pleading with the protesters to stop blocking their printing plant and let them deliver their advertisement-swollen Sunday edition.

The extent and fury of the popular upsurge seems to have forced the British authorities onto the defensive almost from the beginning. On January 31, with a still fresh memory of seeing young boys and even children gunned down before her eyes, Bernadette Devlin made an emotional physical attack on the British Home Minister, Reginald Maudling. In the solemn precincts of the British House of Commons, "she launched herself, a tiny furious figure, on the rotund mass of the Home Secretary," as the February 1 *Irish Times* described it.

The big press seized on this incident to portray Devlin as a fanatic, always prefacing her name with descriptions such as "the fiery civil rights advocate," or the "Ulster firebrand." Few U. S. papers reported her reply when a Conservative MP attacked her for a breach of Maudling's "privilege." Referring to the defenseless people gunned down in Derry on Maudling's orders, she said: "At least I didn't shoot him in the back."

Despite the hue and cry over Devlin's "ferociousness," however, the Speaker of the "most honorable House of Commons" did not dare take any sanctions against the courageous representative of the oppressed people of Northern Ireland.

The murder in Derry produced the opposite effect from the one the British authorities wanted. Instead of frightening the people off the streets, it brought masses back into action

on a scale unprecedented since the explosion that followed the introduction of the concentration camp system on August 9.

"While snipers kept troops at bay, mobs surged through Roman Catholic districts of Belfast, sealing off streets with hastily erected barricades and burning vehicles," the *Washington Post* reported February 1. The *Post* did not explain, however, why "snipers" had been unable before to hold the troops "at bay." Prior to the Derry massacre, most neighborhoods in Belfast had been pretty thoroughly cowed by a massive military occupation, despite frequent bombings and the occasional shooting of a soldier.

It is not likely either that large crowds would have been on the streets while gun battles were in progress. Almost certainly, it was the political force of the aroused population and world public opinion that kept the troops "at bay."

The huge masses that mobilized to protest the denial of their national and civil rights seem to have turned almost automatically to economic forms of struggle. Throughout Northern Ireland, nationalist workers refused to go to their jobs. Nationalist-run shops closed. Dock workers refused to unload British ships. A *de facto* general strike spread through the country on the Monday after the massacre. Attacks mounted on British-owned business and property.

In the face of this mobilization, the British government retreated further. After a campaign of thinly veiled threats of another massacre, the British army allowed a mass civil-rights march to take place February 6 in the border town of Newry. The nationalist people seem now to have proved that no force can drive them from the streets and beat them back into passivity.

Out of a campaign of mass action for basic democratic rights has grown a revolutionary challenge to the entire capitalist-imperialist system in Ireland. It was expressed in the chant of tens of thousands of demonstrators in Dublin February 1, calling for driving out British interests and power from all of Ireland.

This development, however, was not anticipated by the revolutionary organizations in Ireland. Every socialist group has held a more or less "workerist" perspective, separating the na-

tional and democratic struggle from the "properly" socialist one, which was supposed to arise from economic or "class" issues.

In fact, the struggle for democracy and national freedom has proved to be inseparable from the fight for socialism. The struggle for democratic rights can only be carried forward with a socialist perspective and within the context of advancing the theme of workers' power.

Thousands of workers have mobilized to protest British control of their country and to fight against it by their own methods. What could be more natural, more reasonable, than for the workers of British-owned corporations to seize the establishments where they spend most of their waking hours and run them democratically, in the service of the nation.

From one end of Europe to the other, from Jyväskylä in Finland to the Clydeside, workers are tending more and more to resist the brutality and inhumanity of capitalism by seizing their factories and trying to run them for the benefit of the whole people.

What could be more natural, more normal, when the entire Irish nation is rising up in a patriotic fervor, to demand the nationalization first of British property and then of the property of traitors and collaborators? Why wait for parliament to vote to nationalize these factories? The workers themselves can do it much more expeditiously and effectively. There is no automatic reason why it should seem more radical to the workers to defy the established authorities in their place of work than to march to the center of the city and burn an embassy.

The masses themselves have shown the way forward. For the first time, perhaps, in Irish history, they are taking control of their own destinies, bringing their whole enormous power to bear against the oppressive system. The primary credit for this belongs to the Official republican movement, which learned a vital lesson from the failure of their last guerrilla campaign—that only the masses can free Ireland, fighting for their own demands and by their own methods.

Like the other Irish socialist groups, the Official IRA has been hampered by a workerist outlook. But it at least has understood the importance of mo-

bilizing the masses on the basis of the broadest democratic demands, and thus has been able to play a decisive role in bringing about the present upsurge in Ireland.

The Official IRA cannot lead the struggle to victory, however, unless it overcomes its workerism. As long as it regards the unity of Catholic and Protestant workers on economic issues as the essential prerequisite for a struggle for socialism, it will be condemned to a hesitating centrism in the face of the events, an indecisiveness that can only drive its young revolutionary members into ultraleftism and desperate adventures. And this ultraleftist reflex in turn could derail the mass struggle.

Can the Official IRA tell the nationalist people of the North again, as they have in the previous crises, that they cannot win full freedom, that all they can do is put more pressure on the British government to grant bourgeois democratic reforms and then wait indefinitely for the republicans to achieve Catholic-Protestant unity on a "class" basis?

The capitalist-imperialist system that dominates Ireland is a historically evolved, political, economic, and cultural whole. The current struggle has arisen out of the most acute contradictions of this system and strikes at its heart. The Official republican leadership has understood how to set this struggle in motion; this is a historic achievement. It remains to be seen if they can lead this fight to victory.

As well as dividing the struggle for democracy abstractly from the struggle for socialism, the Official republican movement has also tended to see the relation between armed force and mass struggle in a somewhat abstract way—with the "army of the people," the IRA, supporting the masses by guerrilla actions.

These weaknesses apparently led to the politically disastrous assassinations of Unionist politicians in the recent period and the threat of "avenging Derry" by shooting thirteen British soldiers. Nothing could have played into the hands of the British authorities more than this.

The people themselves wanted a different kind of revenge, destruction of the system that debases and humiliates them—not the death of thirteen insignificant individuals wearing the British uniform. For example, when one Derry man was asked if he was

bitter at the soldiers, the February 2 *Irish Times* quoted him as saying: "I'm bitter at the boy who gave the orders to do the shooting."

The murders in Derry were not an isolated atrocity. In fact, they raised the whole tragedy of the Irish people, especially as relatives of the slain marchers had to try to contact families often scattered over three continents to inform them of their loss.

Would the outrage have been so deep or widespread if there actually had been snipers at the January 30 march, or if a large number of soldiers had been shot in the period leading up to it? What would the response of the Irish people have been if the responsibility for the bloodshed had not been clearly on the British? You only have to think of the hypocritical campaigns the Irish and international press whipped up over the killings of three Scottish soldiers in a Belfast suburb several months ago.

When he learned that the authorities had ordered a massacre, Lance Corporal Peter McMullan deserted from the paratroopers and fled to the Twenty-six Counties, denouncing the shooting in Derry as deliberate murder. Would he have done this if one of his buddies had been picked off by a sniper on a routine patrol?

Isolated assassinations cannot defend the nationalist people. By keeping the full responsibility for violence on the British authorities, conditions have been created that may make it virtually impossible for the British or Irish authorities to prevent the nationalist people from arming en masse to defend themselves. Hundreds of thousands of Irish people have demonstrated throughout the Twenty-six Counties. Tens of thousands burned the British embassy with the police cowering at a safe distance. Who can stop the nationalist people of the South from going to the aid of their brothers and sisters in the North? Can even the British troops do it, with a wave of revulsion rising around the world against the repressive system in Northern Ireland?

Because of the mass character of the civil rights struggle, the Irish people are no longer isolated. The whole world has been inspired by the courageous struggle of the nationalist people for their democratic rights. No doubt remains that their fight is part of the world struggle for the emancipation of mankind. □

## British Embassy Gets 'Notice of Eviction'

# Massive Protests in Twenty-six Counties

Dublin

The morning of January 31 saw massive protests throughout the country against the previous day's massacre in Derry. In Dublin students from the College of Technology at University College Dublin, College of Teachers, and Trinity College held protest meetings on their campuses and then marched to the British embassy at Merrion Square.

The demonstrations were spontaneously organized, and no one could tell the exact number of participants. Interviews gave the following figures: At the College of Technology, where 6,000 students are registered and 65 percent attend the daytime course, about 85 percent of the students participated in the protest march. At the College of Teachers, almost all of the 400 students and hundreds of Trinity College students mobilized.

East Fitzwilliam Street, on which the embassy stands, was jammed as one group of marchers after another arrived from all parts of the city. Some 300 workers of a meat company, 500 at Volkswagen, 1,000 at Brittain Smith (machinery), and 2,000 at ESB (the government-run Electricity Supply Board) had protest meetings at their workshops in the morning and then walked out. They organized demonstrations and came to the embassy.

According to the February 1 issue of the *Irish Times*, about 1,000 automobile-assembly workers marched from Naas Road. Workers at the British-owned Battery Makers of Ireland factories at Bluebell and Stanaway Drive, Kimmage, stopped work for an hour. The ITGWU (Irish Transport and General Workers Union), the largest trade union in the country, pressed the Fianna Fáil government to declare February 2, when the funeral for Derry's dead was scheduled, a day of mourning.

In Cork, according to the February 1 issue of the *Irish Independent*, thousands of workers from industry, the docks, and business houses, as well as university students and staff, marched to the city hall.

Black flags were flown from many

houses in Dundalk, and many offices and stores closed for the afternoon as about 5,000 factory workers took to the streets.

In Shannon, Waterford, and other cities of the Twenty-six Counties, workers left their jobs and went into the streets to protest. Thus the first day after Bloody Sunday saw a *de facto* general strike throughout the country.

As nightfall came to Dublin, a protest rally called by the Official Sinn Féin (the political wing of the republican movement) began in Merrion Square. About 1,000 people jammed the street in front of the British embassy.

Speakers included Malachy McGurran, the "most wanted man of the North"; Eoin O Murchú; Tomás Mac Giolla, the president of Sinn Féin; and Seámas O Tuathail. The crowd cheered and applauded when the speakers emphasized the importance of mass action and the necessity to bring down not only the Stormont government but also the Leinster House government.

As the rally was coming to an end, stones were thrown frequently at the embassy. Seámas Costello, the last speaker, condemned the brutality of British imperialism and said, "Last time we came here, we came to deliver a notice of protest, but today we came here to deliver a notice of eviction."

After massive, long applause, he spoke to the dozens of *gardai* (police) standing on the doorstep of the embassy. "We want you to get out of the scene immediately."

He paused and shouts of "Out! Out!" came from the crowd. A petrol bomb burst on the facade, which caught fire and burned for ten minutes. The crowd cheered.

At 8:30 p.m. another rally was held in front of the General Post Office on O'Connell Street. About 500 people listened to speakers from the Provisional wing of the IRA. They later marched to the embassy and threw petrol bombs. The demonstrators drove back fire engines, but the fire did not last very long. □

## Reporter Exposes Second Massacre at Son My

There were two massacres, not one, in the Vietnamese village of Son My on March 16, 1968. The slaughter at the hamlet of My Lai 4 is known all over the world, despite the attempts of the U.S. government to cover it up. News of the other atrocity, at the nearby hamlet of My Khe 4, has been more or less successfully suppressed.

Seymour M. Hersh, the reporter whose stories first brought the My Lai massacre to public attention, described the killings at My Khe 4 in two articles printed in the January 22 and 29 issues of the weekly *New Yorker* magazine.

Hersh's articles were based primarily on the transcript of the testimony at the "Peers Inquiry"—the U.S. army investigation of the massacre and its cover-up headed by Lieutenant General William R. Peers. Except for highly censored excerpts, the report of the Peers commission is still a closely guarded secret of the Nixon administration.

Most of Hersh's material—like the bulk of the Peers group's work—is concerned with the question of which particular officers concealed what information. The evidence indicated that there were few (if any) among the officers with knowledge of the massacre who did not participate in suppressing information about it.

