

Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 10, No. 39

© 1972 Intercontinental Press

October 30, 1972

50c



Kissinger's Mission to Saigon

Golda Meir Gets Green Light From Nixon



Trotsky Recalls Lenin in Copenhagen Interview

Banaba Ruined

About 2,000 Micronesians now living in the Fiji Islands are seeking redress from the British government and international phosphate interests for damage done by strip mining to Banaba (Ocean Island), their former mid-Pacific homeland. They want the damage repaired or \$25 million in compensation.

The British government, according to Robert Trumbull in the October 10 *New York Times*, has agreed to let its courts rule on the claims.

The name of Banaba, Trumbull writes, "has been a symbol of the unequal struggle of brown-skinned islanders against white colonialists in past generations."

Before the turn of the century no one paid much attention to Banaba, a three-square-mile oyster-shaped dot of land just south of the Equator. Then phosphate, a valuable natural ingredient of fertilizer, was discovered there.

In 1915 the British navy made a landing and annexed the island for the empire. Mining companies leased the bonanza at bargain prices, raking in fabulous profits while returning a nominal 1 percent royalty to the islanders.

Most of this went into the treasury of the Gilbert and Ellice Islands, a British colony to which Banaba was attached.

Over the years, strip mining has made the island uninhabitable. Today "it resembles a moonscape of gullies and coral pinnacles." Instead of repairing the damage, the British decided to resettle the Banabans on Rambi Island, which they bought with Banaban royalties.

The Banabans, becoming accustomed to working in the phosphate mines, have fared poorly on Rambi, where they were transferred after World War II. In six or seven years, when the phosphate reserves on Banaba are exhausted and the small royalties cease being paid, the Banabans will face abject poverty.

Trumbull reports that they have been seeking redress for many years, "including an unsuccessful approach to the United Nations, seeking independence for their 1,500-acre homeland on Ocean Island."

In This Issue

| | | |
|---------------|------|--|
| ECOLOGY | 1162 | Banaba Ruined |
| INDOCHINA WAR | 1163 | Kissinger's Mission to Saigon —by David Thorstad |
| | 1170 | War Crimes Hearings Open in Copenhagen |
| CHILE | 1164 | Chilean Army Moves to fore as Crisis Undermines Allende—by David Thorstad |
| MIDDLE EAST | 1167 | Unprovoked Israeli Raids on Lebanon —by Jon Rothschild |
| WEST GERMANY | 1168 | German Students Protest Witch-Hunt |
| | 1176 | Mandel Describes Suit Against German Ban |
| FRANCE | 1171 | Martinique Activist Put on Trial in Paris |
| | 1173 | Demonstration in Paris Over Abortion Trial —by Candida Barberena |
| | 1177 | Ban on Basque Organization |
| BRAZIL | 1171 | Garrastazu Medici Tightens Censorship |
| SOVIET UNION | 1172 | "Radio Pirates" Worry Soviet Bureaucrats |
| | 1179 | Petition Demands Release of Ivan Dzyuba |
| | 1187 | Riot Reported in Brezhnev's Hometown |
| SWEDEN | 1172 | 5,000 Join Stockholm Antiwar March |
| YUGOSLAVIA | 1174 | More Students Sentenced —by Gerry Foley |
| COLOMBIA | 1175 | Pastrana Closes Down University —by Enrique Espinosa |
| ANTIWAR | 1177 | U.S. Cruiser Picketed in Scotland |
| ARGENTINA | 1178 | Maria Antonia Berger's Account of Trelew Massacre |
| SOUTH KOREA | 1180 | Park Follows Marcos's "Exemplary Action" —by Fred Feldman |
| SRI LANKA | 1181 | Rising Sympathy for the JVP Defendants |
| U.S. A. | 1184 | WONAAAC Sponsors Abortion Hearings |
| IRAN | 1184 | "Amnesty" Appeals for Mashouf Kalantari |
| PHILIPPINES | 1192 | Marcos Drives Peasants Into Camps |
| DOCUMENTS | 1185 | Trotsky Recalls Lenin in Copenhagen Interview |
| | 1186 | With Trotsky on the Train to Copenhagen |
| | 1188 | Western CPs Denounce Czechoslovak Trials |
| | 1189 | Australia: Trials Hurt Socialist Cause |
| | 1190 | Netherlands: "Nothing to Do With Justice" |
| | 1191 | Italy: Trials Are Cause for Concern |
| | 1192 | Jeness Denounces Persecution of Arabs |
| PHOTOGRAPHS | 1165 | El Teniente copper mine in Chile |
| | 1166 | Luis Corvalan |
| | 1169 | Students in Heidelberg march against witch-hunt |
| DRAWINGS | 1161 | Henry Kissinger; 1161, Golda Meir —by Copain |

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

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, Ernest Mandel, George Novack.
COPY EDITOR: Lawrence Rand.
EDITORIAL STAFF: Candida Barberena, Fred Feldman, Gerry Foley, Jon Rothschild, George Saunders, David Thorstad.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.
ASSISTANT BUSINESS MANAGER: Steven Warshell.
TECHNICAL STAFF: H. Massey, James M. Morgan, Ruth Schein.

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 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 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.

Kissinger's Mission to Saigon

By David Thorstad

"We must consider the front still nearer than peace," one top Hanoi official told Canadian newsmen Michael Maclear October 18, as rumors of a "settlement" of the Indochina conflict went snowballing through the world's capitals.

"Outwardly," reported Maclear, "Hanoi looks more part of the front than it ever has, with department stores closed in daytime, theaters permanently shut, crowds kept dispersed, and everywhere guns pointing skyward."

Speculation nevertheless continued to mount with the arrival of presidential adviser Henry Kissinger in Saigon October 18 following his latest, and most extensive, round of secret negotiations with the North Vietnamese.

The day Kissinger arrived in Saigon, North Vietnamese negotiator Nguyen Thanh Le, speaking in Paris, ridiculed the idea—given serious credence in some sectors of the press—that the main obstacle to a settlement was now Thieu's obstinate insistence that the war would have to continue until the puppet forces achieved a military victory. He reminded newsmen that puppets do not pull their own strings, and he accused Nixon of using Thieu's belligerence to cover up his own:

"Nixon uses Thieu as a spokesman to express the most intransigent U. S. positions. It's like throwing a stone and putting your hands behind your back. If you look at the words and deeds of Nixon, the deeds always serve to support Thieu.

"Their relations are those between master and agent. There may be some experts who don't get on too well with each other, but the relation is still master and agent."

Le repeatedly played down the possibility of an early agreement that might end the war. He stressed that "the Nixon Administration has not changed its neocolonialist aggressive policy on the two fundamental questions—military and political."

According to a report in the October 19 *Christian Science Monitor*, Le said that in the secret talks, the Nixon

administration "had not budged on two fundamental Hanoi demands: the removal of South Vietnamese President Nguyen Van Thieu and the installation of a three-part coalition government representing the Communists, the Saigon administration minus Mr. Thieu, and third-force elements."

However, in an interview with *Newsweek*, which editor Arnaud de Borchgrave made public October 21, Premier Pham Van Dong of North Vietnam announced what appeared to represent a considerable modification of the North Vietnamese position. According to *New York Times* Washington correspondent Bernard Gwertzman, Dong's statements "seemed to represent the essence of what the North Vietnamese side had been telling Henry A. Kissinger in private in recent weeks. . . ."

Dong reportedly "refused to repeat" the demand that Thieu step down. He also stated North Vietnam's willingness to accept a cease-fire "as the first step in a settlement of the Vietnam war." Up to now, Hanoi has refused to accept a cease-fire prior to a general political settlement.

Following the withdrawal of American forces, Dong said, Saigon and the National Liberation Front could "work out their own arrangements" for a three-part coalition government that would prepare for general elections within six months of the cease-fire.

Dong also stated, according to Gwertzman, that "all prisoners of war, including the American pilots downed and captured in North Vietnam, would be released as soon as the settlement was agreed upon, not after the American withdrawal was completed, as earlier stated by Hanoi."

Meanwhile, a Reuters dispatch from Peking, reported in the October 22 *New York Times*, quoted North Vietnamese diplomats in Peking as saying that Hanoi had warned U. S. negotiators in Paris to expect an "unpleasant military surprise" in Vietnam if agreement were not reached within a three-day period. On the other hand, Washington sources said to be "familiar with the contents" of

Kissinger's latest round of talks think it "unlikely that any agreement could be reached before the [U. S.] election Nov. 7," reported the *Times* October 17.

According to some reports, the real purpose of Kissinger's latest trip to Saigon—which was shrouded in secrecy and mystery—had little, if anything, to do with "convincing" Thieu to step down or go along with a Washington-Hanoi agreement. An Agence France-Presse dispatch from Saigon October 20, for instance, said his talks with Thieu were concerned with "working out counterproposals" to the latest North Vietnamese and National Liberation Front proposals.

Gwertzman said October 22 that reports in Washington indicated that Kissinger was "assuring Mr. Thieu of American support to prevent a Communist take-over in South Vietnam while, at the same time, urging him to agree to a formula that would allow the Vietcong to participate in a postwar South Vietnam."

One thing is certain: Whatever the details of the Kissinger-Thieu talks, uppermost in their considerations was how best to preserve imperialist domination of South Vietnam. If this means breaking or disregarding any agreement the imperialists may make, they will do so. They have done so in the past—most notably when they scuttled the elections provided for in the 1954 Geneva Accords out of the fear, as Eisenhower later explained, that Ho Chi Minh would have won 80 percent of the votes. There is no reason to think that they would not try the same thing this time around, should they agree to the North Vietnamese and NLF proposals for a three-way interim government that would rule the country until elections some six months later.

Indeed, one of the things Kissinger may have discussed with Thieu is how, following a cease-fire, to use the continued existence of the puppet army and apparatus to prevent "free elections" from being held. Gwertzman indirectly suggested this in his October 22 dispatch from Washington: "The North Vietnamese proposal has interested American officials because they believe that as long as the South Vietnamese Army remains intact, the Communists will find it very hard to win any election that is fairly conducted. With this in mind, Mr. Kissinger was reported to have been sug-

gesting to President Thieu that he end his refusal to allow any interim coalition with the Communists."

The Vietnamese liberation fighters, of course, are well aware of the past and present treachery of the United States imperialists. That they might now find themselves compelled to agree to a compromise with them would not be surprising, nor can they be blamed for doing so. They have fought one of the most heroic struggles in human history against staggering odds. It could be that the pressures being exerted upon them—both from the United States and from their "allies"—have reached the point where they feel such a compromise is necessary. If so, their right to make that compromise cannot be questioned. The pressures, however, must be exposed and condemned.

The barbaric bombing and destruction by the U.S. government have gone hand in hand with stabs in the back from Moscow and Peking. Following Nixon's trips to those capitals earlier this year, these treacherous "allies" went still further in trying to persuade Hanoi to listen to "reason."

"The North Vietnamese, under pressure from their principal supplier, the Soviet Union, as well as from American aerial attacks, have shown increasing flexibility in recent weeks," noted Washington correspondent Max Frankel in the October 18 *New York Times*. "They have talked informally of a willingness to 'live with Thieu,' diplomats report, provided the Vietcong were given some share of political power in South Vietnam."

Though most of the attention went to Kissinger's visit to Saigon, it was coordinated with less visible pressures on Hanoi, according to a report by Dana Adams Schmidt from Washington in the October 20 *Christian Science Monitor*. "United States pressure on Saigon to make negotiations with Hanoi possible is paralleled by similar, although less overt, Soviet and Chinese pressure on Hanoi," he said.

"This is the reassuring word reaching the missions here of countries that maintain diplomatic representation in Hanoi, while Henry Kissinger, impressively flanked by powerful military and political aides, begins talks in Saigon with President Nguyen Van Thieu."

On October 20, ten days after U.S. planes bombed the French mission in Hanoi, the U.S. Defense Depart-

ment admitted responsibility for the incident. A day earlier, Pierre Susini, France's delegate general in Hanoi, died from wounds he suffered during the attack.

Jerry Friedheim, deputy assistant secretary of defense for public affairs, said in Washington that the mission had been "inadvertently struck" by a U.S. bomb. He attributed the "error" to "mechanical failure."

A North Vietnamese commission of inquiry, however, charged October 22 that the raid was "deliberately aimed at the center of Hanoi." The purpose of the attack, it stated was to "intimidate the population of the sector, which had absolutely no military targets and comprised buildings occupying isolated positions that were immediately

discernible on a map." It added that, "from all evidence, the deliberate attack was in no way due to an error or to a mechanical malfunctioning."

Meanwhile, in Saigon, a military court on October 17 handed down the harshest penalty yet for alleged violation of the press code. The Reverend Chan Tin, publisher of the monthly *Doi Dien*, was sentenced to five years in solitary confinement and a \$75,000 fine for attempts to "incite young people to escape military duties" and to "harm the national security and abate the fighting spirit of the army." The Roman Catholic publisher's crime, according to Agence France-Presse, was having published "three articles that were all strongly pacifist and anti-American." □

'Strike by the Bourgeoisie Against the Workers'

Chilean Army Moves to the Fore as Crisis Undermines Allende

By David Thorstad

"Has Chile's moment of truth arrived?" In Santiago, this question is being asked with some uneasiness in all political circles," Pierre Kalfon reported in the October 18 *Le Monde*. "The truckers' strike launched last week is, in reality, a political strike against the government much more than it is a simple trade-union strike; by now, this is admitted.

"From the very beginning, this movement, marked by highway barricades, has been severe, and it has had spectacular effects: no more gas, and therefore no more shipping of goods in a country where the railroad network is not very developed and where the highway, which stretches out over 3,000 kilometers from the north to the south, plays an economic role of the first order. The scarcity of basic food products—milk, sugar, rice, etc.—has suddenly increased, and lines have appeared in front of bakeries as well as gas stations.

"The tactic being followed by the opposition is to spread this strike to the point where the entire country will be paralyzed and the helplessness of the government demonstrated."

Luis Corvalán, general secretary of

the Communist party, the strongest member of the Popular Unity coalition, stated that "the patriotic task is to keep the country going." Thousands of Allende supporters, Kalfon reported, have responded to this appeal from the popular-front government.

"While the government anxiously wonders how far its opponents will go," he continued, "all the parties of the left are in a state of alert. The CUT [Central Unica de Trabajadores—Central Workers Union] has asked its members to work more than ever to prevent the bosses from closing the factories. More than 17,000 volunteers—among them many students—have offered to drive or unload the 400 trucks loaded with goods that the government has already requisitioned."

For the activists of the MIR (Movimiento de Izquierda Revolucionario—Movement of the Revolutionary Left), the slogan is: "Turn every factory, every farm, and every shantytown into a stronghold of struggle against fascism."

On October 12, two days after the truckers' strike plunged Chile into the most serious crisis since the Allende regime took office, the main opposi-

tion party, the Christian Democrats, issued an official statement blaming the government for anything that might happen:

"At the moment, the country is going through an extremely tense situation for which the government is responsible.

"The facts show categorically that it will not be possible to return the country to calm unless the serious errors reflected in the present regime's conduct are rectified."

The Christian Democrats stated their "support for the just demands of the truckers' union" and warned that failure of the government to yield could "precipitate a conflict of incalculable proportions."

The statement said that Allende's declaration of a state of emergency—announced the same day—revealed the political weakness of his regime and its need to rely on the army: "The government has chosen to heat up the conflict through repression, and it is once again masking its incompetence by shifting the responsibility for maintaining public order onto the armed forces while, at the same time, persons in official positions are crudely inciting certain sectors of the population to disrupt it."

The Christian Democratic party could hardly claim to be a mere commentator on the mounting crisis, however, for the Confederation of Truck Owners, which initiated the strike, is affiliated to the party. And any strike that threatened to halt the flow of goods, including the supply of bread, could be expected to upset "public order." Even the right-wing, anti-Allende daily *El Mercurio* noted this in an editorial in its October 9-15 international edition. The paper admitted that "under the circumstances, it cannot be considered strange" that the government invoked the state internal security law and arrested more than 200 truck drivers and union leaders. Indeed, it added, the truck drivers' leaders "had anticipated the government's reaction." By week's end, a thousand truck drivers had been arrested.

On October 13, a sympathy strike by small businessmen began, further heating up the crisis. The strike was called by the Confederation of Production and Commerce—also controlled by the Christian Democratic party.



EL TENIENTE: Kennecott refuses to give up imperialist claim to fabulously rich copper mine expropriated by Chile.

The opposition decided October 15 to step up its campaign. The Christian Democratic unions announced their intention to continue the strike, and the party itself issued a virtual declaration of war against Allende. Renán Fuentealba, the head of the Christian Democratic party, called on its members to "pass from a state of alert to a state of mobilization." In the unions, a call to "resistance" was issued.

The opposition is demanding that the leaders of the truck drivers be freed and that the government accede to the demands of their confederation. These include granting higher cargo rates and giving up plans to set up a state trucking company in the south of the country.

As the crisis unfolded, the state of emergency, originally applied to thirteen of the country's twenty-five provinces, was extended to include others.

On October 17, Brigadier General Hector Bravo Muñoz, the commander of the Santiago garrison, declared a curfew from midnight to 6:00 a.m. in the capital of 3,000,000 and the surrounding province.

The strikes continued to pick up momentum, reported *New York Times* correspondent Joseph Novitski October 17. "Civil engineers, some bank employes, some university and high school students and the officers and crews of Chile's largest private shipping line joined the wave of strikes that began with a nationwide work stoppage by truck owners early last week.

"Doctors and dentists announced a 48-hour strike beginning tomorrow and the country's shopkeepers kept

the metal shutters down on most urban stores except food stores, pharmacies on duty and occasional automotive repair shops."

Many shops that stayed open were forced by street disturbances to close anyway, according to United Press International.

While Allende has appealed to the left to refrain from any actions that might "provoke" the army to take a stand against the government, the opposition has kept tensions high by ignoring the ban on demonstrations. On October 16, for instance, police in Santiago used tear gas and water hoses to break up a demonstration led by former Chilean President Jorge Alessandri, leader of the right-wing National party. "Although drenched, Mr. Alessandri continued walking to his destination, the building housing both the United States Embassy and his own company, a paper-manufacturing concern," reported the Associated Press.

"The incident drew a large crowd, and Mr. Alessandri was loudly cheered. He was also showered with ticker tape from offices above the street."

The strike wave was joined October 20 by owners of private buses in Santiago and by pilots of the national airlines. At the same time, the movement was given greater political focus by a joint statement by the five opposition political parties endorsing all the protest strikes and blaming the government for what they called "total chaos" in the economy.

The government was able to avert a strike in public transportation October 18, Novitski reported, but it owed this victory to the fact that the

agreement was "reached under army auspices."

By forcing Allende to fall back on the army for support, the opposition appears to be succeeding in its aim of further undermining the strength of his Popular Unity regime as the campaign for the March 1973 legislative elections gets under way. Although some elements in the opposition may be hoping to provoke the army into toppling Allende, this does not appear—right now at least—to be the aim of the Christian Democrats. They seem to prefer for the moment to force Allende to "rectify his errors" and reach some kind of agreement with the opposition to go even slower on implementing the Popular Unity program.

"This is a middle-class movement, with support from the upper class," Jaime Castillo, a political analyst for the Christian Democratic party, told Novitski. "It does not extend to the proletariat."

He said that the aim of what one paper called "a strike by the bourgeoisie against the workers" is not, for the time being, "to overthrow Allende, or make him renounce his program, but to put him back in his place: within the Constitution and using only laws to carry out his program. We're giving him an opportunity to manage the situation, to talk to the Opposition."

Some opposition strategists appear reluctant to stage a showdown at this time for fear that Allende's support is still too strong and that the role of the army might be unpredictable. "It's absurd to think of overthrowing Allende now," one opposition politician told Novitski. "It would be all out of proportion with the causes of the crisis, and an attempt might put the army on his side once and for all."

Government supporters are concerned, however, and have described the strike wave as part of a concerted effort to overthrow Allende. "We all agreed that this is an escalation of sedition, a coup d'état in the making," Luis Corvalán said October 16. He added that this "will not bear fruit, because the armed forces are faithful to the law and to the legitimately constituted government."

Allende finds himself in a rather tight bind as a result of his dogged adherence to the norms of bourgeois law. Thus, while on the one hand his government issued an appeal to

"the people" to "respond with organization, unity, and mobilization to the provocations of the seditious right," on the other hand it stripped the working class of its right to mobilize by placing the country under a form of martial law. Meanwhile, the right con-



CORVALAN: "A coup d'etat in the making."

tinues to mobilize in open violation of the law, and the popular-front government urges the working masses to trust not in their own strength but in the generals who command the bourgeois armed forces.

In an editorial October 16, the *New York Times* warned that if Allende wants to weather this latest storm, it will be necessary for him to make important concessions to the opposition. Allende, the influential imperialist newspaper advised, "should stand up to the extremists in his camp, relax the repression and revive political dialogue with the Christian Democrats and other democratic forces. That course will inevitably involve major compromises on the Popular Unity program; but it offers the best insurance both of his own survival and the survival of Chile in freedom and peace."

The current anti-Allende campaign was launched at the same time as the American-owned Kennecott Copper Company was opening up an offensive against sales of Chilean copper in the international arena. The offensive, noted *Le Monde* in an editorial October 13, "seems to enjoy at least the tacit approval of the United States government."

Kennecott (whose subsidiary, Braden Copper, was part owner of Chile's largest copper mine, El Teniente, before it was expropriated by a unanimous vote in the opposition-controlled Congress in 1971) claims that the \$80 million it was paid was inadequate compensation for its holdings. It is seeking court orders in Europe blocking payment by European customers to the Chilean Copper Company, Codelco. It has already won one such order in Paris, and is threatening to seek another in Sweden, where a delivery of 1,500 tons of copper is expected in November.

The Paris court order barring payment of \$1.3 million to Chile for 1,250 tons of copper originally scheduled to arrive in Le Havre October 15 amounted to legal piracy with a bourgeois touch. Not only has no bourgeois court ever handed down such a ruling preventing, say, the shipment of U. S. weapons to Vietnam, but it came at a time when the bourgeoisie is mounting a hue and cry over air piracy. Chile is appealing the ruling.

Out of solidarity with Chile, Le Havre dockworkers refused to unload the copper from the West German freighter *Birte Oldendorff*. In view of this the ship proceeded to Rotterdam, where the Dutch Transport Workers Union instructed its dockworkers to also refuse to unload the ship. "The instructions are to follow the example of the dockworkers of Le Havre, France, who said they would not touch the tainted copper," announced Martinus Loef, a spokesman for the longshoremen in Utrecht.

Kennecott's legal offensive, noted Clyde Farnsworth in the October 17 *New York Times*, "has been timed for what is known in the trade as 'the mating season,' when buyers and sellers get together to make their contracts for the following year.

"Kennecott is thus challenging not only present deliveries but also future contracts." □

Unprovoked Israeli Raids on Lebanon

By Jon Rothschild

"We have given up the practice of waiting for the terrorists to strike first. From now on, we will strike whenever a useful target presents itself." The unidentified member of the Israeli general staff was explaining why, after nearly four weeks of complete quiet on the Lebanese border, the Israeli air force had, on October 15, launched air raids against four villages in Lebanon and one in Syria.

The Israeli military reported that dozens of planes had bombed and fired rockets at what were described as headquarters, logistical depots, and training bases of Fateh. The Lebanese government reported that two civilians were killed and sixteen wounded in the raids.

General Haim Herzog, former head of Israeli military intelligence, put the Zionist policy in the most straightforward terms: "We are not engaged in reprisal, but a war against terror. The very presence of terrorists in the area between the border and the Litani River [in Lebanon] is a provocation. It does not matter that they have not acted yet. If they are near the border, we consider ourselves free to act against them."

The timing of the Israeli raids left no doubt that there is and will be no relationship between the activities of the fedayeen and Israeli aggression against Syria and Lebanon. Not only had there been no fedayeen attacks across the Lebanese border in the four weeks prior to the October 15 raids, but according to information supplied by sources in Lebanon and not challenged by the Israeli government, the fedayeen had been in the process of evacuating southern Lebanon at the time of the raids.

Since the Munich events, the policy statements of Israeli government leaders on the question of attacks on neighboring Arab states has undergone a distinct evolution. The original strategy was supposedly to hit the fedayeen in response to specific guerrilla attacks. Then, in mid-September, after the second wave of raids against Syria and Lebanon, government statements began suggesting that the Zion-

ist military was considering bombing so-called fedayeen bases if intelligence reports indicated commando operations were imminent.

But now, all pretexts have been dropped. Its position strengthened by the wave of anti-Arab hysteria whipped up by the imperialists in the wake of Munich, the Meir regime no longer needs any excuses to attack Lebanon and Syria.

The major factor the Israeli regime must take into account before expanding its military attacks on the Arab states is the attitude of Washington. In the October 22 *New York Times* Terence Smith reported that the Israeli leaders "therefore studied the muted American reaction to the raids last week carefully, and by week's end, had concluded that Washington had not been seriously upset."

The green light from Washington having been given, Meir can be expected to launch further attacks soon. In this context, Herzog's reference to the Litani River region is especially threatening. The river, which runs through southern Lebanon parallel to the Israeli border, marks off an approximately 285-square-mile area that could be easily occupied by the Israeli army. The river itself would make a tempting border, one much more easily defended against commando actions than the present one.

The new openness of the Israeli policy of aggression may well be a trial balloon aimed at testing Nixon's reaction to a further territorial expansion of the Zionist state.

In addition to its aggression in the Arab East, the Israeli government has also renewed its threats to resort to terror operations in Western Europe, an option that was first suggested after Munich, but then temporarily discarded in favor of the anti-Arab witch-hunt organized by Washington.

On October 16, Israeli Foreign Minister Abba Eban was interviewed by *France-Soir*. He was asked, "Outside Israel there has arisen a Jewish counterterror. What is your attitude toward

what could be called Israeli counterterrorism?"

Eban responded, "I don't know anything about it, for I have not read any reports claiming that Jewish groups have provoked loss of life or anything like that. In any case, I am not responsible for what happens outside our frontiers and outside our sovereignty. Israel's role against terrorism consists of weakening the terrorists in their bases, at least in the East."

On the same day that Eban took this implausible ostrichlike stand on "Jewish counterterror" Abdel Weil Zuayter, a thirty-eight-year-old Jordanian-born employee of the Libyan embassy in Rome, was gunned down in the courtyard of his apartment house.

The murder appeared to have been committed by professionals. According to Italian police, at least two men had staked out the entrance to Zuayter's building. When Zuayter reached the elevator, he was shot twelve times. The gunmen escaped in an automobile that was later found abandoned.

Zuayter was known as a Fateh representative and was identified as such by a Fateh statement on the murder that was released in Beirut. Fateh accused Zionist terrorists of the assassination, a possibility that was at first considered by the Rome police department. But on October 18, the head of the political branch of the police department suggested that the murderers were "compatriots" of Zuayter's and that the murder was the result of a Palestinian feud.

The October 22 *New York Times* quoted an "Israeli official" as saying "You could make a plausible case for either"—a rather strange failure to deny the first possibility.

The new Israeli brazenness in its attacks on Lebanon seems to have created some deep splits within the Palestinian resistance movement. The Lebanese regime has used the attacks as an excuse for moving the fedayeen completely out of southern Lebanon, the total cessation of anti-Israeli commando actions not being sufficient to satisfy the Meir regime. Yassir Arafat, the central leader of Fateh, has acceded to this demand. Other elements have resisted it.

On October 14, this division led to an armed clash in which three fedayeen were reported killed and nine were wounded. According to an account

in the October 17 *Le Monde*, the clash began when Abu Yussef Kayed, a Fateh commander, attempted to reopen a small pier on the Lebanese coast that had been destroyed two years ago by Israeli bombing. Kayed intended to use the "naval installation" to launch seaborne raids on the Israeli coast.

The Lebanese government opposed the move, and Arafat ordered Kayed to desist. Kayed, who was apparently supported by members of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command (a split from the PFLP which is led by the right-winger Ahmed Jibril), flouted Arafat's order.

Sources close to the commando movement reported that Arafat's forces seized four jeeps belonging to the Kayed group, thus touching off the fighting. An official Fateh statement released in Beirut on October 14, the day of the clash, described the incident this way:

"After the decision of the Fateh Cen-

tral Committee to suspend the officer Abu Yussef Kayed from his responsibilities for disciplinary reasons, the latter took the initiative, Saturday morning, to incite several elements belonging to the organization to rebel against the central authority. The Central Committee then decided to act rapidly to end this situation and instructed one of its military units to intervene against the elements whose behavior threatens the discipline of the revolutionary forces and puts in question the activities of the resistance."

According to the October 20 *New York Times*, the rebels "withdrew to a mountain stronghold" and were surrounded by the pro-Arafat commandos.

On the night of October 18 Mohammed Yassid, Algerian ambassador to Lebanon, drove to the rebel camp and arranged a truce. Kayed turned himself in to the Arafat troops. □

Interview With a Palestinian Student

German Students Protest Witch-Hunt

[The decision of the West German Social Democratic government to declare illegal the General Union of Palestinian Students (GUPS) and the General Union of Palestinian Workers (GUPW) was the opening wedge in an expanding witch-hunt in that country against supporters of the Arab revolution.

[According to the GUPS-GUPW statements, Palestinians are being seized, handcuffed, and treated like criminals despite the fact that there have been no charges placed against them. Police have confiscated literature and even money in the course of widespread raids.

[The German student movement has begun to respond to the government witch-hunt. According to the October issue of the revolutionary-socialist journal *Was Tun*, some 5,000 persons demonstrated in Hamburg against the expulsion of Arab citizens from Germany. Legal assistance for the Palestinians was secured, and some expulsions were actually blocked.

[In Frankfurt, *Was Tun* reported, a united-front solidarity committee

was formed and about 1,000 persons held an antiwitch-hunt demonstration.

[The October 6 issue of the Swedish newspaper *Dagens Nyheter* reported that a protest action in Heidelberg "led to a confrontation between police and some 300 students."

[In calling for the formation of solidarity committees to defend the Palestinians, *Was Tun* noted that such action would be a test for the entire left, "not only because defense of the Arabs' and Palestinians' right to live in West Germany is an elementary duty of international solidarity, but also because the consequences of the government measures hit at the whole German labor movement itself, which the regime hopes to divide and weaken."

[The following interview with a necessarily anonymous member of the GUPS was published in the October 16 issue of the weekly news magazine *Der Spiegel*. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

Spiegel. You have gone underground. Why?

GUPS. The German security agency has left me and others no choice. No one regrets this more than GUPS. After Munich, about 100 Palestinians were expelled [from West Germany] and many were not even given the opportunity of legal defense. Moreover, in most cases, those expelled were deported to countries where Palestinians are subject to further prosecution, for example Israel, Jordan, and Lebanon.

Spiegel. How long can you hold out underground in West Germany? Two years, like Baader-Meinhof?

GUPS. We are not Baader-Meinhof. We want to remain legal, not illegal, in West Germany, and we want it legally established that we are not security risks.

Spiegel. And if this is not possible?

GUPS. Then we go. But then the Federal Republic can no longer pass itself off as a liberal state. Then it must say openly: We want no Palestinians in our country.

Spiegel. In the opinion of the German security agency, the GUPS and the General Union of Palestinian Workers are the "legal daughters" who provide assistance, hiding places, and contacts to the "brutal daughters"—Palestinian agitators and terrorists entering or passing through Germany.

GUPS. This is the claim of the Israeli secret service, and the West German police have obviously adopted it as well. The active support of the Israeli secret service for the police operations in West Germany is demonstrated by the participation of Israeli agents in house searches and in the apprehension of Palestinians. We can prove this. Israel is aiming at stamping out all Palestinians and their organizations by calling them terrorist.

Spiegel. At the 1969 world conference of GUPS, delegates decided that "all student members must undergo military training during the summer semester in order to carry out the armed struggle."

GUPS. That was only for building Fateh, not the GUPS. And in any case, this training took place in Palestin-



German students in Heidelberg protest anti-Arab witch-hunt. Banner at head of march reads: "Down with the GUPS ban! Down with the GUPW ban!"

ian military camps, not in West Germany.

Spiegel. Military training towards what end? To fight Israel by all possible means, if necessary within the borders of the West German republic?

GUPS. In Palestine. The Federal Republic of Germany is not our battlefield. We cannot make the whole world our front, we know this.

Spiegel. Your statutes encourage "preparing Arab Palestinian youth for the liberation struggle."

GUPS. What does "preparing for" mean? For us it is a lot of things, from the eradication of illiteracy to political clarification . . .

Spiegel. . . . to the struggle, as it says right in the GUPS statutes, "for the return to the occupied area by any means."

GUPS. Yes, if we find ourselves at war, nobody is interested in taking lessons in cooking. Should we be the kind of Palestinians that sit and endure the misery of the refugee camps? We want to free the Palestinian people through people's war, and the armed struggle against Israel is a stage along

that road. Here in West Germany, however, our goal is to work against Zionist propaganda and to mobilize friends and comrades in our support.

Spiegel. The decree banning GUPS that was issued by the Ministry of the Interior charged that GUPS recognizes "violence and terror as means of advancing their politics."

GUPS. The word "terror" is disgusting. If you want to call our violence "terror" that's your business. But we make a very sharp distinction. You cannot go up against the Israeli army bibles in hand, but only with armed force. And with this armed force we want not just to destroy, but to build a democratic state in which all Palestinian citizens, regardless of race, religion, and origin, will have the same rights and duties.