For example, Hersh wrote of documents on the case that mysteriously disappeared from the files of the Americal Division:

"The Peers commission concluded its investigation in March, 1970, without being able to discover how the My Lai 4 files had disappeared. General Peers himself suspected that some of the key officers involved at the time were responsible. The truth was more damaging to the Army's system than Peers could imagine: that subsequent officers of the Americal Division, who had had no direct involvement with My Lai 4 and its investigations, had destroyed evidence to protect the officers who preceded them."

The Nixon administration has claimed that its refusal to release the full report of the Peers commission

to the public is motivated by a desire not to prejudice the courts-martial of those involved or the appeals of Lieutenant Calley's conviction for murder. (All other legal proceedings related to the massacre have been completed.) Hersh suggested a less noble motive:

"A careful examination of the testimony and documents accumulated by the Peers commission makes . . . clear that military officials have deliberately withheld from the public important but embarrassing factual information about My Lai 4. For example, the Army has steadfastly refused to reveal how many civilians were killed by Charlie Company on March 16th—a decision that no longer has anything to do with pre-trial publicity, since the last court-martial . . . has been concluded. Army spokesmen have insisted that the information is not available. Yet in February, 1970, the Criminal Investigation Division, at the request of the Peers commission, secretly undertook a census of civilian casualties at My Lai 4 and concluded that Charlie Company had slain three hundred and forty-seven Vietnamese men, women, and children in My Lai 4 on March 16, 1968—a total twice as large as had been publicly acknowledged."

Another embarrassing statistic, in view of the fact that only Calley was convicted of any crime at My Lai 4, is the finding that Calley's platoon was responsible for only about one-third of the murders in the hamlet.

The massacre at My Khe 4 was carried out by Bravo Company's first platoon, commanded by First Lieutenant Thomas Willingham. Willingham was later formally charged with unpremeditated murder, but the charges were dismissed without a trial. Hersh described the slaughter:

"My Khe 4 was a scraggly, much harassed collection of straw-and-mud houses, inhabited by perhaps a hundred women, children, and old men. . . . Lieutenant Willingham, according to many witnesses, ordered two machine gunners in his platoon to set up their weapons outside the hamlet. And then, inexplicably, one

of the gun crews began to spray bullets into My Khe 4, shooting at the people and their homes. . . .

"By now, it was about nine-thirty, and the men in the rear of the first platoon were ordered to pass forward extra belts of machine-gun ammunition and hand grenades. When the gun crew stopped, the platoon, led by four point men, or advance scouts, walked into the hamlet and began firing directly at Vietnamese civilians and into Vietnamese homes. The gunfire was intense. Former Private Terry Reid, of Milwaukee, recalled that he was standing a few hundred feet below the hamlet when it began. He knew that civilians were being shot. 'As soon as they started opening up, it hit me that it was insanity,' he told me during an interview in May, 1971. 'I walked to the rear. Pandemonium broke loose. It sounded insane—machine guns, grenades. One of the guys walked back, and I remember him saying, 'We got sixty women, kids, and some old men.'"

Estimates of the death toll at My Khe 4 ranged from sixty to 155. Survivors later told U.S. military investigators that 90 to 100 women, children, and old men were murdered.

The Peers commission was fully aware of this massacre: Hersh was able to quote from a message Peers himself sent to General William Westmoreland mentioning that there were Vietnamese witnesses to the fact that "approximately 90-100 women and children were removed from bunkers and shot in the immediate locality."

But at a press conference announcing the conclusion of the investigation, Peers responded to reporters' questions about the massacre with a vague statement that "it's all encompassed within the greater area of Son My village. . . ."

The reason that the My Khe 4 massacre did not attract more attention, Hersh indicated, was that it was not sufficiently unusual:

"It is unlikely that any other atrocities of the magnitude and character of My Lai 4 have taken place in South Vietnam, but how many My Khe 4s

have there been? By the fall of 1971, the massacre by Bravo Company was forgotten. That slaughter and its cover-up reveal an important truth about the American Army. Bravo Company killed between forty and a hundred innocent Vietnamese civilians on the morning of March 16, 1968. There was no Lieutenant Calley ordering other men to 'waste them.' There was no confrontation with a

helicopter pilot, and no protesting over a radio network. My Lai 4 was out of the ordinary, but it was obviously not isolated. My Khe 4, however, was just another atrocity, and that atrocity was covered up—after its uncovering in the midst of the My Lai 4 investigation—by a lieutenant general and a Secretary of the Army unwilling or unable to face up to its meaning." □

we have helped to establish conditions and build systems that at least give the Republic of Vietnam an opportunity to choose its future course of events.

"Final thought should be that a strong, broadly based military establishment has been created in RVN that will be difficult to destroy by military action. . . ."

Anderson pointed out that the reality is quite different:

"Actually, the Viet Cong have been making inroads in places that were formerly free of Communists, even as the American people have been told the opposite.

"For example, a classified U.S. study showed that by July 1971, 77 outposts had been overrun in the vast Fourth Military District, compared to 44 at the same time in 1970 and 67 for all of 1970."

Another indication of Nixon's inability to control the South Vietnamese countryside is provided by efforts to revive the notorious "strategic hamlet" concentration camps. In the February 6 *New York Times*, Thomas C. Fox described a project now being carried out in the Mekong Delta under the command of a Saigon general named Nguyen Vinh Nghi:

"To bring security to Tanhoa and the other areas in the southeastern part of Anxuyen Province, he [Nghi] plans to move 24,000 peasants into well-defined hamlets in the next five months. Today they are scattered across the delta province. . . ."

"The purpose of the movements is to concentrate the people so that we can control them better,' said General Nghi. 'If they remain where they are, it is easy for the VC to take taxes and food from them.'

"General Nghi said that the plan was 'similar to the strategic-hamlets program of the late President Ngo Dinh Diem.' But he said the organization was different. 'Diem used barbed wire. We believe that self-development is the key.'"

Fox later explained what "self-development" consists of:

"Once the peasants are gathered in the Tanhoa hamlet and the only other hamlet in the delta still under Vietcong control, Tanthuan, they will be allowed to leave only during the daylight hours and with permission of the hamlet chief. At night, no movement will be allowed, according to General Nghi's plan." □

## Nixon Shows Fear for Indochina Puppets

"American officials," Craig R. Whitney wrote from Saigon in the February 4 *New York Times*, "in a reversal of a 10-year-old policy, appear to be going to extraordinary lengths to spread bad news about the war in Vietnam."

Whitney was referring to the almost daily predictions by American officials of a major offensive by the Indochinese liberation forces.

"The reports," he wrote, "far from easing the apprehension Vietnamese and Americans have felt since the fateful 1968 Tet action, are encouraging it, as if to prepare people for the worst or to lay the groundwork for claims of success if nothing happens."

These predictions have another function that Whitney overlooked: They serve as a pretext for Nixon's escalation of the bombing of Indochina in general and North Vietnam in particular.

On January 31, B-52 bombers carried out raids described as the heaviest in four months near the "demilitarized zone" in northern South Vietnam, dropping more than 500 tons of bombs. On the same day, at least five "protective reaction" strikes hit North Vietnam. On February 1, the U.S. command in Saigon later admitted, there were seven bombing attacks on the North.

There does appear, however, to be an element of genuine alarm in the Nixon administration's predictions, caused by the worsening position of its Indochina puppet regimes.

The February 2 *Washington Post* carried a dispatch from D. E. Ronk in Vientiane that indicated widespread demoralization in the remains of the army of Souvanna Phouma.

"Nearly 40 U.S.-provided howitzer cannons," Ronk wrote, "have been lost

to enemy forces by the Royal Laotian Army since the current Communist offensive began Dec. 18. The loss of howitzers is but one indication of the mass of weaponry, equipment and commodities abandoned on the battlefield, sources here say. . . ."

"So many howitzers have been lost in northern Laos in the past two months that the stream of new guns running along Vientiane's main street toward the airport for transport north has become a joke in the city.

"Similar losses are reported in the south, where it has become the rule for retreating Laotian units to appear at government strongpoints stripped of all military equipment. . . ."

"Stories of Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese using American-provided radios for following the course of battles, providing instant intelligence, are legend in Laos. Some American advisers say the Communists may now have more U.S. radios than the Laotian army."

Ronk reported that the loss of small arms, particularly M-16 rifles, has been "outrageously high." Most of these losses, according to U.S. "advisers," occur when army officers trade the weapons for opium in Burma and Thailand.

On the same day that Ronk's dispatch appeared, columnist Jack Anderson described secret documents that show how the U.S. government prepares its optimistic reports on the process of "pacification" in South Vietnam.

In a September 8, 1971, memorandum cited by Anderson, Brigadier General James Herbert ordered U.S. officials in South Vietnam to "develop ten or twelve high-impact indicators that say persuasively that much progress has been made; that our effort has not been a fruitless venture; that

# A New Coalition Government in Ceylon?

"Prime Minister Sirimavo Bandaranaike may invite the Opposition to join her in a national coalition to salvage Ceylon, wracked by economic problems," B. H. S. Jayewardene wrote from Colombo in the January 29 issue of the *Far Eastern Economic Review*. The "Opposition" to which he referred is the conservative bourgeois United National party (UNP), the major electoral competition in the May 1970 elections that brought Bandaranaike and her "United Front" (UF) coalition to power.

Faced with increasing opposition to its dictatorial rule under "state of emergency" regulations, the government is looking for new sources of support. Backing from working-class and socialist organizations is excluded because of the coalition's attempts to solve the economic crisis by depressing the masses' standard of living. A turn toward the UNP therefore appears to be the order of the day.

J. R. Jayewardene, leader of the UNP's parliamentary group, has emerged as the focus of the proposed "national coalition." Jayewardene brought the behind-the-scenes maneuvers to public attention by declaring in a speech:

"There are a number of national problems needing immediate solution. A large section of the masses are undergoing untold sufferings due to recent disturbances. These sufferings have to be eradicated somehow. By supporting the steps taken by the Government towards eradicating these sufferings, we will be doing a great service to present and future generations."

If there are any UNP members alarmed by the UF's claim that it is building "socialism" in Ceylon, they can be reassured by the testimony of a man not noted for his socialist sympathies. Robert McNamara, president of the World Bank, visited Colombo January 22-23 to discuss imperialist "aid" projects with the coalition government. His impressions of the prime minister were reported on the front page of the February 3 *Ceylon News*. The item, charming in its frankness, deserves to be quoted in full:

"Mr. Robert McNamara, President of the World Bank, has been 'deeply

impressed' by Prime Minister Sirimavo Bandaranaike's 'outstanding qualities of leadership,' according to diplomatic circles in Colombo.

"Commenting on the fact that Mr. McNamara appeared to be 'very well briefed' on the Ceylon situation, a senior western diplomat told the Daily News that Mr. McNamara had ex-



BANDARANAIKE: Ceylon capitalism's "rallying-point" wins praise of McNamara.

pressed his 'deepest admiration' for the quality of leadership shown by Mrs. Bandaranaike during the April insurgency and the skill with which she maintained what Mr. McNamara called 'a middle course in international relations'.

"The same diplomat commented that praise from Mr. McNamara, known throughout the world for his 'computer-like mind' and as a person rarely given to compliments, was high praise indeed.

"At one point in a discussion Mr. McNamara is reported to have said that Mrs. Bandaranaike was clearly 'the one rallying-point that would keep the Ceylonese nation together, in a democratic way.'"

Despite this testimonial, the leader of the UNP, former Prime Minister

Dudley Senanayake, is reported to oppose any coalition with the UF.

Of more interest than the divisions in the UNP is the response of the two junior partners in the governing coalition, the Communist party and the ex-Trotskyist Lanka Sama Samaja party (LSSP). These parties, which found the leftist demagoguery of Bandaranaike's bourgeois Sri Lanka Freedom party (SLFP) sufficient to cover their class collaboration, are not likely to enter a coalition with the UNP without arousing some opposition in the ranks. The same issue of the *Ceylon News* that carried McNamara's tribute to Bandaranaike gave the following account of the situation in the CP and LSSP:

"Lobby circles predict that many of the top rung of the LSSP in Parliament will be willing to have Mr. Jayewardene in the Government on an 'accepted program'. However, they are not ready to have the entire UNP parliamentary group in the Government, according to these circles.

"Even within the LSSP there is a difference of opinion about the advisability of bringing Mr. Jayewardene and some of the UNP parliamentarians into the government ranks.