Spiegel. But what was done at the Olympics was no doubt terrorist.

GUPS. We clearly called the Munich action terror, and we reject terror. It is easy to fling a bomb anywhere a cheerful crowd is gathered. But in the occupied territory the Palestinian people must prepare for a long, difficult anti-imperialist struggle. But it is also terror when Israeli aircraft drop bombs on Palestinian refugee camps.

Strangely enough, there was hardly a word about that in the German press.

Spiegel. According to the investigations of the German police, the Munich terrorists called the phone number of GUPS-member el-Franji, but he did not answer. At el-Franji's, according to the Hessian minister of the interior, police found radio equipment that was "constructed so as to be usable for sabotage."

GUPS. Every Palestinian who has ever been in West Germany knows Franji; he was always of assistance to his countrymen in trouble. His telephone number was generally known. So by itself that doesn't prove anything. And that Franji did not answer seems to speak for his innocence. Finally, as for that radio equipment, it was confiscated by the police about a year ago, not just recently. And then it was returned to him. So what could be so dangerous about it?

Spiegel. If your friends cannot regain their legal status, will they still come here illegally, through East Berlin maybe?

GUPS. That is hardly likely. But it is conceivable that a few of them—people who are innocent, but have been shipped out of the country in handcuffs like criminals—may take up arms with "Black September." Then it will have been the German Federal Republic and not the General Union of Palestinian Students, that will have made them terrorists. That is not a threat, just an analysis.

Biggest Shipment in History

The Soviet Union's purchase of 400 million to 430 million bushels of wheat from American grain dealers will constitute "the largest movement ever of a single commodity from one country to another," according to the October 18 *Wall Street Journal*.

Shipment of the wheat is already producing extraordinary strains on the American railway system. Only 35 million bushels have been shipped so far.

Even this slow rate of delivery may tax ports in the Soviet Union which "aren't equipped with big storage facilities, as U.S. ports are, so for the most part the grain has to be unloaded from the ships directly to trucks or trains."

At the major ports, delays of up to two weeks are already reported in getting ships to unloading piers. The situation is worse in the smaller ports.

War Crimes Hearings Open in Copenhagen

Copenhagen

"I want the USA out of Indochina," stated the new Danish premier, Anker Joergensen, here during his speech October 10 in Christiansborg—seat of the Danish Folketing—welcoming participants in the International Commission of Inquiry into United States War Crimes in Indochina.

This was the first time that a premier has undertaken to open a session of the commission. It occurs at a time when public opposition to the Indochina war is stronger than ever in Denmark. The very fact that the session opened at Christiansborg reflects a certain shift in attitude in comparison to the obstacles placed in the way of the organizers of the Bertrand Russell War Crimes Tribunal session in Roskilde in 1967 by the government as well as its agents. And while that session was not taken seriously in broad circles, today the Conservative party's political spokesman, Poul Schlüter, represents only a minority when he criticizes the premier for going to the opening session. "It does harm to Denmark's prestige when the premier joins in lending authority to the tribunal," he said, accusing the premier of letting himself be used in a one-sided propaganda show "where truth doesn't stand a chance."

The current session of the commission got off to a better start than the previous two in Stockholm and Oslo. The Soviet Supreme Court justice L. N. Smirnov, who had been expected until only a few days before the opening to represent the USSR at the hearings, will not be coming to Copenhagen after all. This removes a serious burden from the commission of inquiry. One can only assume that the storm of protest that erupted in Norway during the recent visit of this expert on show trials (among others, he handled the case against Daniel and Sinyavsky in 1966) was sufficient for the organizers to see that they had made a blunder. At the same time, it will now become somewhat more difficult for certain sectors of the press to attempt to expose the entire undertaking.

Premier Joergensen told the gathering that the Vietnam war has had a

deep impact on public opinion in Denmark and throughout the world and has given rise to a special commitment and feeling of solidarity with the Vietnamese people. He referred to a resolution passed by the Folketing that decries the escalation of the war in South Vietnam and condemns the American bombing of populated centers in North Vietnam.

He also described the war in Vietnam as an extremely unfortunate example of a conflict produced by colonialism and allowed to escalate both in time and in scope. He said that the country has been destroyed in the South by increasingly cruel and extensive acts of war, and in the North by the systematic and unprecedented bombing.

To thunderous applause, he closed his speech with the words that have now become a slogan for the antiwar movement throughout the world: "USA Out of Vietnam!"

The opening session was also addressed by Gunnar Myrdal, author of works on the problems of growth and development in the third world, and president of the commission. He is especially recognized as an expert in Asian matters.

"In a situation in which international law is being disregarded, it is incumbent upon individuals and organizations to establish and publish the true facts about the serious war crimes against humanity perpetrated by the military aggression of the United States government in Indochina," Myrdal stated. He recalled that the United Nations General Assembly in 1949 upheld the principle of personal responsibility for war crimes as laid down by the Nuremberg Tribunal following the second world war. He deplored the fact that the Swedish government's proposal that a UN body to investigate and prosecute war crimes has not been adopted by the General Assembly.

"The American nation must also undergo an intellectual and moral purification," Myrdal said. "As many people as possible in the United States must be brought to understand and deeply regret the appalling and large-

scale war crimes that their government has committed. They must recognize that this war was not only a wrong and desperate policy doomed from the very beginning to be a complete fiasco, but that it was an illegal, criminally cruel, and immoral war."

Myrdal concluded with the following remark: "For the rest of the world it is clear that those who have stood up to the war of aggression waged with increasing ruthlessness by the United States stand for broad, world-wide ideals and interests. It would have been a catastrophe for all efforts to create a just world if the United States government had been able to win an easy victory. In this sense, humanity as a whole owes a debt to the people of Indochina."

Former Danish minister Frode Jacobsen also spoke, noting that although Denmark is allied to the United States through NATO, it, together with Norway, has given diplomatic recognition to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, in spite of the disapproval of their powerful allies.

Jacobsen spoke of the destruction of populated areas in North Vietnam that he had seen. "We ourselves become guilty," he said, "if we do not speak out openly about these things. It is not anti-Americanism but love for the United States for me to state that this must be interpreted as concern that a country not lose the ability to distinguish between right and wrong, between truth and falsehood."

A message was received from North Vietnam's premier, Pham Van Dong, in which he noted that the commission was meeting at a very important moment: "The American aggressors are carrying out an escalation of the war that involves the greatest danger thus far and that is adding even further to the criminal destruction of the population and the environment in both parts of Vietnam." □

And Next Time?

The Nuclear Study Center in Chicago has revealed that an explosion in a research building at the Argonne National Laboratory October 17 released radioactive uranium and plutonium.

The blast injured three atomic engineers and wrecked a \$25,000 research machine. The five-story building was evacuated, but the contamination was found to be slight.

Fortunately no one was working with the device when it blew up.

The cause of the explosion has not yet been determined.

Protest Actions Staged Throughout France

Martinique Activist Put on Trial in Paris

The trial of Christian Courbain, a young activist from Martinique and a member of the group *Révolution Socialiste*, began in Paris on October 11. It was subsequently carried over until November 15. Courbain is accused, according to a report in the October 12 *Le Monde*, of "defaming the army and personally insulting Mr. Pierre Messmer," the French premier.

The charges against Courbain, which have prompted a vigorous defense effort among French leftist groups, stem from an incident that occurred on May 13, 1971, in Fort-de-France, Martinique. During a visit to the island by Messmer, then minister in charge of overseas French departments and territories, the repressive forces gunned down two students, killing one of them, Gérard Nouvet. Courbain, who edited a student newspaper, told the truth about the incident, placing blame for the murder on the forces of repression and the French government. It is for this that he is being tried.

In a statement to the court, Aimé Césaire, the mayor of Fort-de-France and a deputy from Martinique, pointed out that the killing took place after demonstrations against Messmer had completely subsided. The two students who were shot were simply standing around talking when they were fired upon by gendarmes. "There can be no doubt about this," Césaire said. "A gendarme had fired a tear-gas grenade at almost point-blank range. . . . What is the name of this gendarme? Only the government could reveal this, following a serious investigation. But the government carefully refrained from doing so. The result was inevitable: Since it was impossible to place blame on any one particular gendarme, it was all of them as an institution who appeared guilty in the eyes of the population—and beyond them, the government."

Césaire pointed out that "all the newspapers in Martinique wrote this," including the one he himself edits, the *Progressiste*. None, however, have been prosecuted. He asked why it was

that he, for instance, had had the "special privilege of not being indicted."

Courbain's trial is being held in the capital of the "mother country" out of the authorities' fear of the popular outrage that would be aroused from holding it in Martinique. Left-wing groups in France, however, in solidarity with Courbain called for a demonstration on October 10, the eve of the trial's opening. The demonstration was banned in Paris. In spite of this, several groups—*Révolution Socialiste*, the *Ligue Communiste*, *Révolution*, the *Organisation Révolutionnaire Anarchiste* (Revolutionary Anarchist Organization), and *Ligne Rouge* (Red Line)—organized three clandestine demonstrations in various parts of the city. Together, according to a report in the October 14 issue of *Rouge*, the weekly organ of the *Ligue Communiste*, some 3,000 persons participated in these actions,

Brazil

Garrastazu Medici Tightens Censorship

On the weekend of September 16, Brazil's military dictatorship put into practice even more stringent censorship rules than those previously in effect. The new rules prohibit comments on political liberalization, criticism of the country's economic situation, speculation about a successor—if any—when General Emilio Garrastazu Médici's term expires in 1974, or mention of amnesty for Brazil's many political prisoners.

The new rules sparked a telegram of protest from Ruy Mesquita, one of the biggest newspaper publishers in Brazil. The telegram said the censorship regulations "degraded Brazil to the condition of a banana republic." Although Mesquita supports the military regime in general, his criticism reflects differences between the Garrastazu Médici government and sectors of the Brazilian ruling class that would like to see a few more civil liberties restored.

each lasting for approximately a quarter of an hour.

In the days leading up to the demonstration, a number of meetings were staged to help build it, including one in Paris October 6 of 800 persons. Other protest demonstrations have taken place or are scheduled in cities throughout France, among them Rouen, Orléans, Lyon, Toulouse, Aix-en-Provence, Grenoble, and Montpellier.

In addition, *Révolution Socialiste* has published a statement, according to the October 12 *Le Monde*, demanding that Courbain be acquitted and charging that his trial "for articles published in the newspaper of Martinique high-school students represents a new attack on freedom of the press in the overseas departments." The statement was signed by, among others, Simone de Beauvoir; Marguerite Duras; Christiane Rochefort; Aimé Césaire; Michel Rocard, deputy and national secretary of the *Parti Socialiste Unifié* (United Socialist party); Alain Krivine, member of the political bureau of the *Ligue Communiste*, French section of the Fourth International; Professor Laurent Schwartz; and the publisher, Eric Losfeld. □

Although the Mesquita telegram was read on the floors of the Brazilian Senate and Chamber of Deputies, the police confiscated editions of two newspapers in Porto Alegre that defied police orders and published the text. Some army officers also questioned Mesquita about the telegram.

A week later, Mesquita's paper *O Jornal de Tarde* was ordered redone to remove a remark by a progovernment congressman that there were "certain limitations" on freedom of the press in Brazil. Although the comment was finally approved and the paper went out as originally printed, Mesquita charged that the move had hurt the circulation.

A month earlier *O Estado*, another Mesquita paper, criticized Brazil's security agencies for continuing their arbitrary arrests, with which the government sought to stifle any political opposition. □

'Radio Pirates' Worry Soviet Bureacrats

"The postal officials, the militia, and the secret police began to search for illegal voices on the airwaves. In the cities, however, Soviet citizens wondered about this order [an edict in 1960 raising the penalties for operating unlicensed private transmitters]. Only in 1964 did the Moscow *Literaturnaya Gazeta* mention that 'Samefir' [Free Broadcasting] had been heard in a 'big city.' A transmitter called the 'Golden Cock' had commented on the program of the local radio station and set the whole town talking, 'in the streets, in the buses, in the stores, and in police headquarters.'"

This is an excerpt from an account in the October 2 issue of *Der Spiegel* of the growth of illegal amateur broadcasting in the Soviet Union. The phenomenon, the West German weekly explained, has appeared primarily in provincial areas among precocious youngsters, the hope of Soviet technology.

These young teen-agers are bored by the stifling routine of the bureaucratized society. Moreover, unlike their intimidated elders, they have a lively, adventurous spirit, the spirit of a generation beginning to challenge the absurdities that were established as "eternal truths" in the decades of political terror.

As the example of youthful initiative spread from the outlying regions east of the Urals into the more developed parts of the Soviet Union, the bureaucrats began showing more and more signs of worry.

The Soviet press began to report the discovery of illegal transmitters, with such names as "Baby," "Argentina," "Boxer," "Trapper," "Twist," and "Carnal." Horror stories began appearing about "radio rowdies" being responsible for airplane crashes, ship collisions, train derailments, and so forth.

In 1964, three "radio rowdies," Borisov, Smirnov, and Tesin, were sentenced to four years deprivation of freedom for broadcasting "nonsense" over the air.

In February 1964, the Young Communist League paper *Komsomol-*

skaya Pravda carried an article attacking unlicensed hams as "gangsters of the airwaves," "diversionists," "criminals," and "radio pirates." The publication praised licensed amateurs for helping to locate transmitters called "Lazy Bones," "John, Gouge the Eye Out," and "The Man from Nowhere."

Shocking cases of juvenile delinquency were reported. In the Kiev area, seventeen-year-old Volodya Zimbalenko, who broadcast under the names of "Mustafa" and "Teddy Bear" was said to have involved his twelve-year-old sister Valya in the operation.

In Novosibirsk, a schoolgirl conducted a course in sexual technique, which, according to the magazine *Sovetskaya Justitsia* [Soviet Justice], had a large audience.

In Voskresensk, four fourteen-year-old boys were "caught in the act" of broadcasting "dirty jokes" and "stupidities."

In the Kiev region, according to the February 21, 1964, issue of *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, there were 200 illegal transmitters operating, 198 of them "radio rowdies" and two, "radio pirates." The stronger term was used to describe hams who included "cynical" political comment in their broadcasts.

5,000 Join Stockholm Antiwar March

"It is called terrorism when a plane is hijacked in Europe with live passengers on board. But 300 bombing raids on 300 villages in Vietnam—that's not called terrorism. That's called American 'performance' or 'aerial support,'" the writer and prominent antiwar figure Sara Lidman told a Stockholm rally October 3 sponsored by the NLF-Groups, an organization of antiwar committees that support the National Liberation Front.

Nearby, the Social Democratic party, as part of the proceedings of its week-long congress, was holding a meeting in support of Vietnam and other oppressed peoples. Among the

In August 1968, unlicensed hams in the Ukraine broadcast the truth about the situation in Czechoslovakia to the invading Soviet troops. The police found one transmitter, called "Bratislava," in honor of the Czechoslovak station that broadcast news of the democratic reforms to the Ukraine. But in the Kirvoi Rog area alone, there were estimated to be 600 illegal transmitters.

The publication of a radio handbook in the mid-1960s, which sold out immediately, led to a sharp increase in the number of homemade transmitters. But the main culprit seemed to be Soviet technical education, which has given large numbers of youngsters the elementary knowledge needed to build a radio set from materials readily available in a technically advanced society.

In 1964, *Literaturnaya Gazeta* expressed nostalgia for the period "only ten years ago" when "people could not afford such fooling around." It is doubtful, however, that even "the old one" could have kept the lid on such developments forever. In an increasingly complex and advanced society, it seems inevitable that the total censorship of Stalinism will break down and that new life springing up in all the nooks and crannies of a vital country will overcome the official dogmas and stereotyped propaganda of the once all-powerful bureaucracy. □

invited guests who addressed the gathering were Madame Nguyen Thi Binh, foreign minister of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam, and the African guerrilla leader Amilcar Cabral.

As participants in the meeting left the hall to begin a torchlight march to protest the Vietnam war, they were joined by the NLF-Groups. Of the approximately 5,000 marchers, reported Dick Ljungberg in the October 4 *Dagens Nyheter*, some two-thirds were members of the NLF-Groups, which, according to the Swedish daily, had not been invited to join in co-sponsoring the protest. □

Demonstration in Paris Over Abortion Trial

By Candida Barberena

"Like 1 million other women each year Marie-Claire had to go through the tragedy of an illegal abortion because she did not have 2,000 or even 3,000 francs [about \$600] for an easy abortion in a clinic in London, Geneva, or Paris itself, because she had no sex education, and at seventeen it is very difficult to get contraceptives from a doctor . . .