"The Communist Party is likely to find itself in a quandary if the Government extends an invitation to Mr. Jayewardene, these sources say. The younger CP parliamentarians apparently are strongly opposed to UNPers joining the Government.

"In regard to the CP, speculation is mainly about the reaction of Housing Minister Mr. Pieter Keuneman, in the event of an invitation being extended to the Leader of the Opposition.

"Lobby circles feel that there will be strong pressure from the CP rank and file on this issue. It is felt that the LSSP would also be under some pressure from an influential section of the party not to support any 'invitation to J. R.'"

Colvin R. de Silva, an LSSP leader who is minister of plantation industries in the government, appears to head the section of the party that fears the public exposure involved in an alliance with the UNP. In a January 27 speech, de Silva attacked Jayewardene's overtures:

"Certain people have suddenly developed a concern for the masses. This particular person who talks of cooperation with the Government for the liberation of the masses does not do



so with a good motive. His aim is to praise us and deliver a clever blow against us. We, who have for years gathered experience through working for the people, do not find it easy to understand the motives behind such a move. The UF Government has clearly understood this and will not

be misled."

Opposition to the "national coalition" is also reported from "more radical elements" of the SLFP. Despite this, the *Ceylon News* wrote that "a general Cabinet re-shuffle is expected before the end of next month, when the new Constitution is due to be adopted."

## Remedy for Ailing Textile Industry?

# Japanese Capitalists Look to China

By Wataru Yakushiji

Tokyo

Since Nixon announced his plans to visit China, most sectors of the Japanese bourgeoisie have shifted their orientation from Chiang Kai-shek on Taiwan to the Peking regime. This shift was intensified when such monopolies as New Japan Steel, Toyota, and Hitachi declared their willingness to accept Chou En-lai's "four points."

According to the January 20 *Asahi Shimbun*, a number of leading Japanese finance capitalists, including the presidents of Mitsubishi, Fuji, Sumitomo, and Sanwa banks, have expressed a desire to visit China. The Japanese bourgeoisie is now negotiating with Peking to develop a new trade agreement based on exchange between the yen and the Chinese yuan. Such a deal has been hinted at by both sides during the last three years, but this time it seems to clearly represent the direction of the Chinese government and the goal of the Japanese capitalists.

The Japanese textile industry suffered a setback in the monetary cri-

sis. Now, the owners are divesting themselves of small-scale, low-productivity enterprises and counting on the vast Chinese market as a means of getting them out of the slump.

To counteract the difficulties created by the monetary crisis and the revaluation of the yen, the Japanese bourgeoisie is expanding its foreign capital investments, not only in Asia but in Latin America, Western Europe, and the United States.

## China

# 'Street of Great Leap Forward' Takes Leap Backward

During his visit to Peking, Nixon will not be driven along Red Flag Road, Street of the Great Leap Forward, Red Sun Street, or Red Guard Street. In a dispatch from Peking, John Burns of the *Toronto Globe and Mail* reports that the names of these streets have been changed respectively to Street North of the Four Western Gates, Street Within the Gate of Peace, Street of the Yunghe Temple, and Street of the Donkey and Horse Market.

The "new" names are those the streets bore prior to the "Cultural Revolution," when they were renamed by the Red Guards.

There has been speculation that the reversion to the old names is in honor of Nixon, who presumably would feel more at home on the Road Within the Gate of Certain Victory than on People's Commune Road. Another view was described by Burns:

"Observers here view the changes as the latest move in a campaign to undo the excesses of the Red Guards rather than as a direct concession to the President. However, it is thought that the imminence of the visit probably prompted

The January 20 *Asahi Shimbun* claimed that the "greatest crisis of the Japanese economy" in fact did not exist. Despite the initial propaganda of the ruling class, the absolute volume of exports for the period of January-March 1972 is expected to be only slightly lower than the corresponding period in 1971. It is now generally agreed that there will not be a significant decline in exports, except in certain sectors like electrical machinery and steel, where Japanese products have been hurt by competition from the United States and Western Europe.

Export of automobiles, for example, has been growing steadily, a slight decrease in sales in the United States being compensated for by an increase in Western Europe. A drastic decrease in the export of manufacturing equipment was predicted at first, but the bourgeoisie has forestalled this eventuality by successfully developing a new market. The modernization of the Argentinian railway system by the use of Japanese machinery constitutes one of the greatest export sales in Japan's history. □

the decision to make the changes now."

The name changes were revealed when a new Chinese-language map of the capital was published. Only two of the streets baptized by the Red Guards have not yet reverted to their old names, although there are indications that they will soon. Anti-Imperialist Street and Anti-Revisionist Street still have their Red Guard names printed on street signs, but on the new map they are not named at all. □

## Couldn't They Just Pay People to Go?

The Agency for International Development (AID) is lending \$126,422 to a privately owned hotel in the Dominican Republic. The money, provided from AID's Fund for Investments and Economic Development, will be used to buy bar equipment, a swimming pool filter, underwater lights, and an electric frankfurter-warmer, among other things.

AID officials explained that the loan was intended to "promote tourism," and said that this would aid the Dominican economy.

### Still Available

Complete Back Files

### Intercontinental Press

1966	42 issues	\$25.00
1967	42 issues	\$25.00
1968	44 issues	\$22.00
1969	43 issues	\$21.50
1970	43 issues	\$21.50
1971	45 issues	\$22.50

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

## How Derry Fights British Troops

By Gerry Foley

[Even before the British army shot down thirteen civil-rights marchers in Derry January 31, touching off the greatest popular explosion in Ireland since the 1919-21 war of independence, this small pleasant Irish town had become unique in the Western world. For three years, military repression has drawn fiercer and fiercer resistance, until Derry is now an international revolutionary battle-front. If the British authorities were going to drive the people off the streets and beat them back into passivity, as they have to do to restore their kind of order in their Northern Irish enclave, then this stronghold of mass struggle against the imperialist system had to be broken.

[In October, I talked to rank and file activists in Derry. Their statements indicate something of the process that has been developing there and the kind of force the British have been confronted with and now may be confronted with on a much larger scale.]

\* \* \*

The escalation of British repression that culminated in mass arrests of political oppositionists in the dawn hours of August 9 began in Derry on July 7, when the army cold-bloodedly gunned down Seamus Cusack, who was watching a clash between the troops and a group of young boys.

Charlie Morrison, a young civil-rights activist, told me: "The crunch between the people and the army came when Cusack and Beattie were killed. Up until that time only about 30 percent of the people supported fighting the army. But when Cusack and Beattie were murdered, 90 percent of the people were in favor of having a real go at the army. Besides, the army didn't help matters any because they started taunting the people. They used to get slingshots and fire bolts at the factory girls when they were going to work and shout obscenities and all. So it kept escalating until now you have a situation where the people just detest the bloody army."

Tommy McCourt, a member of the Socialist Resistance Group (SRG), said:

"Even before internment, the troops showed no consideration for the people. They didn't come into this area very often, but when they did, they came in tanks and Whippet cars doing about fifty miles an hour. On one occasion, they were driving about that fast down the New Road. The street was wet. They hit a nine-year-old boy and crushed him up against a wall. I heard the commotion and ran out. I saw the Whippet cars going down the road. The soldiers seemed to be laughing. I remember distinctly that one of them said, 'Get the fuck out of here.'

"I ran up to the boy. My young cousin got there first and put a sheet over the boy's face. I lifted it up. He was totally unrecognizable. About five minutes after this, two army Land Rovers with MPs came in to investigate what had happened. The crowd just went berserk and chased them out of the area.

"A little while after this, two policemen arrived. The people decided that they would let the police come because this was an obvious case of reckless driving by the army. The police wanted to take away the army lorry. The people said no. If it was taken away, it would only be used by the British army and some other kid would get it. The people decided that they were going to burn the lorry. About ten minutes after that, seven Saracens [tanks] came roaring into the area. One of them rammed into the lorry and sent it careening across the street. Still on fire, it plowed through a man's fence into his garden. It almost set his house on fire.

"The soldiers couldn't get out of the Saracens, because the people were literally on top of the tanks. There was a turret machine gun and one individual caught it and stuck an iron bar up the barrel of it. Eventually six Saracens pulled out but one got jammed. The people got round it and they practically tore the thing apart with their bare hands.

"There has been another incident like this since internment. A young boy of five or six years of age was on the road and an army lorry ran over him. The driver refused to stop and went on. There was quite a bit of rioting after that. An army doctor came to the father of the child to say how sorry he was. The father just went for him. The people surrounded the army barracks. They commandeered a lorry and ran it backwards and forwards against the post, breaking down the wall. The soldiers had to retreat across the Foyle Road."

When the British army and the police raided the Catholic ghettos in Derry August 9, dragging off local men to "interrogation centers" and the concentration camp, massive protests began immediately and lasted for two weeks.

Morrison remembered the day of the raids very clearly: "I was awakened by shouting, banging of bins. I ran out. The first house I got over to was Mickey Montgomery's. They had already got Mickey. He had no clothes on him. He just had his underwear and they took him away. The first reaction of the people was to go to the nearest army billet, which was Rosemont. I went there myself. There must have been 2,000 or 3,000 people."

McCourt remembered the first confused response of the people on August 9 and their quickly mounting anger. "After a while we gradually got information that people had been lifted [arrested] and that the same thing was happening all over Northern Ireland, that internment had been introduced.

"The people were disgusted, mad, running around in the street without knowing what to do. Word came through that they were fighting in the Brandywell area, that the troops were coming back in because they didn't get everybody they wanted. So we immediately rushed over to the area. We found people already on the streets, fighting. We joined in with them to keep the troops out.

"This fighting went on from about 7:00 or 8:00 in the morning until about 11:00 or 12:00, or midday. By around noon the troops were driven out of the area and retreated back over the Foyle Road to their barracks.

"The reports started coming through then about trouble at Rosemont police barracks. We went up there and a large-scale battle was going on. The barracks was surrounded. The troops

were inside it; the people were petrol-bombing it. The roof was practically torn apart. Slates had been pulled off and petrol bombs were being thrown in through the holes.

"There was an impromptu meeting called for 2:00 or 3:00 that afternoon, down at Free Derry Corner. There was a turnout of probably 2,000 to 3,000 people. Speakers included Eamon McCann, Terry Robinson, and a few other people. We were told that internment had in fact been introduced and that people like Michael Farrell had been lifted, anyone who was in any way prominent or known.

"People went mad and wanted to know what to do. Calls went out for rent and rates strikes, erection of barricades, and in general a civil resistance campaign against the latest repression. Everybody agreed that vigilantes should be formed to patrol the streets. People just took it on themselves. They started building barricades again."

About two weeks after the barricades went up, McCourt said, the troops came in to take them down: "They came in about 7:00 in the morning and were met by the people on the streets. A call was put out from the Creggan for a meeting there by Eamon McCann and various other people for civil resistance. They called for people to sit on the barricades and let the army have to move them. This call was put out because it was obvious since Eamon Lafferty, a member of the Provisionals, was killed by gunfire in the morning that the British military could not be held out of the area by military force.

"So the people came out and sat on the barricades and the troops tried to move them. On one occasion they ran a Land Rover at a barricade where people were sitting, and stopped short at the last minute.

"In Beechwood Road, where I live, the troops came up to the barricade there and told the people to move off. The people refused. They said they were not allowing the British army into the area to intimidate the people there. The army said that if they didn't move, the soldiers would open fire. They didn't specify exactly what they meant by that, they just said they would open fire. But the people still refused.

"An army officer then gave the order to a soldier and the soldier lifted a rubber-bullet gun and fired into the

crowd. The crowd were on the verge of retaliation but decided against it and resorted to verbal abuse of the army. Father Rooney, I think it was, went over to the soldiers and asked them why they had fired. They said it was a mistake and they didn't mean to do it. You know, that was a bit hard to say to the girl that was hit by the rubber bullet."

In some places, the people blocked the movement of the troops with their bodies alone. "The people formed a human barricade on the Lone Moor Road and refused to move. The army came up with a water cannon and sprayed the people with purple dye. It was on this occasion that John Hume and Ivan Cooper were sprayed with it. . . . The army fired rubber bullets into the crowd, but the crowd still refused to move and sat on. Then the army fired CS gas which the people just couldn't stand. After that they lifted John Hume and Ivan Cooper and a few other people.

"Word went round straightaway that John Hume and Ivan Cooper had been arrested. The people in general were very angry about this. The women marched to the barracks and demanded his release. He was then handed over to the people, and the people carried him, shoulder high, into the Bogside."

The united way the people responded to the raids and their ingenuity in opposing the military occupation impressed Charlie Morrison:

"People who never did anything before were out throwing. If they weren't throwing, they were coming out with buckets of water and vinegar, and food, and so on, supporting the boys who were throwing. The first morning there were seven soldiers shot. The Provisionals had opened up with some guns.

"An anti-internment committee was set up in the Creggan by most radical groups. Somewhere around 200 barricades were put up. Well, the army couldn't accept this situation, so they made a push one morning. They said they had 1,500 troops but it was more in the region of 3,000. And they had the equipment for taking away the barricades. They started in the Brandywell and they just completely overtook the area. I think one soldier was shot. Then they came up in the Creggan but the decision was already taken that there would be no guns. People would go and sit on

the barricades and there would be passive resistance.

"When the soldiers came up, it was a very hot day. The people were walking out with glasses of water and they were walking up and saying "Do you want a drink, Limey?" And then they would pour the water all over his shoes or something. They spit in their faces. They even stole their CS canisters. Some of them, the people that is, would get the soldiers to smile at them. And then they would ask the soldier what the hell he was smiling about. They showed every kind of scorn possible. It was terrible the scorn they showed the British army.

"For example, the people would go up to the soldiers and feel their trousers to see if they'd peed themselves. They asked them, did they shit themselves. They asked them if they were scared and spit on them. The people would pull off their berets. . . .

"The girls were dancing around the soldiers singing rebel songs. The people were opening their windows, playing rebel records as loud as they could. Ach, even the wee, small fellows about three or four years of age were going up to the soldiers and stealing their rubber bullets and their CS cannisters. It went to the point where one soldier just threw down his gear in the road and refused to do anything. He said he wouldn't fight women and children. Scorn's worse than physical abuse, you know. They arrested him and took him away.

"The army stood in lines while the barricades were being torn down. And the people started walking slowly toward the army and that's the way they pushed the army out of the Creggan and the Bogside. And the soldiers were glad to get out when it was all over.

"Later the army changed its tactics and started spraying this purple dye on the people sitting on the barricades. Everybody in Derry was running around with purple shirts and purple jumpers and all and treating it as a big joke. The whole thing had its funny aspects too.

"I think passive resistance was the best tactics at the time because it was getting people involved. It was very successful. If somebody had opened up with guns, the people wouldn't have been on the streets, and the soldiers could have taken the whole area and held it by their firepower. The people would have been afraid to

come out, especially after what happened to Cusack and Beattie; they were both shot for nothing. The army said they were gunmen but they had no arms.

"The barricades were made of heavy concrete blocks and flagstones. They were strong barricades, but they were easily enough removed by the equipment the army had. The soldiers would come down a street and take away the barricade at one end. And while they were taking it away, the people would be building up the first barricade again, and sitting on it and sticking tricolors [Irish flags] on it."

Over the past three years, McCourt said, the people have had a chance to perfect their techniques for handling the troops: "The resistance to the troops takes a general pattern. I must admit, it isn't really organized. It is more or less spontaneous. Various techniques have been developed. One is rioting, to show that the population is behind the struggles. They throw petrol bombs and things like this. Another thing is that various people in the area take potshots at the troops and kill them. And then there's the psychological thing the people do on the troops, such as cat-calls. It is quite common for this sort of thing to happen: The troops will be coming up the streets around tea-time. The people are fighting. The young fellows yell out. 'Hey, Tommy, we're going for our tea.' And then they disperse and go home and have their tea and come back an hour and a half later. The soldiers are still standing there and the young fellows are after having an hour-and-a-half break. This really infuriates the army.

"Also, girls have a tendency of going up to soldiers and saying to them, 'Oh, I'd love to see you tonight—preferably dead.' The people do almost everything they can to annoy the troops, to frustrate the troops. Women in particular do this because they can get away with it more. A boy would get batoned or brought in. The women are forever walking by them and telling them how good-looking they are and how they're fantastic fellows and why don't they go home and all. They might get themselves a girl because they certainly won't get one in Derry."

"There are two sides to putting pressure on the troops. One is to make them as uncomfortable as possible to show them that they're not wanted

here. The other thing is things like leaflets and campaigns in England. We say to the troops, 'What are you doing over here? We're ordinary working-class people just like you. What are you going to do if you find yourself going up your own street, terrorizing your own people?'

"And this causes a lot of confusion among the troops. They tend to think that it's more or less Catholic versus Protestant here and that they're here to keep the mad Irish from fighting. We're constantly pointing out to the soldiers that they're bolstering up a regime in London that's doing the same thing to the working class in England as they are here. Posters are up and Radio Free Derry is on the air most of the time and it's always calling on the troops to throw in their weapons and go home. Propaganda is going on, on all levels, to convince the people that they should maintain unity and to convince the troops that they shouldn't be here.

"The socialist and left-wing organizations in England copy our demands. They're all carrying out campaigns in England to call for the withdrawal of British troops and an end to internment. But at the moment there is no direct campaign directed at the troops. The English organizations think that if they can convince the English working class that the troops shouldn't be here, it's through that you will get the troops withdrawn. There's more hope of convincing the working class. Already some polls are beginning to show that the people over there are beginning to come round to the point of believing that British troops should be pulled out."

I asked Morrison if the people weren't becoming a little intimidated after three years of violence and killing. He answered: "The attitude has hardened here. Every day when school finishes, you see the young lads about twelve, thirteen years, younger even, some of them seven or eight, go to the nearest army base. They put down their schoolbags and start tossing stones at the British army.

"The army got wise to this about a month ago, and they started wooing the wee lads. They offered the wee lads rubber bullets. In fact, they gave one young fellow fifty pence [approximately \$1.25] and they give them CS cannisters and ask them 'Who's the gunman on your street?' They

tried this to get information out of the little fellows. But these wee lads, you know, they're not that dumb, they've seen it all, they've lived through it since 1968. I met one wee lad the other day and he told me that a soldier asked him 'Who's the gunman in your street' and 'Is your brother a gunman?' And the wee lad told him a lot of lies to get the fifty pence off him; the lad was after the fifty pence. And it proves he wasn't that stupid. He got his fifty pence and he told the soldier a lot of rubbish.

"The young fellows definitely have no fear. When there is a raid and somebody is shot, it only increases their anger. They go up within maybe five yards of a soldier; they throw petrol bombs and everything. You realize they can be shot dead for throwing a petrol bomb.

"The younger boys don't play cow-boys and Indians here anymore. It's soldiers and rioters. We were watching them one night, Kathleen my wife and I. All the soldiers had these shields made out of cardboard and wood and homemade visors. They would get behind the wall and all the so-called rioters would throw bricks at them. One night, two of the young lads had their heads split and had to go to the hospital to get some stitches. They were soldiers, by the way, you know.

"The wee lads are tossing these bricks and it's inevitable that someone will get hurt. But they're that determined, even though they're only playing. It's very authentic what they do. They've seen it all, firsthand.

"Aye, it's like training. I think the British army's going to have trouble when these wee lads grow up. They're getting well versed in it now.

"The older people are not so keen, probably because they're scared. All their lives, they've been used to getting pushed around. And they are easily pushed about. But the young people are not just going to have it. You go down there to the Bogside, and you see a young fellow, maybe fifteen years of age, and you ask him, what are you throwing for. He'll tell you that there's nothing else to do.

"The politicians here, Hume and Cooper and the lot, they've gone down and said 'Your future's at stake.' The wee lad will turn round and say, 'What future have I got?'

"Kathleen there'll tell you, one day a person approached one of these

young lads and asked 'Why are you throwing stones?' He said his father never had a job. His father was unemployed all his life. And the wee lad's answer was 'They made a cabbage out of my father, they're not going to do it out of me.' That proves that they're aware that the system has never done anything for them.

"You take a wee lad down there, fifteen years of age. The older generation think he's just a thug. But if you could talk with these wee lads, it's surprising the things they come out with."

The young people in Derry will never give up fighting, McCourt stressed:

"We've just been sickened by the whole thing and we're not going to lie down anymore. If you look at youth throughout the world today, they're sick and tired of the whole system. They're just not prepared to lie down under authority and be told what to do. The youth here just don't seem to have any fear of death. You hear the youth around the area saying things like, 'If you get shot, you get shot, so what?'"

"Fighting has been going on for three years here now and it's become part of our lives. People just accept it as the norm. They are sickened by seeing young girls shot and men interned. And the British press has a lot to do with it, too. People are just infuriated by seeing so many bloody lies."

Charlie Morrison explained: "Basically the Catholic here was always a fighter, he was always oppressed. When your back's against the wall, what can you do? You can't do anything but fight. The Catholics are a born fighting race. Whereas the Protestant people never had to do their own fighting. Their fighting was done for them by their RUC [Royal Ulster Constabulary] and their B Specials. I think there'd be more courage on the Catholic side than the Protestant side. The years of oppression have insured this. We never had anything to lose by fighting and all we have to lose now are our chains."

But Morrison also stressed that the nationalist people of Derry have a positive reason for fighting.

"At the minute, they're trying to get all the streets in Creggan in these street committees. I would say that in the Creggan there are about four street-committees set up already and

really functioning. I think it will come to the stage where every street will have its committee."

The street committees were set up to coordinate the passive resistance and maintain the essential services in the neighborhoods. Morrison's committee was interested in recreation for the young people. Few amenities had been provided in the sprawling suburban housing development.

"Creggan's a very big estate and there were never any football fields, playing fields, what have you. The first street-committee set up in the Creggan was Runmore Drive. I was on this committee and I still am. There was a playing field up at the back of the Creggan. The local authority put it up. There were goalposts there. But nobody ever played there because it was way out in the country.

"There's a big field by the side of the church, the bishop's field. Good, flat ground. So we decided to go up and take these goalposts and bring

them down. We lined out a football field there. Now every street in Creggan have their football team, or teams for different age groups. There's a competition going on at the minute, three matches a day.

"We're not just giving the lads the entertainment of a football field, you know. We're getting them involved, to take a wee bit of pride in their own area, and run their own area, which is a good thing, especially for young people. And it also proves to the older generation that the lads are not just thugs, and petrol-bomb throwers and what they're made out to be.

"When the lads aren't playing football, we get them to go out and brush up the streets and all. They've even gone along and helped the old-age pensioners. It's too late on in the year, but come spring, we're hoping to take all these wee lads on the football teams and take them over to cut the grass for the old-age pensioners and fix up their homes and all." □

## Iran

# Military Court Sentences Six to Death

By Javad Sadeeg

A military court in Teheran has sentenced six young revolutionists to death and twelve others to long prison terms at hard labor.

On January 23, the court began trying a group of twenty-three persons, allegedly members of an urban guerrilla organization. On January 31 it condemned to death Saeed Areen, reported the February 1 air edition of the semiofficial Teheran daily *Ettelaat*.

The next day, according to the February 3 issue of *Le Monde*, the same court sentenced to death Abbas and Assadolah Meftahi, Massoud and Madjid Ahmadzadeh, and Hamid Tavakoli.

The defendants were accused of responsibility for bank robberies, assassination of policemen, the assassination last year of the notorious military prosecutor General Farsiou, membership in "subversive" organizations, and conspiracy to overthrow the regime.

However, there were no specific

charges made against any of the accused. Consequently, except for the usual "confessions," there was no evidence presented to the court by the military prosecutor, Captain Mohammad-Esmaeel Afrasiabi. This fact was pointed out by one of the court-appointed defense lawyers, but was ignored by the military judge.

The accused refused to defend themselves in such a court. They contended that as political prisoners they must, according to the Iranian constitution, be tried in an open civilian court by an impartial jury. Colonel Safa Keesh, the presiding judge, replied that his court was open. However, only members of the controlled Iranian press were present.