". . . it is easier to bring one girl to trial than 343 women who call the abortion laws into question."*

These statements were part of a leaflet distributed by several hundred demonstrators near the Opéra in Paris on October 11 to protest the trial of Marie-Claire "X" on charges of having violated France's reactionary laws on abortion.

The show of public solidarity did not meet with the approval of the authorities. The peaceful gathering was attacked by cops who arrived complete with riot gear and paddy wangs. The October 11 issue of *Le Monde* described the assault:

"Toward 6:45 p.m. several dozen mobile guards, sometimes in helmets, all armed with clubs, fell on everyone in the vicinity who looked like a protester whether in skirts or pants. Some of them moved into the Opéra drugstore to seize a young woman in tears whom they dragged out by the hair. Another young woman, struck on the head and the chest, escaped her pursuers just in time, thanks to an older woman who moved in between. A little farther away a young woman left her mother and desperately clung to her husband who had been knocked down by the police, then clubbed and arrested."

The editors expressed their disapproval of using such tactics on "peaceful and unarmed demonstrators." They pointed out that although the demonstration did not have a permit and could be legally dispersed, ". . .

*In April 1971, a petition signed by 343 women who admitted having had abortions was circulated in a campaign for access to contraceptive methods and freedom of abortion in France.

what is not acceptable, legal, or praiseworthy is the brutal use of force against scattered and not at all dangerous demonstrators."

Why should the case of Marie-Claire "X" suddenly make headlines in a country that convicts between 500 and 600 women for abortion each year without headlines and editorials in the capitalist press? Undoubtedly it was because of the efforts by the French abortion group Choisir (Choice). They took up the case of Marie-Claire "X" as part of their campaign to change the laws.

As the proceedings went on behind closed doors in the juvenile court, supporters from Choisir and MLF (French Women's Liberation Movement) chanted: "No trial for Marie-Claire" "We have all aborted, judge us" "Free and legal abortion, contraception" "Switzerland and England for the poor."

As a result of this action, Marie-Claire "X" was acquitted.

Marie-Claire's lawyer, abortion rights leader Gisèle Halimi, announced after the proceedings, "We put the banning of abortion on trial." According to the October 12 *New York Times*, she also noted that ". . . of 100 women brought to trial for abortion, 26 are housewives without employment, 35 are stenographers or typists, 15 are salesgirls, 16 are employed in teaching or in laboratories, 5 are factory workers and 3 are students."

Last year a poll indicated that 55 percent of the public in France favor legal abortion if a woman does not want her future child. Another 87 percent considered it to be a decision between the man and the woman. Nevertheless, abortion legislation has not been relaxed and the strict control and limitation of the sale and distribution of contraceptives, especially to minors, results in the fact that only 6 percent of French women use the pill.

Several deputies now plan to sponsor a liberalized abortion bill drafted by Choisir. The text appeared in the October 12 *Le Monde*.

"Article One: All the legislative or statutory texts punishing abortion, and notably article 317 of the penal code (six months to two years imprisonment for those who perform or are accomplices to an abortion), are repealed.

"Article Two: Every person can have an abortion up to the twenty-fourth week of pregnancy in a hospital establishment. In any case, the costs are to be wholly assumed by the government."

These proposals to liberalize the present laws conform far more realistically to French public opinion than does the position of the French Communist party, which supports little if any change in the present laws. The French Communists favor making "therapeutic" abortions available, without mentioning that this is already standard practice in many European countries.

The French Trotskyists take a different stand:

"It is not up to a judge, or a civil servant, or even a doctor to decide for a man and a woman if they want to have a child.

"No law 'legalizes' abortion if it does not give a woman control of her body and the decision to be a mother or not." (*Rouge*, October 14.)

The supporters of abortion rights plan another public protest in Bobigny November 8 when Marie-Claire's mother and two friends will be tried for complicity. □

Turtle Missed by B-52s

For those unable to figure out what Kissinger's trip to Saigon was all about, Agence France-Presse offered a bit of news from Hanoi October 23 that may prove to be more accurate than the rumors.

A "huge, three-foot-long turtle" crawled "out of the tiny lake of Hoan Kiem in the center of Hanoi," reminding "elderly people" of a "15th Century legend." According to this, "turtles living in the lake leave it when war or peace is imminent."

The augur first occurred 500 years ago when "a turtle emerged from the lake and offered the ruling king a sword to defend the country against Chinese invaders. Ten years later, the legend goes, the turtle again went ashore and took the sword back, as a sign that hostilities were coming to an end."

Agence France-Presse said that the appearance of the Hoan Kiem turtle today drew considerable comment from the city's elderly residents, who linked this event with Kissinger's visit to Indochina and saw happy auguries of an end to the war."

More Students Sentenced in Yugoslavia

By Gerry Foley

"Important Tasks for the League of Yugoslav Communists" was the headline the September 27 *Pravda* put over a TASS dispatch describing the speech of S. Dolanc to a party activists' school in Split September 18. Long quotations were given from the remarks of the secretary of the Politburo of the Yugoslav party.

"Dolanc stressed," the Soviet news agency noted, "that the working class clearly sees that the SKJ [Savez Komunista Jugoslavije—League of Yugoslav Communists] is the only political organization in the country. 'But some so-called intellectual circles do not understand this. Therefore, we are thinking of expelling the people who do not agree with us from the SKJ.'"

Dolanc said that the two main problems facing the SKJ leadership were, first of all, "stabilizing the economy" and second "cadre policy." The prices of basic necessities have been rising rapidly, and since the Croatian nationalist demonstrations at the end of 1971 the Tito regime has been carrying out a purge.

According to TASS, Dolanc said, "We made a big mistake five or six years ago, or even longer, in letting the cadre question get out of hand." The Politburo secretary called for a return to "well-defined forms of ideological-political work and political education, as well as "putting Marxism back into the schools."

On the question of particularist tendencies in the Yugoslav ethnic groups, Dolanc declared that all nationalism had a bourgeois class content and said: "We demand action against nationalism everywhere in the country.

"This is all part of the struggle against inimical tendencies of all shapes and forms. I mean inimical actions and demonstrations. We must keep in mind that enemy forces are uniting against Yugoslavia. This means above all a union of rightist forces, and, to make myself absolutely clear, fascist or neofascist forces."

To conclude his speech, the Kremlin wire service dispatch said, Dolanc

called on the Yugoslav party to free itself from "opportunism, pseudo democracy, and liberalism."

The statements of Yugoslav party officials on internal policy have seldom received such extensive coverage in the Kremlin press. Perhaps Moscow thought that, for a change, the Tito leadership was offering an exemplary model, in a number of ways, for the other East European regimes.

For example, whereas in 1948 the leaders of other East European CPs who were suspected of sympathizing with Tito were purged for "bourgeois nationalist tendencies," in 1972 it is the presiding genius of "national Communism" himself who is purging "bourgeois nationalists."

On October 5, the Zagreb district court handed down harsh sentences against the former leaders of the Croatian Student Union, who were accused of organizing nationalist demonstrations at the end of 1971. Drazn Budisa, the former president of the Zagreb student organization, was sentenced to four years in prison. Ante Pardzik, former president of the Croatian Student Union, and Ivan Zvonimir Cicak, former deputy dean of students at the University of Zagreb, got three years. A fourth defendant, Goran Dodij, also a former president of the Zagreb Student Union, was given a year-and-a-half term.

The four were arrested in December 1971 under Article 100 of the penal code for "counterrevolutionary" activities and attempting to separate Croatia from the Yugoslav federation. The trial, Paul Yankovitch noted in the October 7 issue of *Le Monde*, was one of the longest in the history of Yugoslavia. Nonetheless, only a week before the verdict was handed down, the prosecutor added the charge of "organizing a criminal association" to the indictment.

The prisoners insisted on their constitutional right not to answer questions and remained silent during most of the trial. When the prosecution accused them of having contacts with the fascist terrorist organization the

Ustashi, however, Cicak reportedly protested strongly in the name of all the defendants. At the end of the trial, Budisa tried to give a political analysis of the developments in Croatia in recent years, but found himself repeatedly interrupted and ruled out of order by the judge.

On October 9, the trial opened of four leading figures in the Croatian cultural organization Matica Hrvatska. The indictment charged the defendants with the following crimes:

1. Creating a nationalist-oriented "aggressive opposition political party" inside Matica Hrvatska.

2. "Systematically and deliberately" planting their supporters in the legal political, economic, and cultural organizations.

3. Establishing a list of political opponents slated for "liquidation."

4. Maintaining contacts with emigres, "both the so-called democrats and the terrorists."

5. Attempting to transform the student strike last November into a general strike.

6. Propagating hatred of other Yugoslav peoples, especially the Serbs living in Croatia, whom the defendants allegedly planned to "eliminate from the municipal and labor organizations."

7. Developing a plan for "armed struggle and guerrilla warfare."

The crackdown has also reportedly hit alleged Serbian nationalists such as Professor Miodrag Vulin in Sarajevo, who was sentenced to three years in prison for publishing writings condemned as anti-Croat, and Professor Mihajlo Djuric, in Belgrade, who got two years.

At the same time, the Tito government has moved against alleged Trotskyists, sentencing three students in Belgrade to terms ranging from one and a half to two years for engaging in a "Trotskyist plot" to "reconstruct the Fourth International in Yugoslavia." (See "Letter Smuggled from a Yugoslav Prison," *Intercontinental Press*, September 25, p. 1032.) It has also banned the magazine of the Belgrade philosophy faculty, *Filosofia*.

This broad crackdown, coming in the context of rising prices and increasing popular discontent, has been accompanied by denunciations of "Communist millionaires." In a recent speech in Rijeka, a Croatian port city that has been the scene of violent

strikes in the past years, Tito said, according to the October 2 *Der Spiegel*, that there were "people in Yugoslavia who are building extra homes and country houses in various parts of the republic," and that this was "irritating the workers and causing discontent among many Communists and thus leading them into passivity."

The most notable effect of Tito's denunciation of "Communist millionaires," *New York Times* correspondent Raymond H. Anderson wrote October 2 from Belgrade, was to bring a run on the banks, with nervous depositors rapidly withdrawing their assets. But reassurances were quickly forthcoming that indicated the crackdown on private fortunes was not likely to be very long lasting or very severe.

"As the Belgrade bank officials have stressed, however, the campaign collides with some of the objectives of the country's leadership, among them efforts to create more jobs through expansion of small private enterprises and to attract the savings of Yugoslavs here and abroad."

If the campaign against "Communist millionaires" were intended primarily as a cover for a general repression, however, it would not be the first time that an increasingly discredited reformist bureaucratic leadership turned to such methods. In 1968, the Gomulka regime in Poland also resorted to demagogic appeals to workers as a means for covering up their repression of oppositionist students.

The complex pattern of nationalities in Yugoslavia, of course, complicates the picture of opposition to the bureaucratic regime and offers openings for conservative or even reactionary influences. Chauvinistic impulses can, for instance, be exploited by local bureaucrats to strengthen the positions they have won as a result of the system of decentralized economic control, a system which in general has increased the unevenness of development and prosperity throughout the country. But the fact remains that none of the Yugoslav peoples has any significant control over the use of the surplus product created by their labor.

"It is hard for us to work, Comrade Tito, when our wages are low. . . . The workers are bearing the whole burden on their shoulders, but they must at least know why. It is hard for us to watch people raking in money that they have not earned with

their own sweat." This was the message that Zvonko Racic, speaking for his shopmates in Zagreb, delivered

to the old partisan commander at the latter's luxurious estate, Zagorje. (*Der Spiegel*, October 2.) □

Turmoil on Bogota Campus

Pastrana Closes Down University

By Enrique Espinosa

Colombia's "democratic" government on October 11 closed down the state-financed National University in Bogotá for a semester.

The action was taken against a background of repressive measures to which the reactionary administration of Misael Pastrana Borrero has resorted in face of strike struggles of all kinds among the workers and peasants. These were touched off by a sharp decline in real wages because of inflation. In addition, Pastrana is waging a McCarthyite witch-hunt reminiscent of the 1950s, when he served in the civilian dictatorships of those years.

After winning an election on the state and local level last April (only 28 percent of the voters went to the polls), Pastrana whipped up anti-Marxist hysteria. Illegal arrests and rule by decree became the "norm."

In accordance with this course, the government decided to decree an end to the small amount of control the students and professors exercised at the National University. Dr. Luis Duque was appointed president of the university. Duque is notorious not only as a man of very low academic standing, but also as an ultrarightist. One of his first measures in his new post was to close down the cafeteria and the dormitories. This was intended to force low-income students to drop out.

The students fought back by going on strike. The government answered by sending in the army and the police. Eighty students were expelled and seven employees were fired. The secret police arrested several students.

Duque contended that the strike was a "plot" engineered by a handful of "professional agitators." He claimed that he was backed by the "silent majority" of students.

The students thereupon organized a referendum to determine Duque's

standing and the attitude of the student body toward the army's invasion of the campus and the reprisals taken against the eighty-seven students and workers.

Despite harassment by the army, 8,398 out of 9,800 students participated in the referendum. A "silent majority" of 130 supported Duque and his reactionary measures. This was countered by 8,210 against and 58 blank ballots.

Duque declared that the referendum was "ill-conceived" and a "fraud." With the full support of President Pastrana and his cabinet, he canceled the academic semester. Duque has now set out to "reform" the university and to "select" a new student body.

All of this is consistent with the government's policy of favoring private education at the expense of the public school system attended by low-income students. The public universities have had to turn to such financial sources as foreign loans and handouts from private foundations (Ford, Rockefeller, etc.) to make up for mounting deficits.

These sources have thereby understandably gained increasing influence and control in public education. The needs of American imperialism are met by suppressing "subversive" teachers and "adjusting" curricula, particularly in the field of social sciences.

This process has been marked by the growing exclusion of low-income students from the entire educational system. Nevertheless the Colombian students are fighting back. They are now preparing a nationwide strike. □

Anti-inflation Victory

Sri Lanka newspapers are currently carrying advertisements offering condoms at specially reduced rates. The condom is the only commodity whose price has fallen during the past twenty-five years.

Mandel Describes Suit Against German Ban

[The following interview with the Belgian Marxist economist Ernest Mandel appeared in the September 30 issue of the Danish daily *Information* just prior to the October 2 referendum in which the majority of Denmark's voters chose to join the Common Market. The interview, obtained by Per Michaelsen, was translated by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Question. Ernest Mandel, you are now on the blacklist at all West German border crossings and are not allowed to enter the country. Do you intend to go along with this, or have you already taken steps to get the travel ban lifted?

Answer. I have lodged a complaint before the administrative court in the Saar. Actually, I would rather have brought the case before the courts in the area in which Minister of the Interior Hans-Dietrich Genscher resides, but that was, unfortunately, not possible. The administrative court in the Saar has jurisdiction for the simple reason that the border guard who seized me in the Frankfurt airport comes from there.

Q. What arguments will you use?

A. I am basing my case on the section of the Common Market treaty dealing with the right to freedom of residence. It states that any citizen of a member country can work at his trade on the territory of another state that belongs to the Common Market. I am a Belgian citizen, and my country belongs to the Common Market. Therefore, I must also have the right to work within the boundaries of the Federal Republic.

Consequently, the case does not revolve around the refusal of the West Berlin government to appoint me as an official of the Free University, since the freedom of movement provided for in the Common Market treaty does not apply to appointments in public service. My suit revolves only around the ban on entry, which prevents me

from giving lectures as a guest professor.

Q. But aren't you blowing the whole thing up into more than it is? The ban on entry affects only one person, namely yourself.

A. No, that's not true. The discrimination is aimed not only at left-wing radicals, but can be stretched much further. Let me give you an example.

I am criticized for placing factory occupations in the forefront of political struggle. This is quite correct, and I have never attempted to hide it. But I am not the only one. Recently, two factories of the multinational concern Akzo—in Breda, Holland, and Wuppertal, West Germany—were occupied by the workers, who wanted to thwart mass layoffs. The occupation was a success, and those who had been fired have now been taken back—precisely because of the very same attitude that I also hold. If the court finds in favor of Minister of the Interior Hans-Dietrich Genscher, in the future he will be able to expel any foreign worker who takes part in such actions. On the other hand, the people who run these multinational corporations and who turn people out onto the street are not declared *persona non grata*.

We got a foretaste of just how dangerous this can become when French President Georges Pompidou the other day proposed that Spain be taken into the Common Market. If Spain becomes a member, its police will collaborate with European authorities, whereupon they will be able to jointly move against Spanish workers and students. And so the European superstructure's democratic veneer disappears, leaving a European police state looming on the horizon.

Q. But doesn't the Common Market treaty provide for restrictions that can be justified on the grounds of public security and that are considered exceptions to the rule?