Two international observers were prevented from witnessing the trials. John Thorne of the United States and Jacqueline Portell of France were told by the authorities when they arrived in Iran that the trials had been postponed. They therefore left the country before the trials started on January

23. The Confederation of Iranian Students reported that another lawyer then flew to Iran, but there is no indication that he was allowed to be present in the court.

The court-appointed military lawyers for each prisoner usually tried to put the blame on another prisoner, in order to break the group's solidarity.

Despite all pressures, the prisoners held their ground, refusing to defend themselves. Their determination angered the judge, who declared, "Your silence is proof of your guilt!"

In addition to the six condemned to death, the names of five of the twelve who received prison sentences are known. They are Mehdi Savalani, Gholam-Reza Golavi, Bahman Ajhang, Abdol-Karim Hajian, all of whom were sentenced for life, and Hameed Arzpeyma, who was sentenced to fifteen years.

The decision on five of the twenty-three prisoners is not yet known. □

## Japan

### Students Fight Tuition Increase

A wave of student revolts protesting increases in tuition is spreading throughout Japanese universities. A total of eighty-six universities are involved in some form of struggle over this issue, according to *Asahi Shimbun* of January 17.

The paper reported that at six schools, including Kyoto University, Doshisha University, Kansai University, and Waseda University, students have occupied buildings.

Since the government recently began to talk about raising tuition at national universities, private schools have announced increases one after another.

While the student movement was forced to retreat by the government's attempts at physical suppression in the 1969-70 period of student upheavals, the regime has not been able to solve a single issue raised. The present struggles indicate that the radicalized students retain a high level of militancy and threaten the government with a major student rebellion. □

## Bihari Collaborators Fire on Bengalis

### Rahman Collecting Mukti Bahini Arms

By Jon Rothschild

On January 31 all members of the Bengali Mukti Bahini (Liberation Forces) still holding their weapons officially became "undesirable elements" in the eyes of Mujibur Rahman's Awami League government. Throughout the day, according to the February 1 *Washington Post*, guerrillas arrived in Dacca to participate in a massive arms-turn-in ceremony at Dacca Stadium.

"Government officials in Dacca and other towns report impressive totals of weapons have been collected and most say they are satisfied that the number of arms still to be rounded up by police and soldiers is not too large. At the stadium today, it was impossible to count the number of weapons, but 20,000 is a conservative guess."

The core of the old East Bengal Regiment has now been transformed into the regular army of Bangladesh. According to reports in the Western press, the most powerful contingents of the Mukti Bahini have been largely disarmed. Nobody really knows, however, how many Mukti Bahini troops were actually under arms, so it is difficult to tell exactly what percentage of them have complied with Rahman's order. So long as Rahman requires the services of the Indian army, which as yet has shown no sign of leaving Bangladesh, it can be assumed that the new government feels unsure of its success in establishing a solid capitalist state apparatus.

But present indications are that the absence of a revolutionary party authoritative enough to give form to the socialist aspirations of the Bengali masses has enabled the Awami League to utilize Rahman's personal prestige effectively and to ride the crest of the mass mobilization to power.

The end of the "time of the guerrilla" in Bangladesh has been punctuated by a series of macabre developments that had been predicted by the Mukti Bahini rank and file. Elements who supported the Pakistani regime, unimpressed by the Awami League's prestige, have refused to disarm themselves. On January 29, while

Bengali guerrillas were en route to Dacca to give Rahman their arms, bands of Biharis, non-Bengalis who collaborated with Yahya's occupation army, opened fire on Bengali refugees returning to their homes on the outskirts of Dacca.

In two Bihari-dominated neighborhoods, Mohammedpur and Mirpur, fighting raged for three days. Despite the Western bourgeoisie's hypocritical concern for the well-being of the accomplices in Pakistan's genocide, initial reports indicated that the Bengalis suffered considerably higher casualties than the Biharis.

At first the Bangladesh government refused to reveal how many Bengalis had been killed—"apparently to avoid inflaming the Bengali population," according to the *New York Times*. But on February 2 a spokesman for the Bengali armed forces said that 100 "or maybe more" soldiers had been killed. He did not report the number of civilian dead. The same spokesman charged that some of the "Biharis" shooting at the Bengalis were in fact Pakistani soldiers who had kept their arms, changed into civilian clothes, and vanished into Bihari neighborhoods after the Pakistani surrender last December 16.

Rahman refused to allow the Mukti Bahini to deal with the situation. "In the latest violence in Dacca's two Bihari neighborhoods," wrote Sydney Schanberg in the February 2 *New York Times*, ". . . the Bengali guerrillas were heavily involved in the initial stages. But Sheik Mujib quickly ordered them out and turned over the collecting of arms to the Bengali police and the East Bengal Regiment. . . ."

Mohammedpur and Mirpur have been placed under twenty-four-hour curfew. But as of the second week of February, the Biharis have yet to be disarmed. In other parts of the country, similar situations persist. Rahman, qualified bourgeois prime minister that he is, has shown considerably more concern for the disarming of the revolutionists than the

quashing of the counterrevolution.

The desire of the Mukti Bahini rank and file to eliminate the threat of armed Bihari terror is more than a simple thirst for revenge. Even during the last days of the Pakistani occupation, the Biharis, armed by Yahya's troops, demonstrated a relentless determination to inflict massive casualties on the Bengali people. While the relatively few instances of revenge killings by Bengalis have been splashed over the front pages of the Western press, the role of the collaborators in the March-December murders has generally been relegated to the inside pages.

One exception was a dispatch from Sydney Schanberg printed in the January 24 *New York Times*. Entitled "Bengali's Land a Vast Cemetery," it warrants quoting at some length:

"On this graveyard, we shall build our golden Bengal.' So reads a cardboard sign hung on a flagpole in the city of Khulna.

"Not far from the flagpole, human bones, picked clean by vultures and dogs, still litter the roadside at various execution sites where the Pakistani Army and its collaborators killed Bengalis.

"Bloodstained clothing and tufts of human hair cling to the brush on these killing grounds. Children too young to understand play grotesque games with the skulls and other bones.

"This correspondent found, on a recent tour of the countryside, that almost every town in East Pakistan [!] had one or more of these graveyards, where the Pakistanis killed hundreds of thousands of Bengalis, apparently often on a daily basis, throughout their nine months of military occupation. . . .

"In the capital, Dacca, many execution grounds have been found—particularly in sections like Mirpur and Mohammedpur, which are populated largely by non-Bengalis who collaborated with the Pakistanis.

"One corner of the zoo in Mirpur is strewn with skeletons with hands tied behind their backs. Many of the animals were also killed."

The Rahman government, after nearly two months in power, has been either unable or unwilling to control the continued terrorism of the collaborators. Since his announcement of the January 31 deadline for the surrender of all arms, Rahman has

spoken more threateningly of Mukti Bahini fighters who have resisted the order than of Biharis who have not only kept their arms but have used them against the Bengalis.

Rahman's aim is to show the Western powers, toward which he has politically oriented the regime, that his government can be relied upon to destroy the Bengali revolution and re-establish firm capitalist rule in Bangladesh.

For Rahman and the aspiring Bengali bourgeoisie he represents, this policy has already borne some fruit. On February 4 ten Western countries formally recognized the new regime:

Britain, West Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, Austria, and Israel. Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg announced that they would soon do the same. Even within the U.S. ruling class, pressure for recognition is mounting. Senator Adlai Stevenson III is the latest public official to add his name to those calling upon Nixon to establish diplomatic relations with the Rahman government. Rahman announced on February 4 that he was "adopting the necessary diplomatic measures to become a member of the [British] Commonwealth," a move he had earlier promised to make. □

## Nixon, Mao Promise Aid to Bhutto's Army

Despite an officially declared ban on military shipments to Pakistan, the Nixon administration provided Yahya Khan with at least \$3,800,000 worth of military supplies during the genocidal war against the Bengali people. That was the conclusion of a study conducted by the General Accounting Office, an agency of the U.S. Congress. The study was commissioned by Senator Edward Kennedy, a critic of Nixon's pro-Pakistan policy. It was released February 4.

According to the *New York Times*, the study is "replete with references to conflicting statements by spokesmen for the State and Defense Departments."

The figure of \$3,800,000 applies only to military items exported under licenses that had been granted before March 25, the day Yahya launched the war, and delivered to Pakistan between March 25 and September 30. During the entire year ending June 30, 1971, \$28,500,000 worth of military supplies were sent to Pakistan by the United States.

The \$3,800,000 figure for equipment shipped during the war is in fact a serious underestimation. It does not include material shipped between September 30 and November 8, when the State Department halted shipments on outstanding export licenses. It also excludes arms exported from military depots, which do not require licenses, and arms licensed for export in earlier years but sent during 1971.

Some congressional estimates of the actual total of material sent between March and December run as high as \$7,500,000.

On February 2 Kennedy charged that Nixon was preparing to resume military shipments to Pakistan. Officials in the State Department denied that such a move was under "active" consideration. But according to the February 3 *New York Times*, "qualified Government informants said later that the Administration had sent confidential cablegrams last month to Joseph P. Farland, United States Ambassador to Pakistan, and to Kenneth Keating, Ambassador to India, outlining legal justifications by which arms shipments could be resumed despite a Congressional ban voted in July."

But even if it takes some time for Nixon to arrange the legal pretext, Pakistan President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto apparently has nothing to worry about. Yahya's successor returned February 2 from a three-day state-visit to Peking. A snowstorm prevented the usual red-carpet treatment at Peking airport the day he arrived, but when he left tens of thousands of cheering Chinese lined the two-mile route to the airport.

Bhutto described his visit as "productive, useful, constructive, and successful." Perhaps he had in mind the comment of the obliging Chou En-lai: "We are not ammunition merchants. Whatever your defense requirements are, they will be met gratis." □

# Gierek's Attempt to Remodel the Communist Party

By Michel Reval

[The Sixth Congress of the Polish Communist party, held in December, naturally preoccupied itself with attempting to evaluate the lessons of the December 1970 workers' uprising in order to prevent such challenges to the bureaucracy's privileges in the future. The following analysis of the situation in Poland appeared in the December 4 issue of *Rouge*, the newspaper of the Ligue Communiste (French section of the Fourth International). The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

\* \* \*

In introducing the draft theses for the Congress, a Warsaw newspaper wrote: ". . . The discussion now opening will be different from its predecessors . . . the socialist consciousness of our people has deepened; we have understood some bitter truths as never before, and we have better realized the dangers arising from the break in connections between the basic components of the party and society, which was so tragically revealed in the December explosion. . . ." (*Zycie Warszawy*, September 7, 1971.)

An extraordinarily clear confession. In the last phase of the Gomulka period, the party had ceased to play its role as an effective tool for the bureaucracy's management of society. Party members were apathetic and insufficiently motivated. They defaulted in their responsibility of explaining the economic goals set by the leaders to their fellow workers, of convincing them of the correctness of these goals, and of urging them to work without protest toward realizing the goals "for the well-being of the nation."

And when protest did develop, these same members not only were incapable of derailing it, but, in their political apathy (and out of fear for *their personal careers*), they did not even report its existence through hierarchical channels so the leadership could be informed of the real sentiments of the masses. It is not surprising, today's leaders cry, that the

Gomulka crew should have become so divorced from the masses that it had been able to go so far as to decree that monstrous increase in the price of basic foodstuffs, never foreseeing that the workers might take to the streets in response.

Such is the critique made by the present leaders. The party had become *too* bureaucratized! It allowed popular discontent to overflow into channels that were totally uncontrolled and uncontrollable. Thus, the party could no longer insure the bureaucracy's domination of society. This is the danger they are trying to alleviate today.

But unfortunately for our bureaucrats, if the party has arrived at this point, the reasons do not lie on the level of simple personal deficiencies. They are profoundly embedded in the present crisis of the regime.

During the period of the initial industrialization, the bureaucrats' job was relatively simple. It was to explain to the working class that the task of the hour was the reconstruction of a country totally destroyed by the war; that this necessitated a great deal of effort and sacrifice from the *whole* society (they simply "forgot" to make any comparison between the salary of a bureaucrat and that of a worker), but that at the cost of belt-tightening in the present, a radiant future would be constructed within twenty years.

This explanation was easy to put over, since it was often propagated by devoted militants full of enthusiasm,<sup>1</sup> and was addressed to a work-

ing class that was numerically and culturally weak.