A. It is true enough that there is a legal complication in the treaty that provides for considerations of public

security. What this in fact means is that the member countries can introduce restrictions on the right to freedom of residence. But there is also a February 25, 1964, directive passed by the council of ministers which is legally binding on all countries. It states that considerations of public security shall be based on the "personal conduct" of the individual in question. This means that the Common Market treaty does not apply to bombers, arsonists, and gunmen. Therefore, a person's opinions do not fall under the category of exceptions.

Q. Do you mean to say that the West German ban is a violation of the February 25, 1964, directive?

A. Yes. It is completely obvious that Minister of the Interior Hans-Dietrich Genscher paid no attention to it. What he is holding against me is not any criminal activity but simply my personal opinions. And for this reason the entry ban is extremely dangerous. The West German authorities are taking the view that the Common Market treaty is not valid for persons who make statements that they find troublesome.

Q. What is your stand on the Danish referendum next Monday? When all is said and done, wouldn't it be best for Denmark to join, so its left wing, in cooperation with others, could help alter the course of the Common Market?

A. I don't think so. Here we're dealing with two different questions. One revolves around principles, the other around tactics.

From the standpoint of principles, it is wrong to give one's support to greater capitalistic concentration. Such concentration is perhaps unavoidable, but one cannot go to the workers and ask them to applaud it. A left-wing oriented "no" vote must not be interpreted as a defense of national sovereignty and capitalist independence. We must support neither one of these, but rather oppose the whole thing. Our goal can only be a United Socialist States of Europe.

Q. I am curious to hear the tactical grounds you would give for Denmark staying out of the—

A. The tactical standpoint must take

into account the fact that the process of integrating legislation and repression has not yet gone very far. Under these conditions, membership in the Common Market can constitute a roadblock to a breakthrough for socialism in individual European countries.

If Denmark follows an independent monetary and financial policy, under certain conditions the country can

guarantee full employment. If it joins, the council of ministers — in which conservatives have a majority — can force the government to pursue a so-called policy of stabilization, with unemployment resulting.

But if that autonomy some day comes to an end — and I am convinced that it will — then socialist cooperation on a European scale becomes more important than short-term national goals. □

Follows Moves Against Arabs in West Germany

Ban on Basque Organization in France

The Pompidou regime has resurrected a 1939 law as justification for "invalidating" the Basque separatist organization ETA (Euzkadi ta Azkatasuna — Basque Nation and Freedom) in France. The sudden decree, announced October 8, leaves Basque political opponents of Franco residing in France open to harassment and threat of deportation.

The Ministry of the Interior explained that the 1939 law could be invoked when "foreign organizations have not registered" in accordance with the law. (*Le Monde*, October 11.)

The same issue of the French daily pointed out that the ban followed a September 17 conference in Bayonne to advance the Basque language in France. Two nights prior to the conference there was an assault on the Bayonne subprefecture, although the ETA was not directly linked to the incident.

The decision to ban the organization follows intense efforts in recent months by the Franco regime to quell militant Basque nationalism. The drive has resulted in armed clashes in some towns and a systematic hunt for Basque guerrillas in the mountainous region.

Cooperation in this witch-hunt campaign has not been at all difficult for the French and Spanish regimes. Groundwork for the present collaboration was laid well in advance.

Since December 1970, when six ETA members were tried in Burgos, the French government has steadily move closer to a common front with Franco in handling the Basque problem. Following a February 1971 news

conference between Pompidou and Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs López Bravo, the Spanish press called for taking "undesirable elements" on the Spanish-French border into custody and establishing greater collaboration between the two police forces. (See the March 11 issue of the French Trotskyist weekly *Rouge*.)

The editors of *Le Monde* suggest that in invoking the 1939 law against the Basques, the Pompidou administration may have gone a bit too far.

"Above and beyond public unrest and quibbling over legal technicalities, the important point in these different procedures is that the French government seems once again to be acceding to the wishes of the leaders in Madrid. But according to authoritative French sources the Spanish government did not exercise any pressure to obtain a 'de facto' ban on the ETA and the measures to deport members, whether

avowed or not, of the Spanish Basque nationalist organizations."

Is this to mean that reprisals against Basque separatists in France were taken on Pompidou's initiative rather than Franco's? The point is a fine one. In any case Franco has given no indication of being displeased with the gesture.

The editors of *Le Monde* continue: "The French concern for working together and cooperating with the Spanish authorities in the question began after the Burgos trial in December 1970. There is no doubt that at the time of the trial the tone of part of the French press, and television still more, was impassioned . . . But the 'representations' made then by Mr. López Bravo, the Spanish minister of foreign affairs, met with a rather quick response in Paris.

"For two months the Spanish Basque country has been the scene of new assaults and a brutal repression, denounced last week by the bishop of Bilbao. The measures undertaken by the French government risk providing arguments for those who regret that the Basques must face thunderbolts from both Paris and Madrid at the same time."

A point overlooked by *Le Monde* is that the timing of Pompidou's repressive measure against the Basques follows the West German ban on Palestinian student and workers' organizations and the mass deportation of Arabs.

The French government's action is part of the witch-hunt campaign that the Western powers decided to launch in concert after the events at the Olympic Games in Munich. □

U.S. Cruiser Picketed in Scotland

Glasgow

Supporters of the Glasgow Indochina Committee picketed a U.S. navy cruiser that had docked in Glasgow on October 5. The response of the crew was friendly, many of the sailors raising clenched fists and shouting "Right on!" to the demonstrators.

When the navy brass chased the sailors off the deck, many hid behind the deck guns to continue watching the picket line.

The police soon showed up and informed the demonstrators that they were "trespassing" and evicted the marchers from the area.

The demonstration was sponsored by the Glasgow Indochina Committee. The

committee plans actions on October 26 and November 18 in solidarity with the call of the U.S. National Peace Action Coalition for international antiwar demonstrations.

Pan-American airways will be picketed on October 26. The projected slogans of the November 18 march are:

Total withdrawal of U.S. forces from Indochina now!

Stop the bombing now!

End the blockade now!

End British support for U.S. aggression now!

Support the right of the Indochinese people's struggle for self-determination!

Maria Antonia Berger's Account

[The first complete testimonies of the survivors of the Trelew massacre on August 22, when nineteen escaped guerrillas were shot down by Argentine Marines at a naval air base in Patagonia, were published in the September 22 issue of the Montevideo weekly *Marcha*. Newspapers in Argentina are prevented from reporting these statements by the dictatorship's proclamation, in the wake of the slaughter, of a special decree making it illegal to publish the views of members of illegal organizations. The testimony of Maria Antonia Berger follows. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Dear Compañeros,

All I can do is write to you to inform you about the events that have disturbed you. I lived through these episodes in the period after the seizure of the Trelew airport. My compañeros and I decided that we had to have some guarantee that we would not be physically mistreated after surrendering. Therefore, we got doctors and journalists to certify that we were in good health at the time the authorities took us into custody.

The federal judge who took part in the negotiations for our surrender promised to grant our request to be returned immediately to Rawson prison. The judge, as well as the police official who accompanied him, behaved in a correct manner. When the marines arrived, we negotiated with their commanding officer, Captain Sosa. Mariano Pujada, Rubén Pedro Bonet, and I insisted on being taken back to the prison as a condition for giving ourselves up. Captain Sosa opposed this but we let him and the federal judge know that in our opinion the naval air base didn't offer the most minimal guarantees for safeguarding our lives. In case the Rawson prison was still being held militarily by the compañeros confined there, we three offered to try to get them to give up unconditionally.

That was the way it was argued, but later Captain Sosa gave in to

our requests and said that he would take us back to the prison. It was in this way that the surrender was carried out, and we all handed over our arms. Moments before getting into the minibus that was to take us back to the Rawson prison, we learned that we were being taken to the Almirante Zar naval base. The pretext was that the whole area around the prison had been declared an emergency zone, and that for this reason Sosa's orders were to take the prisoners to the base and lodge them there.

We got into the minibus, somewhat reassured by the guarantee we were offered by the federal judge, who still had Dr. Amaya with him. Both accompanied us to the base and went with us as far as the corridor leading to our cells. In departing, the federal judge repeated that he would do everything possible to guarantee our physical security.

Once we were in our cells, about four hours later, under the pretext of a medical examination, they made an exhaustive search of our persons. The medical officials ordered us to take off all our clothes, and they made a prolonged search of our bodies. Maybe they were looking for some weapon, although, as we all know, we don't have pockets or knapsacks in our skin. At 5:00 that morning, they brought us blankets and mattresses.

The guard unit was composed initially of twelve draftees with FAL and FAP rifles and another long-barreled automatic weapon I am unfamiliar with. The noncoms were armed with PAM 1's. And they all kept their guns pointed at us with the safety off and their fingers on the trigger. This became standard procedure. Later, on our third day on the base, the draftees were replaced with professional soldiers, that is, corporals and higher noncommissioned officers under the command of one or two officers, who were now a regular part of the guard unit.

The treatment of the prisoners started to get harsher. When we went to bathe or to eat, they took us one by one, with our hands behind our necks,

while our jailers kept their guns trained on us and the safety catches off. They began to systematically mistreat us. They ordered the men to do repeated push-ups in the nude despite the intense cold typical of the area. We also were ordered to do a lot of sit-ups and to hold ourselves up by leaning against a wall with our fingers spread apart, until the pain became unbearable.

And all the while they kept their guns trained on us. I should point out, too, that everybody on the base knows about this treatment, because many officers came to watch us, and hung around to observe what they made us do.

I remember one time when we were doing all kinds of exercises that our jailers ordered us to do, Lieutenant Bravo put a .45 to the head of Clarisa Lea Place, with the safety off and his finger on the trigger, threatening to kill her because she refused to lie face up on the ground. Clarisa, terrified, answered pathetically: "Don't kill me!" The officer hesitated, and then lowered his pistol.

Tension was mounting. Every time someone was taken from a cell to go to the bathroom or to eat, they were taken away at the point of cocked rifles and we were never sure if we would see them again. It was obvious that things were getting tenser. Even our jailers felt it. Three separate shots and a whole machine-gun volley, which left holes in the walls, were obvious signs of nervousness resulting in guns being fired unintentionally.

One night we were witnesses to what we later guessed was a simulated execution scene. Around midnight, we were awakened by shouts. In the dark we were forced to fall flat on the ground time after time, to stay sitting on the ground, and so forth, while they pretended to come and get us, locking and unlocking cells. They turned the lights on and off as they raised their guns again and again. We heard our jailers whispering with some other officers who had arrived. I motioned to a corporal, asking him what was going on. He made a sign with his index finger as if he were squeezing a trigger.

As the culmination of an upsetting night, we were subjected to new questioning by the officers. We reiterated our refusal to talk. They threatened Alfredo Kohon with torture if he held to his position of not saying anything.

On the day before the events occurred, the judge came to witness new physical examinations of the prisoners. Of course, he did not know about the questioning we were subjected to by agents of the DIPA [División de Investigaciones Policiales Antidemocráticas—Police Bureau for Investigating Antidemocratic Activities] in a room near where he watched the examinations.

At 3:30 that night I was awakened by shouts from Lieutenant Bravo, Corporal Marchan, and another corporal whose name I don't know. Bravo is blond, about 1.85 meters tall, handsome, about thirty years old, and wears a mustache. Marchan is dark, with a dull complexion. He is of medium height and about twenty-one. The other corporal is fat, about 1.75 meters tall, with a pale complexion.

All of them voiced insults at our lawyers, swearing that they would teach them to mess with the navy. They said that we were going to talk that night whether we wanted to or not. I heard the voices of other persons saying similar things, but I could not make out exactly who they were, because we were immediately ordered to leave our cells and to keep our eyes on the ground. It occurred to me that this was the first time we had been given such an order, but I couldn't figure out what the reason for it was. Once we were in the corridor that separates the two rows of cells that we occupied, we were ordered to line up in single file in front of our cells facing the far end of the corridor. I also noticed that this was the first time we had been ordered out of our cells in such a way.

Suddenly, without warning, without any order, as if they had planned it, the fat corporal began to fire his machine gun at us, and in an instant the air was filled with bullets and screams, since all the officers and non-coms began firing their guns. I was hit four times. Two wounds were superficial, one in the arm and another in the buttocks. The bullets went right through. The fourth hit me in the stomach. I managed to get back into my cell, throwing myself on the floor. Maria Angélica Sabelli did the same thing when she felt a bullet strike her in the arm. But a few minutes later I heard her breathing become labored, and then she stopped moving. In the door of his cell, in the place where

he had been ordered to get in line, Santucho was lying completely still.

I recognized the voices of Mena and Suárez by their provincial accents. They were screaming in pain. I also heard the voice of Lieutenant Bravo, talking to Alberto Camps and Cacho Delfine, shouting to them to confess. They refused. Pistol shots followed. After that I didn't hear Alberto or Cacho anymore. I did hear other screams followed by more pistol shots. Then all I could hear were the agitated voices of our jailers, who were beginning to cook up a story to justify these vicious murders, even if they were the only people who would believe it.

I heard the pistol shots getting closer; it was obvious that somebody had taken on the job of giving the prisoners the coup de grace. He was close to my cell. I tried to play dead. Through my half-closed eyes, I saw him standing in the door of my cell. He was tall, about 1.85 meters, with thin chestnut hair, slender. He was wearing the insignia of a naval officer. He pointed his gun at Maria Angélica's head and fired, even though she was already dead. Then he pointed his gun at me and fired. The bullet went through my chin, smashed my right jawbone and lodged behind my right ear. Then he went away without looking to see what the result of his shots were, assuming that I was dead.

The pistol shots continued, until a silence fell, disturbed only by the coming and going of a lot of people. They came, looked at us, perhaps to see if we were already dead. When they found somebody wounded, they reassured each other, saying that the

person would bleed to death. In the meantime, I kept on trying not to give any sign of life.

In time, a nurse came who verified the number of dead and wounded. Then some important person came, perhaps a judge or a high official. They told him the story that they had cooked up. Four hours later, the ambulances arrived, whereupon they began to move the wounded and the dead one by one. When I arrived at the base infirmary, I noticed the time; it was 8:30 a.m. It had all started at 3:30. They took me to a room in the infirmary in which I saw six cots, with six wounded persons. I was the seventh.

The doctors and some nurses looked at us, but they held back from doing anything. Only one of them, a nurse, stirred by a pang of compassion, wiped the blood off my mouth. Nobody was tending to the wounded. They were just waiting for them to die, in order to add them to the list of the dead.

Although the city of Trelew was nearby, they didn't ask for medical assistance from there. They waited for doctors from the Puerto Belgrano base, who didn't get there until noon, four hours after our arrival in the infirmary. The newly arrived doctors took very good care of us. They operated on me right there, finding blood donors among the soldiers. I regained consciousness twenty-four hours after the operation, already in an airplane that was taking me to the Puerto Belgrano base, where I continued to get very good medical care. □

Petition Demands Release of Ivan Dzyuba

A petition calling for the immediate release of Ivan Dzyuba, a prominent Ukrainian writer and literary critic, and other political prisoners in the Soviet Union is being circulated by the Toronto-based Committee to Defend Ivan Dzyuba.

Dzyuba is the author of *Internationalism or Russification?*, an examination of the Leninist policy on nationalities and its betrayal by the Stalinist bureaucracy.

Dzyuba was placed under house ar-

rest in January, as part of a crack-down on Ukrainian opponents of Russification. He was expelled from the Ukrainian Writers' Union in March and imprisoned in April.

Besides Canada, defense work for Ivan Dzyuba is being conducted in the United States, Western Europe, and other parts of the world.

The address of the Committee to Defend Ivan Dzyuba is P. O. Box 187, Station "E," Toronto, Ontario, Canada. □

Park Follows Marcos's 'Exemplary Action'

By Fred Feldman

South Korean President Park Chung Hee on October 17 declared martial law, dissolved the National Assembly, banned strikes and political activity, imposed censorship of the press, and suspended parts of the constitution. In a broadcast to the nation, Park said his measures were "designed to reform the political structure" to cope with the "rapidly changing international situation around us" and to facilitate his negotiations for "reunification" with the North.

Troops occupied the headquarters of the opposition New Democratic party. Schools and universities were shut down. According to the October 20 *New York Times*, "South Korean officials said there had been no martial-law arrests and that none were contemplated. But other sources said that Opposition leaders had been advised to stay at home and to refrain from criticism of the President's actions." A *Newsweek* reporter was roughed up by South Korean soldiers when he tried to photograph them in front of an opposition leader's home.

The October 21 *New York Times* reported that armed forces commander General Roh Jae Hyun had ordered a crackdown on "all elements of decadence including long-haired youths, hoodlums and gamblers."

According to the same issue of the *New York Times*, Park plans to hold a referendum in December on constitutional amendments that will ensure his continuing in office. Park, who seized power in a military coup in 1961, is serving his third term as president and is constitutionally barred from seeking a fourth. In the 1971 elections, Park's Democratic Republican party lost the two-thirds majority in the National Assembly needed to adopt constitutional amendments.

Park's proposals are expected to permit him to seek at least two more six-year terms. Direct election of the president will be abolished in favor of election by 3,000 to 5,000 delegates to a "national conference on reunification." One proposed change will give Park the right to choose one-third of the National Assembly, which

will meet only 150 days a year, unless called into special session by Park.

According to the *Times*, "The revisions would delete a provision of the present Constitution that implies that Seoul intends to reunify Korea by armed force. That would be replaced by a clause permitting the exploration of peaceful reunification."

The October 19 *Christian Science Monitor* reports that "American officials are puzzled as to why the President has linked martial law and the unification talks. . . .

"South Korea's opposition parties have been critical of the North-South dialogue, maintaining that they should have a voice in the contacts, but they have not directly opposed them."

Park's move was supported by South Korea's military commanders. According to the October 19 *New York Times*, he told a delegation of officers that "martial law had been imposed because he had feared that his intended political reforms might touch off 'social unrest.'"

Park's assertions that martial law is necessary to facilitate "peaceful reunification" are certain to arouse skepticism. In December, Park justified his declaration of a state of "national

emergency" by pointing to the supposedly "aggressive designs" of North Korea.

Coming so soon after Ferdinand Marcos's assumption of dictatorial power in the Philippines and on the eve of the American presidential elections, Park's martial law declaration compelled the State Department to take a critical stance for the moment. According to Tad Szulc, writing in the October 18 *New York Times*, "Secretary of State William P. Rogers expressed the United States objections to the South Korean Ambassador, Kim Dong Jo, whom he summoned to his office last night, while the American Ambassador in Seoul, Philip C. Habib, acting on instructions, delivered a similar statement to Premier Kim Jong Pil and Foreign Minister Kim Yong Shik.

"State Department officials disclosed the substance of conversations with South Korean officials since late yesterday—after Premier Kim had given Mr. Habib a few hours' notice of the decision to declare martial law—emphasizing that President Park's action was highly embarrassing to the United States."

In the October 19 *Christian Science Monitor*, Charlotte Saikowski wrote:

"President Park Chung Hee appears to be looking to his political future as he eyes the Washington-Tokyo-Peking thaw and the dialogue between North and South Korea.

"He may even be concerned about the effect on his own position of a settlement in Vietnam that might spell the end of President Nguyen Van Thieu." □

Perfect Cure for Capitalist Roaders

Since those famous Peking banquets that featured Nixon clinking glasses with Chou En-lai, Chinese wine has begun to trickle into the United States.

Washington columnist Jack Anderson, who reported the fact in his October 7 column, says that the brand name is "Most Precious Three-Whip Tonic Wine" and that it's bitter and spiced.

The label, designed for the English-speaking market, would in his opinion violate all the rules and regulations of the Food and Drug Administration "against fraudulent advertising of curatives." Here is the description given of the

virtues of the wine:

"Nutritious and roborant; promoting the brain and recovering the memory; strengthening the organs and systems of generations."

Moreover, the wine is good for "general weakness, untimely senility, kidney trouble, neurasthenia, sores on waists and backs, overburdens of the brain, anemia, dizziness, poor memory, involuntary perspiration, insomnia, pale faces, poor appetites."

Best of all: "May be taken at any time according to patient's capacity for wine."

The queue forms to the ultraleft.

Rising Sympathy for the JVP Defendants

[The following interview with Bala Tampoe was recently obtained in Colombo. Tampoe is the head of the Ceylon Mercantile Union. He is also counsel for some of the leading figures of the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna (People's Liberation Front) now under government "investigation" in Sri Lanka (formerly Ceylon).]

* * *

Question. Could you describe for us the present situation in Ceylon and what the impact of the trials has been?

Answer. There are no trials going on at the moment. What is going on is an inquiry before the Criminal Justice Commission that has been set up under the Criminal Justice Commissions Act which was passed in April.

The purpose of this inquiry, as far as the government is concerned, is to try to justify the imprisonment of large numbers of youth who were arrested during the state of emergency and particularly after the events of April 1971, and also to justify before public opinion in this country and before the world what was done by the government in April 1971. Of course, from a legal point of view, the situation is different.

The commission is composed of five supreme court judges who are required to inquire into the causes of what has been described as the insurrection that took place in April 1971. They are obliged by the law to accept that there was an insurrection. They have to decide whether or not any of the persons brought before them are guilty of participating in the "insurrection" or "conspiracy" to bring about the overthrow of the government.

How that issue will be determined by the commission is not a matter on which I can comment—in the first place because it is still too early to judge the question but also because I myself am defending ten of the thirty-two suspects who are being charged before the commission and am advising three others who are defending themselves. One of the latter is Rohana Wijeweera, who is the reputed leader of the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna, and Mahinda Wijese-

vera, who was the most reputed university student leader said to have been associated with the JVP.

On August 10, three of the thirty-two "suspects" pleaded guilty at the very outset. One pleaded not guilty. The remainder, including the ten I am defending, did not agree to plead, for no power to release anyone whom it finds not guilty. The power of release is vested solely in the executive, that is to say, in the permanent secretary to the ministry of justice. The five supreme court judges functioning as a commission have only the power to punish by imposing any sentence other than death on those they find guilty but not the power to set at liberty those they find not guilty. The commission decided to record those who did not agree to plead. The inquiry is now proceeding in respect of the charges of "conspiracy" against all, as well as charges of "waging war against the queen" or aiding and abetting the waging of such war.

Q. Why are they charged with "waging war against the queen"?

A. Well, the charge of "conspiracy to wage war against the queen" is based on our penal code which was established during the period of direct British rule when we were under the British crown. Any attempt to overthrow the state or to overawe the government is construed in terms of English law as being an attempt to "wage war against the queen."

One of the legal objections raised at the very beginning of the inquiry by some of the counsel for the defense was that since Ceylon was declared on May 22, 1972, to be a free and sovereign republic, completely independent of the British crown, it is not permissible to punish people now for having waged war, or having attempted to wage war, or having conspired to wage war against the queen before May 22, 1972. The commission has asked for written submissions on that point as well as points relating to the constitutionality of the Criminal Justice Commissions Act itself and has reserved its decision in the matter.

I myself have submitted certain writ-

ten submissions as to the constitutionality of the act itself because it was enacted under the previous constitution. In that document, there was a separation of powers, as in the United States, between the judiciary, the executive, and the legislature. The act has the effect virtually of the executive impinging upon the functions of the judiciary by the legislative creation of a body which, though composed of Supreme Court justices, is outside the judicature. That is a matter on which the Supreme Court will have to decide.

In the meantime, subject to its decision on these questions of law, the commission is proceeding with the inquiry and up to now we have had the evidence of a bhikku (Buddhist priest) who claims to have been a member of the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna and who has given evidence on the basis that he is now disillusioned with that organization.

We have also had the evidence of a police officer who claims to have recorded confessions from two of the thirty-two suspects, both of whom I am defending.

As to the public reaction to the published reports of the evidence of these two witnesses, I would rather not comment since I am myself a participant in the proceedings.

It is already clear that while the government is seeking to prove a conspiracy against the suspects, the allegation has been made on behalf of the suspects that the government was engaged in a conspiracy against the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna.

As to what precisely took place in April 1971, I doubt that the full facts can emerge through the proceedings before the inquiry because of its terms of reference. I do think, however, the inquiry is beginning to reveal aspects of what took place in April 1971 which were not known to the public at large and which may well help to create a different impression of what actually took place than the version the government has been putting out.

I might mention that forty-one persons have been charged in the first inquiry but only thirty-two are in custody. Nine are not traced [at large]. It is believed that amongst them at least four have been killed. There is no proof as yet as to who has been killed and who is still alive but evading capture.

Wijeweera, in cross-examining the

police officer who is still giving evidence at the inquiry, challenged the police to prove that eight police stations in the Kandy district were attacked on April 5. The government has claimed that ninety-four police stations were attacked, but this is a gross exaggeration.

Unfortunately, the government is not required to prove that ninety-four police stations were attacked. The Criminal Justice Commissions Act is so framed that a report by a military or other competent authority has to be accepted even without the officer who gives the report being called in evidence. However, by cross-examination, to some extent the government's propaganda about what happened in April has been challenged to the extent of presenting a different picture of what took place.

Wijeweera was kept in solitary confinement for 467 days after he was taken into custody on March 13, 1971. He was brought to the Vellikodda prison immediately before being brought before the inquiry on June 28. I myself met him and he remarked that he felt as if he had begun a second life because of his long confinement incommunicado.

He was allowed one visit a month by a member of his family. Most often it was his younger brother who met him but when they met, they did so in the presence of prison guards and everything they said during the visit was recorded, as it was with the other political detainees. He was not allowed any means of written communication with the outside world whatsoever.

Q. Describe the attitude of the Ceylonese people toward the government and the repression and the changes that have taken place in the past two years.

A. When the present United Front government was elected, it was certainly very popular and especially among the younger people, who supported it in preference to the United National party, which had held office for five years. Today the position is very different. I would say that the overwhelming majority of the former supporters of the government have now become alienated from it.

In April last year we had what has been described as the uprising of the youth against the government led by the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna. It

has been admitted that the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna and its supporters had supported the United Front in the elections but as a result of the repressions which they suffered they became completely alienated from the government and hostile to it.

Then under the emergency they were completely suppressed and large numbers of their members were thrown into prison. Most of them still remain there although considerable numbers of those who were seized during the emergency have now been released without being charged.

As for other sections of the population, it is important to note that big strikes in certain sectors have taken place despite the fact that strikes in almost every category of workers in every type of establishment in the public and in the private sector have been virtually illegalized by what is known as the essential services orders. Under these orders, if a worker goes on strike, after twenty-four hours he is deemed to have vacated his post, which means that he is deemed to have terminated his employment. This provides the government as well as the private employers with a ready means to victimize workers who go on strike if the strike is unsuccessful.

However, on August 1 there began a strike of nearly 2,000 technical and civil engineering workers in the irrigation ministry despite the essential services order. The government was unable to break the strike, which was over an economic demand, and at the end of forty days the strike ended without the essential services order being invoked against the strikers. On September 1, a general strike of bank employees led by the Ceylon Bank Employees Union began, covering nearly all categories of workers in the banks including even managers in some of the state banks and also some of the commercial banks. That strike is still continuing and has created a lot of public interest since almost every bank has been affected except one national state mortgage bank that was exempted. In the other banks, the staff officers are working and there are restricted hours of banking. The moot question is whether the bank employees will hold out long enough to make the government negotiate a settlement as many of the unions have demanded.

In relation to this strike and otherwise, the Lanka Sama Samaja party,

which is one of the three component parties in the United Front government, has become extremely unpopular, as have the three LSSP ministers, Colvin R. De Silva, Leslie Goonewardene, and N. M. Perera.

Colvin R. De Silva himself was booed and then hooted recently when he went to distribute the prize at a national boxing championship meeting at which there was a crowd of over 1,000 people. The wife of Leslie Goonewardene, Vivian Goonewardene, who is a senior member of the LSSP and a member of parliament, was heckled quite a lot when she spoke recently at a public seminar on the controversial "press council bill," by which the government is seeking to impose permanent and drastic control over freedom of the press. N. M. Perera, the minister of finance, is now the subject of a great deal of public animosity because of the unpopular fiscal policies of the government and because he is directly responsible for the efforts of the government to try to break the bank strike instead of settling it.

Leslie Goonewardene himself has been obviously quite conscious of the degree of unpopularity, especially among the youth, of the Lanka Sama Samaja party as well as the government in which he is a minister. He made a speech in a public meeting recently, which was reported in the newspapers two days ago, in which he stated, "The youth of today feel we are all liars and a spent force."

I think he might have added correctly that it is not only the youth — a majority of the working people as well as the masses of the rural and the unemployed poor have the same opinion. And not only in relation to the LSSP but in relation to the government. The daily press and the right wing within the government as well as outside it are anxious to hold up the LSSP as scapegoats for the generally unpopular political and economic policies of the government.

Q. What is the attitude of the people toward the defendants in these hearings?

A. I think that the general attitude of the people towards the persons in prison and the defendants amongst them is one of sympathy today, in part because of the general alienation of the people from the government.

In addition, it is being realized more and more that the government's version of what took place in April last year was certainly not the truth and that the prisoners were much more the victims of repression than the causes of what the government claimed was the general state of "terror" that prevailed in April 1971.

One manifestation of sympathy with the prisoners is the presence daily outside the entrance of the premises where the criminal justice commission holds its sittings of hundreds of university students from the University of Colombo. At the entrance, when the prisoners leave each day after the sittings, these students stand there and wave to the prisoners, who pass by in closed vans singing revolutionary songs, preceded and followed by armored cars in a regular armed convoy on their way back to prison.

Generally speaking, even amongst the public at large, judging by day-to-day comment on the newspaper reports of the proceedings, it also appears to me that there is widespread sympathy now with the people who are in prison.

Q. This is a change from the past?

A. Well, I would say that in 1971 considerable sections of the working class and the general public did have some idea that the people who had been thrown into prison had been associated with terrorist activity. That idea has now virtually completely died down. In fact, the Criminal Justice Commission itself has ruled that the persons who are charged may be referred to as suspected insurgents but not as terrorists, because of the wording of the act. This is an important point of difference because the state radio and the government had continually referred to the persons associated with the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna as terrorists and not as insurgents.

Q. What activities are being planned against the repression?

A. Six organizations, including the Ceylon Mercantile Union, which originated the idea, have called for a one-day hunger strike from dawn to dusk on a nationwide scale on October 18.

The other organizations are the Human and Democratic Rights Organization; the Ceylon Workers Congress,

the largest union on the plantations; the Ceylon Estates Staffs Union, consisting mainly of clerical and supervisory workers on the plantations; the United Front of Trade Unions in the Electricity Board, a union of state sector employees; and the Central Council of Ceylon Trade Unions.

The purpose of the hunger strike is to protest against the repression generally and repressive laws like the public security act and the Criminal Justice Commissions Act, which the government is using to give effect to its repressive policies, as well as other contemplated laws like the press law which is now being debated in public.

It is intended on that day to seek to bring into action people from all over the country in various walks of life, both young and old, in one common act of protest which will require a degree of consciousness for them to decide, each of them, to refrain from eating for a whole day, whether they go to work, to school, or however they are occupied, or remain in their homes or even in sickbeds in hospital, or in prison. It will be an act which we think will bring together hundreds of thousands of people for the first time directly against the repression. It is also an act which we think will serve as a starting point for a mass movement to end the repression.

Q. What has been the response to the call for a hunger strike?

A. The first public meeting to launch the hunger strike campaign, which was organized by the six organizations I have mentioned, was held on September 21 in the town hall of Colombo. It was packed to capacity. I would say about a thousand people were present and it really went off with a bang.

Apart from that, hunger strike committees have been formed in various workplaces and also in different residential areas and they are actively mobilizing public interest in the idea of the hunger strike.

A very important and active element in the development of the hunger-strike campaign are the relatives of the thousands of persons who are still in prison, as well as many of those who have now been released but who still see the need for a struggle against repression. These people

come from all over the island, particularly from the rural areas where the movement led by the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna found its roots. One indication of the degree of interest in the hunger strike is the fact that in the last two days, literally hundreds of letters have come into the headquarters of the Ceylon Mercantile Union from villages and towns all over Ceylon, pledging the support of individuals, families, or groups for the hunger strike. Yesterday, there were 125 such letters and today there were over 100 letters.

As far as the workplaces are concerned, the fact that five major trade-union organizations are taking part will mean that on October 18, there will be, literally, hundreds of workplaces, plantations, ports, and various establishments, industrial and commercial, shops and offices, in which people will be at work but not eating. We are quite sure that in all these establishments and generally in the country, what will be uppermost in people's minds on October 18 will be the hunger strike and the struggle against the repression.

Q. Is there anything that people in other countries can do to help and to express their solidarity?

A. Yes. In fact, the six sponsoring organizations of the hunger strike have specifically called upon people in other countries who are in sympathy with the struggles against repression in Ceylon and who wish to identify with that struggle to demonstrate their solidarity in any form on October 18 in their own countries.

I feel that the October 18 action in Ceylon is not only going to be an action of national importance but also of international importance. It will really mark a day of international protest. I am sure that even though the number of people who may take part in solidarity actions in other countries may not be very great, their actions will be significant.

Sympathy actions are planned in Japan, Australia, India, the United States, Europe, England, and many other countries.

Arising out of that, I think that in all countries where there is an understanding of the situation in Ceylon and the struggle against the repression, people will be assisting us in our struggle to end it by studying

what is taking place here, communicating what they learn to people in their own countries or to other countries, and building up international

public opinion against the repression. This will certainly have some bearing on the attitude of the present government to the question. □

'A Woman's Right to Choose'

WONAAC Sponsors Abortion Hearings

More than 500 women and men attended the "New York Abortion Hearings" sponsored in New York City October 20-21 by the local chapter of the Women's National Abortion Action Coalition (WONAAC). The hearings were part of the preparations for the International Tribunal on Abortion, Contraception, and Forced Sterilization to be held in New York next March 9-11.