It was composed, in its great majority, of first-generation workers arriving in the city from the overcrowded countryside. They derived considerable immediate benefit from the industrialization (disappearance of the specter of unemployment, increased social advantages, the possibility of rapid social advancement in an expanding industrial apparatus, etc.).

Today, after twenty-seven years of the regime and in spite of an immense industrial development, serious difficulties persist, especially in the sphere of consumption.<sup>2</sup> And it is no longer possible to replay the same old song with the refrain "in twenty years this will be paradise." Even the militants who were most devoted in the past find it hard to believe, all the more so since many of them were profoundly demoralized after Gomulka's gang liquidated the conquests of October 1956, in which they had placed their hopes.

Finally, the working class itself has undergone many changes during the industrialization. Today, it constitutes a modern proletariat of a high cultural level, strongly unified, a majority of society; a proletariat that feels a growing discomfort at submitting to the tutelage of the bureaucracy. The young workers (whose weight within the working class is very great) do not consider the early industrialization as a conquest achieved at great cost, but as a natural basis for new conquests. For them, above all, the old song no longer has any credibility.

Finally, as the old cadres have become increasingly demoralized, a new layer has increasingly asserted itself in the party. Careerists, largely depoliticized *in the image of the system*

1. They were principally worker militants, old prewar militants, and those of the Young Communist rank and file. But that in no way predetermined the composition of the party at that time. Just after the liberation, a considerable mass of people having nothing in common with the ideas of socialism attached themselves to the party, feeling that this was now the path to privilege. Among them were a significant number of servants of the old bourgeois regime, including some members of the old fascist movements.

2. The Central Committee theses for the Sixth Congress now officially recognize that in the course of the last five years living standards had stagnated and there was even a fall in the real wages of some categories of workers.



itself, pour into the party, which they consider exclusively a device for ascending the rungs of society to assure themselves the biggest slice of the pie. Devoid of conviction, carefully concealing from the top leaders the difficulties at the base so as not to compromise their personal careers, they are the motive force of the ossification of the apparatus. They subordinate the general interests of the bureaucracy to the interests of their own personal careers. It is especially to them that the present leaders refer when they complain, in the newspapers and in the draft theses for the Sixth Congress, of "comrades having a weak political consciousness, who do not belong in our party."

This layer of members seems to constitute the base of Moczar's group of "partisans."<sup>3</sup> Moczar's group, fighting tooth and nail for the commanding heights of the party, rather well expressed the aspirations of all the careerists wanting to climb the steps of the apparatus, which on the whole is already well structured so that each jealously defends his already acquired position. The careerist layer was not at all bothered by the virulent anti-Semitism of the "partisans," which well served their personal interests. The expulsion from the party of bureaucrats of Jewish origin resulted in a certain number of vacant spots in the apparatus, which the careerists could take over.<sup>4</sup>

To recast the party into a more efficient tool, better able to manage society, more attentive to the complaints of the masses, that is the fundamental concern of the present leadership. It is also one of the fundamental themes of the preparations for the Sixth Congress. Let us give some examples.

A big campaign had been launched in which the "activist" members (paid functionaries) of the party talked (in-

3. Before the December 1970 events, the ultranationalist grouping of "partisans" led a fight inside the leading organs of the party, which had given them complete control of the security apparatus and a good deal of control of the news organs.

4. In the same way, forcing citizens of Jewish origin out of the country meant that several thousand posts in society became free for the taking. That's how, after 1968, the bureaucracy tried to "attenuate" the social crisis produced by the slowdown of economic growth.

dividually, like good bureaucrats, to avoid collective discussion) with 1-, 200,000 members and candidates in order to politically remotivate them and expel a series of those whose "political level is insufficient."

We have no illusions about the effectiveness of this campaign. In the first place, the expulsions have not been very numerous. It was more a matter of frightening others, rather than creating any kind of "mass" movement whatsoever, which would



MIECZYSLAW MOCZAR

at the same time weaken the forces of the party, the fundamental structure of the bureaucratic state.

Besides, the "activist" was doing the purging, but there was no one to purge the "activists" themselves. But the intensity of the campaign, the publicity it was given in both the press and the draft theses for the Congress, well testify to the importance the present leadership group attaches to the problem.

The press overflows with testimony of party secretaries of certain factories explaining the functioning of their cells. Some of these are real "little handbooks for the good bureaucrat," presented as recipes for others to follow. The recipes are always the same: you must listen to what people say and *know how to respond to their questions*, or else they will find other ways of expressing their discontent;

it is necessary for people to complain, but *individually and in a recognized fashion*; the factory management must bring its decisions into line with the requests of the party, otherwise the latter might get into fights with the management (to protect the confidence of workers discontented with the decisions) and this undermines management's authority, which is indispensable, etc., etc. . . . All this bureaucratic cynicism is widely diffused in the press under a title that is itself revealing: "Authority and Frankness in Factory Life."

Lastly, we should try to explain why the new leaders sent the "partisans" on leave. This grouping has lost most of its pre-December 1970 positions, especially in the security apparatus. From the viewpoint of maintaining his own position at the head of the party, Gierk certainly had every reason to fear the "partisans." It is also certain that Moczar's demotion must have pleased the Kremlin, which did not appreciate his supernationalism. Finally, one must not forget that Moczar and his friends, as heads of the police, were directly responsible for the repression on the Baltic coast in December 1970, for which the workers demanded his resignation.

Perhaps the demotion also reflected the desire to get rid of the spokesmen for this most rotten element of the party, whose immobilization and incapacity had become so dangerous for the bureaucracy. In any case, the demotion does not mean that the fate of the "partisans" is settled. If the Gierk team fails in its turn, if social tensions are again exacerbated, the present leaders will call on the "hard man" who, for the moment, is waiting in the wings.

All these machinations do not mean — far from it — that the present leaders count on regaining complete credibility in the eyes of the masses. To derail the movement of December 1970 Gierk turned to a "realistic" solution: he appealed to the church, demonstrating by that alone his conviction that Cardinal Wyszynski's words are better received in the hearts of the Polish masses than those of the First Secretary. That was already a damaging admission. And the cardinal did not disappoint the leaders. He called upon the people "not to accuse, not to rebel, but to harness yourselves together to the national

plow, to bring out of the fields more bread for the fatherland." (1)

Today, the same admission continues. One of the regime's leading journalists<sup>5</sup> wrote, in commenting on the last synod of the Vatican, that this venture could be very useful if it served to induce the Polish clergy "to pledge itself to the virgin soil of society, to combat social ills more actively, such as alcoholism and hooliganism, and above all to foster the

---

5. The same one who in May 1968 referred to Daniel Cohn-Bendit in the Polish press as "the German-Jewish leader Cohn-Bendit." We may thus have some reason to express doubts about the purge of the apparatus.

maturation of the ethical ideal of work as the fundamental criterion of value in all society, and in the first place in socialist society."

Thus, after having persecuted the church during the Stalin era,<sup>6</sup> today the Polish bureaucracy stretches out its hand, asking the church to provide a powerful contribution to its own police within the society.<sup>7</sup> □

---

6. This was an important factor in the church's popularity, all possibility of leftist opposition to the regime being forbidden.

7. Obviously, this "fraternization" with the church occurs only on condition that the church not challenge the bureaucracy's domination of society.

in order to protect the health of the bank manager.

*La Nación* wrote: "At 3:00 a.m. yesterday [Sunday, January 30], the manager, Señor Campis, and his wife arrived at the building, where they live. As they came in they were overcome by the alleged extremists and taken to the room where the other employees, and Campis's son, were being held. The couple were tied up and gagged. Since Señor Campis suffered from heart trouble, the raiders called a doctor, who arrived immediately afterward."

The police charged that the raiders had opened the gas vents in the basement and planted bombs in order to delay their pursuers: "The first thing the firemen did was close the open valves and begin to clear the air," *La Nación* reported. "Once they had done this, they found eleven packages that later proved to contain cans of naphtha and kerosene. In one of the basements, they found another package containing a powerful explosive that had to be detonated on the spot. . . .

"A catastrophe was averted. With the quantity of gas that had accumulated and the various explosives left by the malefactors, the building would probably have collapsed."

Despite the police reports of finding "documents," presumably of the ERP, the bank officials believed, according to *La Nación*, that the raid was the work of common criminals. "For example, it was pointed out that, contrary to the usual practice, the initials "ERP" were written without periods in the slogans painted inside the bank and in the communiqués issued by the alleged extremists. Moreover, the star drawn on the walls and the papers differed from the symbol used on other occasions.

"It was also noted that the raid yesterday would have required at least two years' preparation."

However, the official version put out by the government press service stated: "The presumed extremists left the bank after they found that they could not carry off their subversive action. They painted the letters "ERP" on the wall with an aerosol can. They also painted the five-pointed star, which is the emblem of this clandestine organization. Moments after they fled, a bomb went off at the entrance of the Galería La Favorita at Córdoba 1065. They shouted some slogans defaming the authorities." □

## Argentina

---

### Police Blame Guerrillas in Bank Robbery

"A robbery, unprecedented both in the way it was carried out and in the amount of loot taken, was perpetrated Saturday night [January 29]," the Buenos Aires daily *La Nación* wrote in its January 31 issue. "A commando team, presumably composed of extremists, raided the central offices of the Banco Nacional de Desarrollo, which is located in the heart of the Argentinian financial world and only a short distance from the Casa de Gobierno [Government Palace] and the Servicio de Informaciones del Estado [National Intelligence Service]."

The raid was attributed to the ERP [Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo—People's Revolutionary Army]. About 4.5 million pesos were reported taken [approximately US\$483,000].

"The attackers left behind the pots and brushes they had used to paint ERP slogans, as well as the remains of their lunch and a banner bearing the emblem of their organization," *La Nación* continued. "Moreover, in a taxicab left across the street from the bank offices, documents and weapons were found."

The Buenos Aires paper gave this description of the raid: "At approximately 10:30 Saturday night [January 29], three persons wearing hoods and apparently aided by two employees of the Banco de Desarrollo—allegedly named Serrano and Abud—entered the office of this institution

at 145/159 on 25 de Mayo street. They overcame the seven persons on the security and custodial squads and opened the doors to seven of their own cohorts. According to police investigations, a total of about a dozen persons participated in the raid.

"Once the raiders had locked up the bank employees and the manager's son in an interior office, the group, which proclaimed its extremist affiliation, searched the area, and it is supposed that they went down to the sub-basement where the vault is located."

The operation took an estimated seven hours to complete. "The raiders did not—as first reports claimed—force or destroy the mechanism that moves the vault door. Such a task would probably be impossible. They immediately began to disconnect a complex air-conditioning apparatus placed in one of the lateral walls of the vault. Once they had finished this job, they ran up against eight thick iron bars, the only obstacle remaining between them and the money."

The raiders cut through the bars with an acetylene torch and took most of the currency. According to an unconfirmed report, they got only 10,000-peso notes.

The commando team was accused of endangering the lives of their captives and any other people in the area. However, another report indicated that they had risked their own safety

## Situation 'Critical and Deteriorating'

# Ovambos Continue Resistance in Namibia

After two days of negotiations, the South African government and the Pretoria-controlled Ovambo Council on January 20 signed an agreement aimed at ending the five-week-old strike of nearly one-third of Namibia's labor force. The deal reportedly abolished the old system of contract labor, a sort of industrial serfdom under which Ovambo tribesmen were bound to white employers for periods of up to eighteen months.

According to the settlement, labor-recruiting for Namibia's mines will henceforth be handled by the Ovambo Council, instead of the South-West Africa Native Labor Organization. Workers will be advised of their wages, hours, and working conditions in advance, and the length of contracts will be reduced. The new agreement stipulates that conditions will be made easier for workers to "maintain their family ties," but no explicit mention was made of the strikers' demand that they be allowed to take their families with them when they travel to southern Namibia for long periods.

Since the apartheid regime, which rules Namibia in defiance of United Nations and World Court orders to withdraw from the territory, consistently refused to deal directly with the strikers' elected representatives, it is unclear whether the settlement will be accepted by the Ovambos. Although no strikers were present during the negotiations, Johannes Nangatuula, widely recognized as a respected strike leader, has called for acceptance of the pact.