The hearings began with a debate on the question "Abortion: A Woman's Right to Choose?" Dr. Barbara Roberts, a national coordinator of WONAAC, and Elaine Amendola, a lawyer active in legal cases involving women's rights, spoke in support of the right to abortion on demand. Dr. Karl Klinges, a gynecologist, and Father Joseph Lynaugh, a Catholic priest, defended the priority of the "rights of the fetus" over those of women with unwanted pregnancies.

In the following day's proceedings, some forty women testified on their experiences with illegal and unsafe abortions, police harassment, and sexist hospital policies. A symposium evaluated the results of the liberalized abortion law passed by the New York state legislature in 1970.

Another panel refuted the arguments of those forces led by the Catholic church which have organized "Right to Life" groups. These organizations favor reinstating harsh antiabortion laws wherever these have been repealed or ameliorated, and defend existing antiabortion statutes wherever they are challenged.

Towards the conclusion of the hearings a panel of leading feminists handed down "indictments" against antiabortion forces that have violated the rights of women. Presiding judges were Harriet A. Gair, president of the New York Women's Bar Association; Florynce Kennedy and Diane Schuler, attorneys and coauthors of *Abortion Rap*; and Alix Kates Schul-

man, author of *Memoirs of an Ex-Prom Queen*.

Those indicted were Richard Nixon, who has said that the right of abortion violates his belief in the "sanctity of human life"; Robert Byrn, a Catholic layman who is asking the U.S. Supreme Court to name him "guardian" of all fetuses in the state of New York; the 109 legislators who, under heavy pressure from the Catholic hierarchy, voted to repeal New York's relatively liberal abortion law (the repeal bill passed and was vetoed by Governor Rockefeller); the "Right to Life" organizations; the

Knights of Columbus, a fraternal organization with close ties to the Catholic hierarchy; Governor Thomas Meskill of Connecticut, who is seeking to overturn court decisions that declared his state's antiabortion laws unconstitutional; and a New Jersey prosecutor who is seeking to jail Dr. Robert Livingston for providing abortions, even though there is no anti-abortion law in New Jersey.

The indictment charged them with (1) seeking to deprive women of the right to privacy; (2) violating the thirteenth amendment to the U.S. constitution, which bars involuntary servitude; (3) interfering with the medical profession's performance of a needed service; (4) using the tax-exempt funds of church-related organizations in the antiabortion campaign; (5) violating the right of free speech; and (6) violating the constitutional principle of separation of church and state.

At the conclusion of the hearings, WONAAC staff-member Susan Lamont announced that Simone de Beauvoir had agreed to function as chairwoman for the projected international tribunal.

Iran

'Amnesty' Appeals for Mashouf Kalantari

[The following appeal in behalf of an Iranian political prisoner appeared in the September issue of *Amnesty Action*, the American bulletin of Amnesty International.]

* * *

Mashouf Kalantari, who has been in prison since July 1968, was one of 14 civilian intellectuals who were charged with "having formed a group with Communist ideology which had plotted against the security of the state." An Amnesty observer who attended the trial, which was held before a military court, reported that the prosecution case relied mainly on individual guilt by association, and on group guilt established largely on the basis of one man's statement, said by the defense to have been one of several "confessions" extracted under torture. Kalantari was sentenced

to 10 years imprisonment.

His family is very worried about his health. They believe he is suffering from tuberculosis and that the climate of Bandar Abbas, on the Persian Gulf, where he is imprisoned, is particularly unsuitable for someone in his condition. The prison is a long way from Teheran, where his family live, so they can seldom visit him. This makes them even more anxious about him. Appeals for his release, or at least that he be transferred to a prison nearer his family and less deleterious to his health should go to: His Imperial Majesty Shahanshah of Iran, Niavaran Palace, Teheran, Iran; to: His Excellency Fazlollah Kassemi, Chairman of the Petition Committee (Majlis Showraye Melli), Maydan Barestan, Teheran, Iran; and to: His Excellency Dr. Amir-Aslan Afshar, Ambassador E. and P., Iranian Embassy, 3003 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D. C. 20008. □

Trotsky Recalls Lenin in Copenhagen Interview

[The following interview with Leon Trotsky appeared in the November 24, 1932, issue of the Copenhagen newspaper *Social-Demokraten*. It was obtained by Henrik Rechendorf on the train that was taking Trotsky, Natalia Sedova, and their aides from the western port of Esbjerg to Copenhagen. There, on November 27, Trotsky was to give his famous speech "In Defense of the Russian Revolution."¹

[Trotsky made the journey from exile in Prinkipo at the invitation of the Danish group *Socialistiske Studenter* (Socialist Students). The interview is translated for the first time in English by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

As we pass by the heaths of Jutland, the rich fields of Funen, and into the evening darkness in Sjaelland, we carry on our conversation. Trotsky is informed about everything, but he still wants more information. His hands draw pictures in the air, opening and closing to emphasize his thoughts, and he almost purses his lips under his soft mustache when, in a rather cutting way, he heads into a sentence for which he has just decided upon a formulation.

*

Trotsky. First and foremost, I want to express my thanks for the invitation and entry permit to Denmark. I recognize that the government, which in no way shares my viewpoint, has given me permission to give a purely historical and scientific lecture to a number of interested young people. I had already received a similar invitation prior to this from Norway, but I had to turn it down because of a fire in my house in Constantinople last year. The trip has been a great pleasure, especially for my wife,

1. The text of the speech is included in the recently issued book *Leon Trotsky Speaks*, Pathfinder Press, 410 West St., New York, N.Y. 10014 and 28 Poland St., London W1V. \$3.45 (L1.45).

who for ten years was in charge of all the museums in Russia, and who was happy to be able to see the wonders of Italy in this field.

Rechendorf. How long has it been since you spoke in public?

Trotsky. I have not given a speech in Western Europe since 1914, in Austria. For four years I have been isolated not only from political life, but also from public life in general and from any real communication with broader circles. I have no auditorium where I can speak face to face with people. All I have is my literary activity.

Rechendorf. Are you lonesome?

Trotsky. On the island where my house is located, I live alone with my wife and my six-year-old grandson—who, by the way, was to have come with us—and with a few good friends, some of whom come to visit from great distances. There are 600 inhabitants on the island, but I have no contact with them. I go fishing, hunting, and boating—and, of course, I write.

Rechendorf. Only about Russia?

Trotsky. I was more at the center of the Russian revolution than any other living person and as a result I have certain qualifications for portraying it. I have just finished a three-volume history of the revolution—a work that has required three years of intense labor. I just finished thoroughly going over the material, which I plan to present to my audience in Copenhagen. And I am already enjoying the fact that I will be able once again to speak directly to an audience in a meeting, rather than to unknown readers. But I am going to talk only about the results of historical research; I am not going to talk politics.

Rechendorf. Do you have any plans for the future?

Trotsky. Yes, I am preparing three books—one about the world economic and political situation, and one about Lenin, a biography, which I have already written a little about in an English periodical.² But reports of my book on Lenin have leaked out. In Spain, for instance, a book on Lenin has already come out with my name on the title page. A falsehood and a forgery from one end to the other. I didn't write a word of it.

Rechendorf. What's behind this forgery, politics or the desire to make a buck?

Trotsky. A combination of both, I think. The book will bring in money, and at the same time it will do damage to me. The book is political in character, and it is full of mean things. Among other things, it has me making extremely disparaging and contemptuous statements about Lenin, speaking about him in a way that was completely inconceivable for me. I am now trying through the Spanish courts to have justice done in this matter.

Rechendorf. What do you plan to write about Lenin?

Trotsky. Besides writing his biography, in the second volume I want to do away with the false interpretations of his teachings and the incorrect conclusions that have been drawn from his ideas. And in the third volume, which will be theoretical and political, I will go into a polemic against what I call his epigones in Russia.

Rechendorf. Was Lenin himself the Russian revolution?

Trotsky. As a Marxist, I know that history is made according to the ma-

2. In this interview, Trotsky does not mention the subject of the third book. But in another interview, published at the time in the Social-Democratic paper *Folkeblad*, Trotsky says the following: "As for my third projected book, it is about the Red Army, about which I have some knowledge." — IP

terial conditions. But under certain circumstances, men can end up playing a decisive role. Without a mechanic, the machine will not run, and without the spark plug's spark, the motor will not start—even if every other part is working fine. *Lenin was the Russian revolution's spark.*

Rechendorf. Do you mean that without Lenin, there would have been no revolution?

Trotsky. All the necessary conditions for revolution were present in Russia in October 1917. But without him, I doubt that it would have occurred at that point. Or perhaps it would have lasted for three years; new factors would have come into play, and perhaps the opportunity would have been missed.

Rechendorf. What was Lenin like?

Trotsky. A lovable and simple person. I can still remember him playing in the corridors of the Kremlin, where we both had offices. He played with my two boys. He was like a child in the midst of all the seriousness. His character was such that he took a responsible approach to everything he did. He worked just as carefully on a speech to five workers in London as he did on a proposal to the all-Russian Congress of Soviets. And this almost omniscient man could all by himself make the world's most complicated questions simple and easy for the uninitiated to understand.

Rechendorf. What did his death mean for the Soviet Union?

Trotsky. That Russia lost a man who could not be replaced.

Rechendorf. And for you?

Trotsky. Aren't you trying to sneak in some politics here? You know I'm not going to say anything about politics.

Rechendorf. Isn't everybody asking you about politics?

Trotsky. Sure they are, but in order to avoid any misunderstanding, I never let a word about current politics cross my lips—let alone an interview. I am writing. I am enjoying the pleasure of relaxing after the exertions of

the trip, and I intend to spend my time seeing Copenhagen and its surroundings, and renewing acquaintances I made during my stay here twenty-two years ago for the 1910 congress.

*

As the express train approaches the capital, Trotsky gradually becomes more and more animated. One gets the unquestionable impression that it is only his companions who are apprehensive about him. Already on the Storebaeltsfaergen he has gone for a walk on the platform and signed autographs for a few young people, as well as talked animatedly with a few German-speaking passengers.

When the train goes by Roskilde, the moment approaches when we are to leave it and take automobiles the last leg of the way to Copenhagen. We are going into Copenhagen, because Trotsky has expressed a desire to see

the town at night, when it is all lit up. We were originally to have gotten off at Hedehusene, but a counterorder was issued. The train finally comes to a stop at Taastrup. Here, except for two, the entire group gets into three automobiles, and then takes off at full speed down Gl. Koege Highway into the capital. Through Valby we drive down Vesterrogade to Raadhuspladsen [Copenhagen's main square].

Here something happened that made Trotsky's companions tremble and turn pale. We are to meet a man at Raadhuspladsen who is going to look after Trotsky. As we come to a stop, Trotsky leaps out, smiling like a playful boy, and ignoring all warnings he takes a little walk around the brightly lighted square. Not one person recognized him, and his smile showed that he was delighted.

Then a car drove up, and within a few minutes, Trotsky and his wife sped off into the night, no one knows where. □

With Trotsky on the Train to Copenhagen

[In 1932, Leon Trotsky was invited to Denmark by a Social-Democratic student group. He made the journey from his place of exile in Prinkipo to Copenhagen, where he gave his famous speech "In Defense of the Russian Revolution" on November 27.*

[A correspondent of the Danish newspaper *Politiken* obtained the following interview with Trotsky on the train that was taking him from the western Danish port of Esbjerg to Copenhagen. It appeared in the November 24 issue of the newspaper, from which it has been translated by *Intercontinental Press*. It is published here for the first time in English.]

* * *

In the countries he has traveled through, Trotsky has avoided talking about politics. He has turned down interviews because his visas have been issued everywhere with the stipulation that he refrain from making any statements about the present political situa-

* The speech has been included in the book *Leon Trotsky Speaks*, published by Pathfinder Press, 410 West St., New York, N.Y. 10014; or 28 Poland St., London W1V 3.54 or L1.45.

tion. In Esbjerg he had his secretary announce that he wanted to give only a written statement to the press, but on the train trip to Fredericia I was able to have a conversation with him.

Trotsky entered the compartment smiling. He is like a completely different person when he smiles; his eyes light up, his features are gentle, and he exudes charm. One feels in the presence of an individual whose strength, far from being on the wane, is in full force.

"Are there particular reasons why you accepted the invitation to give a lecture in Copenhagen. I imagine you have received many other invitations as well?"

"Naturally it's a long way up here," Trotsky replies, "but I wanted to take a trip at the moment, and I am fond of Scandinavia. I've been here before, you know. It's purely accidental that I am now visiting Denmark before Norway. Two years ago I received an invitation from Norwegian students, and I was even granted an entry permit by Mowinkel, but in February of last year, just as I was about to begin the trip, there was a bad fire in my home in Prinkipo. All my manuscripts and papers were

destroyed, and I left the island while the house was being repaired. I did not want to travel while that was going on. But now that is finished, and we will be going back there after our trip to Scandinavia."

"Have you been to Denmark before?" I ask, after promising Trotsky not to touch on politics.

"In 1910 I took part in the international Socialist congress in Copenhagen. I came here from England with Rosa Luxemburg, who in those years was living in exile from Russia the same as I. The lovely days spent in Copenhagen at that time are some of the happiest memories of my life. There is something gentle and friendly about the Danes. I'm not trying to flatter them, because obviously they can't help being the way they are. But it made an impression on me, I remember.

"We ended the congress with a big banquet in the city hall, I believe, and that was a magnificent experience. Yes, a lot sure has happened since then. When I think back on the people who were together in Copenhagen at that time, numerous events come back to mind. There was Bebel, the German Socialist leader; Jean Jaurès, who was murdered when the World War broke out; Lenin, who was relatively unknown at the time; and Rosa Luxemburg, who fell as a martyr for her passionate convictions. If we engaged in guesswork over the future, we nonetheless never guessed what was to happen later."

"Was your wife along with you that time?"

"No, but she has kept the photographs and picture postcards that I sent her from Copenhagen, and she has always looked forward to seeing the city that I praised so highly."

"Do you know that Lenin lived in Copenhagen a while when he was in exile?"

"That I have never heard, but I find it interesting to know. I myself almost went to Copenhagen in 1907 at the time of my second escape from Siberia. Disguised, I managed to get to the Urals. From there, in my rashness, I took the train to St. Petersburg, and fortunately was able to avoid the police spies. At the Finnish border, I was met by Finnish activists who helped me get to Sweden. Yet on my way to Copenhagen, I only reached Malmö—a steamship there

happened to be heading for London."

"Are you going to give a speech in Norway this time too?"

"I think so. If only I can get in, I'll travel up there. My wife and I would also both like to go to Sweden, my wife mostly to see the museums and art. For ten years she was in charge of all the Russian museums—both scientific and artistic—and there are now many valuable collections that she was responsible for bringing together. In Italy, where we stopped on our way here, we had a great experience. We saw the new, huge excavations in Pompeii. What the Italians have achieved there is really colossal. A third of the city has been re-created just the way it was in times past and you can relive the life of the city at that time."

"Have you had a hard trip?"

"Not at all. We had eight days of marvelous sailing from Constantinople to Marseille, where, fortunately, we arrived too late to catch the train, so we had to take a car to Lyon. That was an unforgettable drive—400 kilometers through southern France. I like to get around." With this Trotsky gets up and rolls up the window blinds. "I would also like to see a little of Denmark," he adds, "though it's too bad about the fog you've got here at the moment."

"What is your speech in Copenhagen going to deal with?"

"I am going to talk about the Russian revolution—but it will consist of a purely historical and scientific explanation of events. I am going to stick exclusively to Russia and will not get into international politics. I unfortunately can't speak Danish, but I have chosen to speak in German,

which is understood, I have heard, by many Danes."

"How long have you been living in Prinkipo?"

"For four years. I have been given the right to live in exile, you know, and Prinkipo is, naturally, better than Siberia. When I'm not writing, I go hunting or fishing. At present I am working on a new, big work on the Russian revolution. I have a daughter, who lives with me along with her six-year-old son; and, as you know, where there are children, time never hangs heavy. Yet naturally I am not planning to settle down on the little island forever."

"Do you hope to go back to Russia?"

"No, thanks," smiles Trotsky, pulling thoughtfully on his grizzled, pointed beard, "now you're trying to provoke me into talking politics, but I already told you I wouldn't."

The train approaches Fredericia. The wholesaler Boeggild [representative of the Social-Democratic students] has sent ahead by telegram ordering sandwiches from the train station for Trotsky and his party. Two waiters come out on the platform carrying big baskets of sandwiches, including quite a few of caviar—a treat for the Russian guest.