According to the February 1 *New York Times*, about half the workers have indicated willingness to return to work under the new agreement. But many members of the Ukwanyama tribe, the largest of the seven Ovambo subtribes, have rejected the settlement as a "watered-down version of the old system."

The government's decision to negotiate with the Ovambo Council, a move that was originally rejected, was prompted by the rapid spread of militant action throughout Namibia. When Pretoria sent police reinforcements to Ovamboland, the population, instead of becoming intimidated, de-

fended themselves against the illegal occupation. Even after the signing of the settlement, on January 30, about 100 Ovambos attacked a police unit. Four Ovambos were reported killed in the clash.

On January 28, some sixty Ovambos armed only with bows and arrows battled a police patrol. At least two cops were injured; two Ovambos were killed. Many white-owned cattle corrals have been destroyed by Ovambo activists.

Even if the government manages to end the strike, the political situation in Namibia will not return to "normal." The February 3 *Christian Science Monitor* reported that though the unrest had erupted over economic issues, it "now appears to be based on political grievances and is no longer a mere labor question."

Blacks who have been through the strike are trying to form a new op-

position political party. Despite a ban on meetings imposed by the Ovambo Council, the new group has been able to hold some secret gatherings. Still more police reinforcements have been sent to Ovamboland to bolster the power of the now widely discredited Ovambo Council.

An additional facet of the Ovambo resistance that is creating problems for colonialism in Africa is the fact that some of the Ovambo tribes live across the border in Portuguese-occupied Angola. South Africa has closed the Namibia-Angola border (a move that was supported by the Ovambo Council) in an effort to prevent Africans from coordinating their independence struggles.

On their part, Portuguese troops took up positions on the Angolan side of the frontier, after Black freedom fighters tore down eighty miles of border fencing.

Bishop Colin O'Brien Winter, the top Anglican church leader in Namibia, recently returned from visiting his mission in Ovamboland. On February 3 he described the situation there as "critical and deteriorating daily." □

## Zimbabwe Still Says 'No!'

# Commission Finds No Backing for Sellout

"As two British commissioners used a magnetic blackboard and other visual aids to explain the complex settlement terms, the aged Chief Chikwakwa, descendant of the leader of a 19th century black rebellion against white settlers, fell asleep. When he awoke and was asked to express his opinion, the chief muttered: 'Kwete, kwete,' which in the Shona language means 'No, no!'"

The incident, according to the January 23 *New York Times*, was a "vivid example of how the British test of acceptability of its deal with Rhodesia's Prime Minister Ian Smith was running into deep trouble, even among so-called tame tribal Africans."

After nearly a month of public hearings on the proposed pact, the commission, headed by Lord Pearce, has still come up with only one African (a pro-Smith tribal chief) who supports the agreement. The mass vio-

lence, precipitated by Rhodesian cops firing on Africans demonstrating against the sellout, appears to have subsided. But still, in meeting after meeting in the Zimbabwe countryside, the Pearce commissioners are met by crowds of Africans chanting "No! No!"

The racist Rhodesian regime has put forth two explanations of the unanimity of the Black response: Blacks are too uneducated to understand the subtlety of the agreement; and those who favor it have been intimidated into silence by savage Black nationalists. Both excuses have been shown to be patent frauds.

The January 29 *Christian Science Monitor* noted that "ordinary Britons" have been surprised by the African reaction: "They [Britons] had been led to believe that, particularly in rural areas, the average black man was too unsophisticated and too unschooled to understand what is pro-

posed. But television programs of African meetings to discuss the proposals with various Pearce commissioners show a high level of awareness of what it is all about."

The January 23 *New York Times* provided a revealing comment on the intimidation charges: "... if moderate Africans who had been expected to support the agreement were now afraid to say 'yes,' they were clearly intimidated not so much by a small group of conspirators but by a hardened front of black opinion."

Just how hardened that front is was demonstrated on January 24, when eight Black members of parliament (appointed to their posts by tribal chiefs) formally declared their opposition to the agreement.

To the extent that there has been intimidation, it has consisted of white employers threatening the livelihood of Blacks who oppose the pact. On February 3 Bishop Abel Muzorewa, chairman of the African National Council (ANC), a group founded last December to organize opposition to the agreement, charged that white employers had been engaging in "explosive intimidation" of their employees.

He said the ANC could present documentation that five Blacks had been fired from their jobs and evicted from their homes. Edison Sithole, publicity director for the ANC, said that even an employee of the Pearce commission itself had been fired (by a Black supervisor) because he was seen talking to Muzorewa. According to the ANC, 250 Africans have been arrested by the Smith regime since the commission arrived in Zimbabwe, and thirty-one have been shot to death by police. The government admits that fourteen Blacks have been killed.

The commission tactic of trying to interview Africans individually and in private (talk about intimidation!) has so far failed. Blacks have simply refused to hold private discussions with the British colonial "investigators."

On February 4 the United Nations Security Council, meeting in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, voted on a resolution condemning the terms of the Heath-Smith deal. The resolution was vetoed by Great Britain, with the United States, Japan, Belgium, Italy, and France abstaining. Nine nations voted in favor. The Zimbabwean people cannot, of course, expect justice from

the leading body of the "den of thieves." But the terms of the betrayal of the African people now stand condemned

on the international level, with only a worldwide imperialist front and a lone African chief speaking in their defense.

## South Korea

### Fifteen in Seoul's Prisons Face Death

At least fifteen South Koreans have been condemned to death in a series of witch-hunt trials being conducted by the Park Chung Hee regime. In the first round of trials, which began in late 1971, Seo Sung, a twenty-six-year-old leader of the democratic movement, was sentenced to death. His brother, Seo Joon Shik, was given

were barred, that gave Park the right to run for a third term as president.

Seo was viciously tortured by the regime. A few Koreans residing in Japan who were able to get to see him during the trial reported that his physical condition was grave; they feared that authorities would kill him before the official death sentence could be executed.

The Seo brothers' trial was the first in a wave of juridical repression launched by Park after the upsurge in the South Korean student movement last October. During a two-week period, thousands of students battled police who had been sent to occupy six of the country's largest universities. The government admitted that nearly 2,000 students were arrested between October 11 and 15. In all, nearly 45 percent of South Korean students were affected by the protests and the police occupations.

The student upsurge, combined with the U.S.-China détente, threw the Park regime into panic. On December 6, 1971, a "state of national emergency" was declared. "All social unrest that might weaken national security" was prohibited, as were "irresponsible arguments on national matters."

"The rapid changes in international situations, including the recent admission of Communist China to the United Nations, its effect upon the Korean peninsula, and the various fanatical moves by North Korean Communists" were cited as the reasons for the move. The state of emergency would continue, an official presidential spokesman said, "as long as tensions continue and the North Korean Communists do not abandon their aggressive posture."

This excuse was thoroughly preposterous; even the U.S. State Department was compelled to admit, on December 6, that there was no threat of imminent North Korean attack on the South.

But Park pressed on. The National



PARK CHUNG HEE

a fifteen-year jail term. Eight others received sentences ranging from one to five years. All had been charged with espionage and violation of the country's anti-Communist law.

The prosecution claimed that Seo Sung had visited Pyongyang, North Korea (in 1967 and 1970), where he was given espionage training. He was accused of organizing a group that helped lead student demonstrations in 1969 against a constitutional amendment, passed in a sneak, pre-dawn session of the National Assembly from which opposition members

Assembly met secretly on December 27 (opposition delegates, ineffectual though they are, were barred from the session) and passed a motion granting dictatorial powers to the president.

The witch-hunt trials against student leaders have proceeded concurrently with the "parliamentary" moves. Fearful of being abandoned by the United States in the wake of a deal with the Mao government, Park is engaging in a hysterical effort to decimate all potential sources of opposition to his rule. The total number of oppositionists jailed or slated for trial is not known.

In Japan, the Save the Seo Brothers Society has been founded to publicize the nature of the South Korean repression and defend its victims. The group has held meetings, sit-ins, and demonstrations in support of the Seo brothers and other South Korean political prisoners. Leaflets and petitions will be distributed to foreign guests at Sapporo, site of the winter Olympics.

The Japanese branch of Amnesty International has also launched a defense campaign for the Seo brothers. That action has been endorsed by a number of prominent Japanese personalities. Those wishing to aid in the defense of the victims of the South Korean witch-hunt can contact the Save the Seo Brothers Society, YMCA Center of Waseda University, Shinai-Gakusha, 1-520, Totsuka-cho, Shinjuku, Tokyo, Japan. □



### COPIES MISSING?

Keep your files of Intercontinental Press complete and up-to-date. Missing issues for the current year may be ordered by sending 50c per copy. Write for information about previous years.

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

## Great Britain

# 'Socialist Woman Groups' Hold Conference

London

More than 100 delegates, members, and sympathisers of Socialist Woman Groups met at Imperial College, London, over the weekend of January 29-30 for the first national conference of the Socialist Woman Groups. The editorial board of *Socialist Woman*, the journal initiated in 1969 by members of the International Marxist Group (British section of the Fourth International) and sympathisers, had called the conference for groups and individuals supporting the paper to exchange experiences and agree on a common political basis and coordination of activities for the future.

The enthusiastic response and measure of agreement reached have established *Socialist Woman* without any doubt as the main pole of attraction on the left of the women's movement in Britain. Delegates and members reported from groups in Birmingham, Bristol, Canterbury, Cardiff, Colchester, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Keele, Lancaster, Leeds, Leicester, Norwich, Nottingham, Preston, Reading, Rickmansworth, Sheffield, and York, as did many supporters from areas where groups have not yet been set up.

In workshops and plenary session, *Socialist Woman* supporters discussed papers presented on "The women's liberation movement in its historical context," "Women's liberation and revolutionary socialism," "Women and capitalism—and priorities for the present," "Women and trade unions," "The family," "Nurseries," and "Rent campaigns."

Guest speakers were warmly received and included Althea Jones of the Black Panthers; Rosemary Sales of the Irish Solidarity Group; Steve Lynch, an organiser in the General and Municipal Workers Union particularly concerned with organising women workers in hotels and catering; and Lone Sorensen of the Danish section of the Fourth International, who reported on the beginnings of a Socialist Woman movement in Denmark.

A lively discussion was provoked by Mrs. Pat Sturdy's account of her Women's Industrial Union—an attempt to set up a women's democratic breakaway union in reaction against the bureaucratic and male-dominated nature of most trade unions.

Letters received in support of the conference included those from Mike Cooley, president of the Technical and Supervisory Section of the Amalgamated Union of Engineering Workers; Joan Maynard of the National Union of Agricultural and Allied Workers; and one from Mrs. Brailsford, the wife of a Kent miner currently involved in the national miners' strike, who told how she was busy organising a committee of support for the miners, and thanked *Socialist Woman* for its help.

On the second day of the conference,

the liberal national Sunday paper, the *Observer*, carried a big picture of the conference on its front page with the following report under the headline "Strike, Says the Socialist Sister":

"Britain's Socialist Women began their first national conference yesterday, with Women's Lib high on the agenda.

"They seemed unabashed by the refusal of Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, the Speaker, to allow a vote on the Bill that would ban discrimination on the ground of sex. It was 'talked out' in the Commons on Friday.

"'Frankly, it's as much as we expected,' said Mrs. Leonora Lloyd, acting chairman [sic] of the conference, as the delegates assembled in the students' union of Imperial College. 'Legislation is useless. What we need is direct action; women must strike for their rights.'

"The mood of the conference, which continues today, was distinctly anti-Westminster. Most of the delegates—about 100 paid-up members from the 20 regional Socialist Women's Groups—were in sympathy with Mrs. Lloyd's scorn of orthodox legislation. 'In America the pay differential has increased since the Senate introduced the equal rights, equal pay Bill a couple of years ago,' she said.

"'Our greatest successes have been achieved through our own initiative. For instance, last year the Lancaster group won their campaign to get cleaning women into the union and a pay rise for them at the same time.'

"Liz Lawrence, a third-year sociology undergraduate from Kent University, dismissed parliamentary procedure as irrelevant. 'Anyway, our policy is not necessarily synonymous with Women's Lib,' she said.

"She is a member of the Canterbury branch, which has been supporting the miners' strike. 'When the miners were picketing in Doncaster, we thought it reasonable to identify with the miners rather than the women scabs,' she said.

"Delegates with children left them in an improvised creche upstairs, where a man from the International Marxist Group organised games."

On the afternoon of the second day, delegates voted to undertake a joint national campaign for equal pay and equal work, to accept a statement of common political position and aims, which would become the national manifesto of the Socialist Woman Groups, and to continue the discussion in their local groups. An editorial board was elected for the paper *Socialist Woman*, and arrangements were made for closer coordination between the paper and the groups. The conference ended with a resolution passed in support of Angela Davis, and called on the groups to organise local demonstrations in solidarity. □

## Yugoslav 'Popular Front' of Stalin and Churchill

*The Embattled Mountain* by F. W. D. Deakin. Oxford University Press, New York, N. Y. 284 pp. \$9.50. 1971.

At the end of May 1943, a British officer named F. W. D. Deakin was parachuted into Yugoslavia with the mission of making contact with the Partisan forces fighting the German and Italian occupiers. Deakin spent six months with Tito and the guerrilla army, observing the Partisans' strengths and needs and reporting by radio to British military headquarters in Cairo.

The sending of Deakin's mission to Tito was in itself a reluctant concession to reality on the part of Winston Churchill and the British government. The Royal Yugoslav Government, in exile in London, had named as its Minister of War Draza Mihailovic, a Serbian officer who led the Cetnik "resistance" movement.

Those inclined to believe the myth that the second world war represented a democratic, antifascist crusade would do well to read Deakin's account of the relations between Mihailovic, Tito, and the governments of Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union.

Mihailovic, as the duly recognized representative of an "allied" government, received as much British aid as the latter were able to provide, beginning in 1941. The problem was that he regarded the Germans and Italians as too formidable enemies. Instead he devoted his energies to attempting the extermination of the Communists—and the Croats, Montenegrins, or any other Yugoslav nationalities likely to resist his dream of Serbian hegemony. His military operations against Tito's Partisans were generally undertaken in collaboration with the German and Italian armies of occupation.

Deakin actually landed in Montenegro in the midst of a joint offensive by Mihailovic, the Germans, and the Italians against the Partisans' liberated area around Mount Durmitor

(the "embattled mountain" of the title).

Deakin attributes the attitude of the British government to ignorance of the real situation inside Yugoslavia. While it is probably true that London had an exaggerated idea of Mihailovic's strength, Deakin himself shows that British military authorities had sufficient evidence of Mihailo-



TITO: Told by Stalin to put his troops under command of fascist collaborator.

vic's collaboration with the Axis and nevertheless maintained their support for him.

The aim of Churchill—and in this he had the backing of Stalin—was the creation of a united "resistance" under Mihailovic's leadership.

"The Russians," Deakin writes, "seemed to have assumed that the British Foreign Office had been successful in imposing this solution in Serbia, which fitted with their own short-term conception of popular fronts in enemy-occupied territories. Radio Moscow announced the news with apparent satisfaction."

Fortunately for the Yugoslav revolution, the "news" was false. While

Tito made several attempts during 1941 to organize joint actions with the Cetniks against the occupation armies, he refused to subordinate the Partisan units to Mihailovic's command. This refusal met with Stalin's disapproval. On March 11, 1942, Tito wrote to one of his subordinate commanders:

"Your comment on the common action of the Yugoslav government, Draza [Mihailovic], Nedic [the head of a puppet Serbian state established by the Germans], and the occupier is correct, but the Comintern is reluctant to believe this. Some days ago I received a letter, miles long, telling me that the material evidence which we are sending gives the impression that our Partisan movement is proceeding too much under Communist leadership, because otherwise how is it possible that the supporters of London are organizing the Cetniks against us? They (the Comintern) further ask: why has it been necessary to create a special proletarian brigade? We ought to revise our policy and set up a broad national front. . . ."

At times Mihailovic even spoke publicly about his collaboration with the fascists, forcing Churchill to try to restrain the general's words if not his actions. On April 12, 1943, King Peter's prime minister found it necessary to radio Mihailovic from London:

"The British government has further taken amiss the passage in your speech where you say that you regard the Communists, the Ustasa, the Moslems, and the Croats as your main enemies, and that you will first use your forces to deal with them before taking on the Italians and the Germans. . . ."

"Since you are a member of the Yugoslav government, the British government requests that you should be instructed to change your attitude both towards the Italians and the Yugoslavs [but not towards the Germans?], otherwise the British government will feel obliged to revise its

policy which is to give exclusive support to your movement in Yugoslavia."

In addition to its account of the often complicated political maneuvers surrounding the Yugoslav resistance, Deakin's book provides some information on the structure and activities of the Partisan army and interesting recollections of Tito, Milovan Djilas,

Vladimir Dedijer, and other figures who were to play major roles in subsequent events. While Deakin assumes a fairly extensive knowledge of Yugoslav history, politics, and geography on the part of the reader, his account is not difficult to follow. Perhaps the chief drawback of the book is its outrageously high price.

— David Burton

Another article of political interest is entitled "We have had abortions." Fifty-three women are listed as stating that they have had illegal abortions, and other women are asked to add their signatures. This section, modeled on similar ones in France and West Germany, may well help the current struggle for the repeal of all anti-abortion laws. Unfortunately, however, the article makes no attempt to link up with the national campaign being conducted by the Women's National Abortion Action Coalition, which sponsored the demonstrations in Washington and San Francisco last November 20.

Other articles in the first issue of *Ms.* touch on many issues of concern to feminists: nonsexist child-raising; legal oppression of women, particularly married women; oppression within the institution of marriage; sexism in language;\* the psychological results of women's oppression; the relationship between Black liberation and feminism; and the oppression of women by the welfare system. Also included are a few examples of feminist art, among them a beautiful and moving poetic play on childbirth by Sylvia Plath, author of *The Bell Jar*.

— Helen Jarvis

\* The name of the magazine is itself an attack on sexist language. "Ms." is the form of address being popularized by the feminist movement to replace "Mrs." and "Miss," which distinguish between married and unmarried women.

## Commercial Publishing's Feminist Venture

Over the last few years in the United States there has been a stream of new publications reflecting the growing significance and influence of the women's liberation movement.

The first publications were produced by the disparate groups all over the country that were the starting place of this second wave of feminism. They ranged from short-lived mimeographed newsletters to now fairly well established newspapers reflecting the many different approaches and attitudes within the movement, to high-quality magazines concentrating on particular aspects and themes (*Aphra*, *Women: A Journal of Liberation, Second Wave*).

In the past few months, a new element has entered this field: Commercial publishers have seen the possibility of turning a profit and have jumped in with such wretched pseudo-feminist magazines as *New Woman*, which cashes in on the interest in women's liberation by combining articles on "liberated women" with hints on makeup and sex appeal.

Somewhere between these two poles is the latest entry, *Ms.*, the "preview issue" of which is now available. *Ms.* has the professionalism that none of the other feminist publications can hope to match: 128 glossy pages, sophisticated graphics and photography, liberally sprinkled with advertisements for *Newsweek* and *Fortune* magazines, furs, perfumes, and expensive liquors.

The magazine is the creation of Gloria Steinem, who is widely known as a feminist spokeswoman and journalist. Her magazine is aimed at a particular market: middle class and wealthy women, especially the "sophisticated" New Yorker.

*Ms.* clearly reflects Steinem's politics.

She is a member of the Policy Council of the Democratic party and one of the founders of the National Women's Political Caucus, which believes that women's liberation can come from increasing female participation and representation in the Democratic and Republican parties and attempting to make these parties responsive to women's needs and interests.

An example is the article "Rating the Candidates," which scores the Democratic and Republican contenders on "taking women seriously," "making waves," "personal reflection of the traditional masculine role," and "opposition to militarism and violence." A remarkable omission from the list of candidates is Linda Jenness of the Socialist Workers party—the only candidate with a serious program for women's liberation.

## How to subscribe

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

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

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

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Street \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

## Kidnapping, Torture, and Murder in Argentina

[The article below is excerpted from a longer article prepared by Professor James F. Petras for the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation. The foundation has also issued the following appeal, signed by Edith Russell, Ken Coates, and Chris Farley:

"Repeated complaints from citizens of Argentina draw attention to an unprecedented wave of police brutality in that country. Numerous students and political activists have been murdered by the police, and professional people including lawyers and doctors have either been kidnapped or murdered. We appeal to Civil Rights organisations, and socialist and radical opinion, throughout the world to protest to the Argentinian authorities concerning these brutalities, and to demand that they be brought to an end."

\* \* \*

The officially condoned selective terror by police and right-wing gangsters continues: lawyers of suspected guerrillas disappear; guerrilla suspects are arrested, and the arrests are denied by the police; the bodies turn up in anonymous graves. Given the centralized nature of the Argentine administrative, and especially law-enforcement structure, these official acts of police terrorism cannot be passed off as the activities of marginal right-wing extremists acting contrary to the wishes of the general-"president."

Lanusse's decisions not to undertake a thorough investigation of the linkages between the police and the right-wing political assassinations strongly suggest that it is not convenient, that he too shares the police/assassin reasoning that the lawyers of the political prisoners are interfering with political investigations because—they demand an end to torture.

Surrounded by a sea of hostile social forces, the police and army are striking out wildly at individuals innocent of "subversive" behavior. The continued mass unrest, the spiraling inflation, the lack of cooperation even

from the middle class have demoralized some sectors of the police and have made others more vicious. The question: Is Argentina headed into the abyss—will it become a Brazilian-style police-state? The selective terror belies Lanusse's claim that he aims to democratize the country and to reconcile all Argentinians.

Given the growing radicalization of the working-class movement and its proneness to resort to direct action, alongside the growth of increasingly effective urban guerrilla units, it is hardly possible to envision the "easy" conversion of Argentina into a Brazil. That type of change has to pass over the corpse of an aroused populace which begins with a strong antipathy toward the military: a costly civil war is the alternative to democratization—and the terror that Lanusse tolerates and/or permits can lead Argentina down this road.

On December 16, 1970, Nestor Martins, a lawyer well known for his defense of militant trade-unionists and for his public exposure of police use of torture, was kidnapped by secret police agents in broad daylight along with one of his clients, Nilo Zenteno. From that day, nothing is known of them. Repeated inquiries concerning their whereabouts have received virtually a deaf ear from all public officials—including the president.

On March 8, 1971, Diego Ruy Frondizi, the nephew of a former president of Argentina; his friend Manuel Belloni; and the chauffeur Ruben Greco were gunned down by police. The three were unarmed. The police justified this homicide by stating that they were "suspected" of being guerrillas. In fact they were supporters of the nationalist Peronist movement, which has several million members.

On July 13, 1971, Juan Pablo Mestie and his wife Mirta Elena Missetich were kidnapped by secret police agents while leaving the house of her parents. Two days later his body, with two bullets in the back, turned up in a grave. The police said it was a plain case of suicide. Mirta Elena Mi-

setich is still missing, despite President Lanusse's promise that she would be returned safe and sound. Apparently, there is some disagreement among the assassins as to who is and isn't on the list.

On June 2, 1971, Dr. Verd and his wife Sara Palacios were arrested by the police, who brought the couple's two daughters to Dr. Verd's sister. Subsequently the police denied having made the arrest, and the home secretary claims it was a case of—self-kidnapping to get publicity.

In October of 1971 a psychiatrist, Enrique Pujals, was arrested. His wife's letters to the president requesting information have gone unanswered.\*

The terror goes on. The arbitrary and violent nature of these officially condoned selective assassinations has alienated the professional classes. The line separating the police from the political underworld has been deliberately blurred; as a result all arrests have become suspect and all policemen have become suspected gangsters. It may reach the point where many Argentinians will think it is the better part of wisdom to resist rather than risk arrest—and possible death.

The agonizing crisis which grips Argentina is far from over. There is an urgent need for the international community to severely condemn the Argentine military government and its policy of assassination of students, professionals, and workers.

This is one way of expressing our solidarity with, and moral support to, the Argentine people. □

\* It is generally believed that Pujals is dead. See "Argentine Prisoners Tortured," *Intercontinental Press*, January 17, p. 40. — IP

### When You Move...

Don't count on the post office forwarding your *Intercontinental Press*! It's against their rules.

Send us your new address. And in plenty of time, please.