Many people have gathered at the depot in Fredericia in order to catch a glimpse of the Russian revolution's Danton. There are crowds of curious people in every town the train goes through, but the secretaries pull down the shades, and nobody gets to see Trotsky. They can only get a hint of the celebrity behind the lowered shades and feel a gust of world history pass by. □

Riot Reported in Brezhnev's Hometown

Troops and police were called out to put down a rebellion that broke out in Soviet Communist party chief Leonid Brezhnev's hometown of Dneprodzerzhinsk last summer, according to reports reaching the West.

An article in the September 16 *New York Post* said that an undetermined number of persons were killed and that many were arrested and remained in prison.

The riot reportedly began when three drunks were arrested by police and placed in a van in which some inflammable liquid had been stored. One of those

arrested lit a cigarette, and the van burst into flames. Before police opened the compartment, one of the drunks had died.

A crowd gathered and accused the police of incompetence and misconduct. As the police argued back, the crowd grew larger and eventually violence broke out. Rioting spread to various sections of the city. Crowds of people attacked the local Communist party headquarters and the police station, heavily damaging both.

Reinforcements were called for, as were troops, and the disturbances were finally quelled.

Western CPs Denounce Czechoslovak Trials

[The witch-hunt trials conducted during July and August by the Czechoslovak regime headed by Gustav Husak gave rise to deep divisions within the Communist parties outside the workers states.

[The trials, held between July 17 and August 11, sentenced a total of forty-six persons to prison terms ranging from six months to six and a half years. Most of the defendants were supporters of the Prague Spring policies of former Communist party general secretary, Alexander Dubcek. Many of those prosecuted had been leaders of the Communist party, members of its Central Committee, chairmen of its local committees, and directors of its institutions, educational and otherwise.

[Although the charges against the defendants involved "antistate" or "subversive" activities, no evidence of concrete antisocialist acts on the part of the defendants was presented. There was a total of nine trials—brief affairs often lasting less than forty-eight hours. In violation of Czechoslovak law, they were closed to the public.

[These trials were but a part of a more generalized repression that has involved the purging of student and trade-union organizations, the closing of theaters, and the firing of intellectuals (some 30,000 of them) from their jobs.

[The Western Communist parties had already been divided over the 1968 Kremlin invasion of Czechoslovakia. Most of the parties that opposed the invasion, or expressed reservations about its efficacy, continued to voice concern about the repression. In February 1972, when news reports reaching the West seemed to indicate that purge trials were being prepared in Prague, the French Communist party sent Roland Leroy, a member of its Political Bureau, to Prague to discuss the situation with Husak. The latter, in a declaration widely quoted in the world radical press, assured Leroy that there would be no "show trials," that no one would be prosecuted for his or her political beliefs. "The time of prefabricated frame-up trials has definitively passed," Husak declared.

[When that pledge was cynically violated by the July-August trials, the French CP, which had since formed an electoral alliance with the Socialist

party, reiterated its opposition to political trials. On July 25 the French CP's Political Bureau approved a resolution that, while it supported all necessary measures to suppress counterrevolutionary activity by anti-socialist forces, noted that the defendants in the Czechoslovak trials did not appear to be counterrevolutionaries. "Now, since it is a question of political and ideological opposition, we consider that it is by means of an intense political and ideological struggle, waged with the support of the workers and the popular masses, that the opponents of socialism must be fought and isolated."

[An attack on the CP position by Gaullist forces impelled the CP leaders to go somewhat further. On August 2 the Executive Committee of the Confédération Général du Travail (General Confederation of Labor, the CP-dominated trade-union formation) passed a resolution that stated in part, "The current trials, whose political character is obvious, contradict these [Husak's] assurances. The CGT vigorously deplores the trials."

[The British Communist party, which in the past has been among the most slavish in bowing to the Kremlin's line, this time felt compelled to take its distance from the Husak show trials. The *Morning Star*, official organ of the British CP, wrote editorially that the charges against the defendants arose from political differences and "should be dealt with by political means and not by trials and imprisonment."

[The Norwegian Communist party sent a letter to the Czechoslovak leaders on August 20 in which it referred, among other things, to the "rights that the Norwegian Communist Party thinks a socialist democracy must assure to the people in freedom of thought and expression."

[The Italian Communist party, which is the largest outside the workers states, the Australian Communist party, and the Dutch Communist party also expressed opposition to the trials.

[One Western CP that gave unconditional and uncritical support to the Czechoslovak witch-hunt was the Communist party of the United States. The American CP kept silent on the subject of the Prague trials for five weeks. On August 23 the *Daily World*, which

reflects the CP's views, noted that forty-six persons had been sentenced to prison "for attempting to take up where the counter-revolutionary movement around Alexander Dubcek left off in 1969."

[But the American CP found itself unable to let the matter drop. In Angela Davis the Communist party has a member whose reputation as a fighter against capitalist repression is worldwide. This put the American CP in a unique position to act in support of the victims of Husak's witch-hunt.

[On August 31, the left-liberal weekly *New York Review of Books* published an open letter to Davis from Jiri Pelikan, one of the leaders of the movement against the "normalization" in Czechoslovakia. Pelikan was director of Czechoslovak television under Dubcek and was elected to the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist party at the August 1968 party congress, which was held secretly in a Prague factory after the invasion. He now resides in Italy, where he has continued activity in support of the Czechoslovak resistance.

[In his open letter Pelikan pointed to the socialist credentials of the victims of the July-August trials, recounted his own twenty-five-year history in the Communist movement, and appealed to Davis to come to the aid of the witch-hunt victims.

[The Pelikan letter, which was reprinted by the American Trotskyist weekly *The Militant*, seems to have upset the Kremlin-fawning leaders of the American Communist party. On September 29 the *Daily World* began a three-part series of articles defending the Czechoslovak witch-hunt and smearing Pelikan and *The Militant* as allies of world imperialism.

[Despite its efforts to present damning evidence against the Czechoslovak defendants, the *Daily World* was able to "prove" them guilty of only one "crime"—they were in correspondence with Pelikan, who is an "emigre."

[The political heart of the series was contained in the second and third articles, which deal mostly with denunciations of Pelikan and the "Trotskyites." The *Daily World's* attacks on Pelikan and *The Militant* are hardly worth discussing, consisting as they do merely of allegations about

Pelikan's antisocialist aims. More significant is the general line: "Around the recent trials of anti-socialists in Czechoslovakia an unprincipled united front has emerged, embracing Trotskyists, anti-Soviet 'liberals,' revisionists and those Rightward from there."

[The *Daily World's* articles refer to "progressive forces" in the West that have been taken in by the above-mentioned cabal. Assuming that the American CP regards the French, Italian, British, Norwegian, Dutch, and Australian Communist parties as progressive forces, the inescapable conclusion is that a good part of the Western Stalinist movement has been duped by an anti-Soviet bloc.

[There is some evidence that even the American Communist party may find within its ranks some members who find it difficult to swallow whole the Kremlin's version of the Prague trials. There has not yet been a direct statement from Angela Davis on Pelikan's appeal. The August 14 issue of *Pravda*, the newspaper of the Soviet Communist party, reported that Davis had "rejected with indignation" Pelikan's bid to draw her into "an alliance with anti-Communists to defend anti-Communists."

[But the *Daily World* has yet to quote Davis on this matter.

[Shortly before her recent tour of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, Davis held a press conference in Atlanta, Georgia. A *Militant* reporter questioned her about whether she had received the appeals directed to her on behalf of Czechoslovak political prisoners. Her answer was uncharacteristically equivocal:

"I'm concerning myself with the liberation of my people in this country. We have a long struggle ahead. We've come a long way, but we still have a long way to go. I've seen with my own eyes the thousands and thousands of my sisters and brothers in the jails and prisons in this country, and that is where my priorities lie."

[Davis did not denounce the Czechoslovak defendants as counterrevolutionaries, which is the CP position on the matter. Did she want to say more than she actually did? In the absence of any direct quotation from Davis in the Communist party press, one can only speculate.

[In any case, the American CP finds itself virtually alone among the West-

ern Communist parties in its complete acceptance of the Kremlin's line on the Prague repression.

[For the information of our readers

Australia: Trials Hurt Socialist Cause

[The following statement appeared in the August 8-14 issue of the *Tribune*, which reflects the views of the Communist party of Australia.]

* * *

SYDNEY: On behalf of the executive of the Communist Party of Australia, the party's national secretary, Mr. Laurie Aarons, this week released a press statement on the current series of political trials in Czechoslovakia.

Full text of the statement follows:

The Communist Party of Australia expresses deep concern at the trial and conviction of 31 Czechoslovakians on obviously political charges.

The C.P.A. protests at the harsh sentences imposed, going as high as six and a half years, on vague charges of "antistate activity" and "subversion."

The charges seem to arise mainly from publication of leaflets, including an appeal for voters to exercise their constitutional right to cast informal ballots at the 1971 parliamentary elections. This makes the severity of the sentences quite inexplicable and unjustified.

Even more disturbing is that the charges were brought at all. These are political trials directed at communists who were excluded by administrative means from the Communist Party after the August, 1968 intervention in Czechoslovakia. They include former Central Committee members, secretaries of city committees, students and youth leaders, and others whose devotion to socialism is unquestioned. These people have been removed from their positions, dismissed from their work and discriminated against in employment because of their political beliefs; now they are imprisoned.

The Communist Party of Australia protests against these political trials, which still continue. It calls for the release of all those imprisoned, cancellation of the sentences and the dropping of all further proceedings.

The prosecutions contradict Czech-

we reprint below the texts of statements on the trials from the Australian, Dutch, and Italian Communist parties.]

oslovakian Party leader Gustav Husak's explicit assurances that there would be no political trials. It is a sad commentary that the harshest sentence so far was imposed upon Dr. [Milan] Hubl, former Central Committee member and director of the Higher Party School. Dr. Hubl was mainly responsible for the release and rehabilitation of Dr. Husak, himself jailed for eight years under the Novotny regime in the 'fifties on false charges of "bourgeois nationalism" and working for the restoration of capitalism.

These political trials damage Czechoslovakia's international reputation and the socialist cause which is used to justify these actions. In our view, the suppression of political views in general, and these trials in particular, are a serious departure from socialist principles.

The trials will not suppress the aspirations of the Czech and Slovak peoples for genuine national independence and for a real socialist democracy. In fact, the trials are only a symptom of the serious problem arising from the so-called "normalisation" imposed after intervention by armed forces of the USSR and other Warsaw Pact nations.

[In the next issue of the *Tribune*, dated August 15-21, the campaign against the Czechoslovak trials was continued with the following editorial.]

The article on this page sets out facts and circumstances relating to the recent and continuing series of court trials of a large number of political activists, many of them communists of long standing, in Czechoslovakia. *Tribune* last week published a statement of strong protest by the Communist Party of Australia against these political trials.

The Czechoslovak people, especially its communists — and indeed the cause of socialism throughout the world — have already suffered gravely from political trials. From the beginning of the 1950s many tens of thousands

were jailed or executed in Czechoslovakia following summary or elaborately staged court proceedings used to dispose of political critics—real or imagined—of the leadership at the time in Prague or Moscow. This was the direct line of descent from Stalin's purges of the '30s. In early 1968, following the democratic overthrow of the authoritarian and bureaucratic Novotny, there was hope that the path of socialist democratic development had been found—but the march of the Warsaw Pact armies abruptly ended that. Since then, the leadership in Czechoslovakia appears to have steadily passed under more and more authoritarian influences. Now Prague is seeing something very reminiscent of the 1950s and apparently for similar reasons.

It is claimed in *Rude Pravo*, organ of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, that these are trials of people, not for their political views, but for breaches of socialist laws, for "anti-socialist activity," and thus it is not a "return to the fifties."

Why then are we seeing a contrived mass trial after more than a year's delay, instead of individual prosecutions at the time of alleged breaches of the law? Why, if the breaches were clear and serious, is there such little information released about the evidence and other detail of the trials that the Italian, French, and British communist parties have criticised this aspect? Why the refusal of a visa to a British Labour MP seeking to observe the proceedings? In short, why is there such a closed, defensive atmosphere around the trials?

In answering such questions we are driven to conclude that the trend is indeed back towards the political persecutions of the 'fifties when, also, the stock charge in such cases was "anti-socialist breaches of the law." The current events are a far cry from the CPCz First Secretary Husak's statement of June 2, 1969—"Today is no longer the 'fifties, and no one needs fear their return"—and his many similar pledges.

But we are living in the 1970's and many things *HAVE* changed. Revolutionaries throughout the world, including very many communists, have determined that never again will they be deluded into condoning the use of coercive powers of the proletarian state—necessary as these are for defence against real capitalist class

counter-revolution—to silence debate among socialists.

We repeat today what CPA national secretary Laurie Aarons said at the June 1969 international conference of communist parties in Moscow: "If we say openly that the August, 1968, intervention was wrong, it is not because we want to intervene in the internal affairs of the parties which made the decision . . . we say again that the intervention harmed our cause, the struggle for a socialist world."

Our protest today, far from seeking to intervene in Czechoslovakian internal affairs (for that would be futile as well as a violation of communist principles) is above all an assertion that when we, Australian communists, speak today of socialism we mean something very different in important respects from what is being displayed in Prague.

We ourselves have already demonstrated in practice in our own party and its international relations our firm belief that differences of view in the on-going socialist movement must and can be unravelled by means of open and persistent discussion, debate, and the testing of diverse theories in the practice of mass struggle.

While not pretending that after capitalism has been abolished the problems of serious political debate are easy to solve, we declare that Australian communists will continue to strive for a socialist society in which, alongside socialised ownership of production, economic institutions and the media under fully democratic forms of workers' control and self-management, there will be consistent promotion of humanist values, and democratic control and decision-making in all spheres, as the basic antidote to

Netherlands: 'Nothing to Do With Justice'

[The following article, titled "The Trials," appeared in the August 5 issue of *De Waarheid*, which reflects the views of the Dutch Communist party. It was signed by Joop Wolff.]

* * *

The Czech press agency CTK is sending out ambiguous reports about trials now taking place in the country. Even relying on the reports of CTK itself about the prosecution and

the bureaucratic tendencies revealed in all human societies so far.

Such a socialist society must, of course, safeguard its basis of socialist production relations, following the transfer of all main means of production, distribution and exchange from capitalist profit-making ownership to socialized ownership for public use. This will be necessary as long as capitalist forces retain organised strength. But the trials in Prague are showing once again that the mere establishment of such a socialist base of new production relations does not yet constitute or ensure a truly developed socialist society. The trials are a vindication of the CPA view that, at their present stage of development, such societies are more correctly described as "socialist-based."

On September 18, 1968, a few weeks after the armed intervention in Czechoslovakia by the Warsaw Pact governments—*Tribune* editorially stated: "The issues involved in the Czechoslovakian events will long be important to the theory and practice of socialism."

Those in Australia and elsewhere who have attempted to sweep these matters under the carpet and pretend they did not really matter are once again proved wrong. They will be hard put today to justify or excuse the events in Prague, though they will probably try, in further demonstration of their subordination to long-discredited concepts.

We take the stand which we believe to be shared by the majority of Australian workers—the revolutionary social transformation of this country by the workers must be accompanied by adherence to the genuinely socialist principles of free flow of information and debate and full democratic control of decision-making processes.

sentencing—to terms of one-half to six and a half years in prison—of persons on charges of distributing leaflets, it is clear that these trials have nothing to do with justice.

Certainly not with socialist justice.

Some remarkable facts surround this business of trials. Bilak, one of the secretaries in the present leadership of the Czechoslovak Communist party, has refused to offer any explanations in regard to the bitter com-

plaint of the French Communist party that the trials are being pursued despite the assurances given to a member of the French CP who was sent to Prague some time ago that there would be no trials.

As for the Communists in the Netherlands, their attitude has been clear and is still clear now.

Our party has never seen any value in *démarches* which the masses do not support.

Our party has taken a clear stand in all respects. Since the shocking events of 1968, the Dutch Communist party has maintained no relations with the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. An invitation a year ago to take part in a so-called international conference in Karlovy Vary was to be led by Novotny—the man who was, in his own country, held responsible by the masses for the distortion of socialism—was turned down unambiguously and forcefully by the Dutch Communist party.

As Dutch Communists, we maintain that we want to have nothing, absolutely nothing, to do with such practices as the trials reported by CTK and that we do not want our high opinion of socialism to be tainted by these practices.

In the August 26, 1968 declaration of the party leadership we stated our solidarity with the attempt "to eradicate the distortion of socialism that has grown up under Novotny in favor of a progressive course, a broadening of democracy, for a human socialism." And we added this: "We are firmly convinced that it is impossible to halt the development of this type of socialism and that any attempts in this direction are doomed to failure."

These words are still valid today and are especially appropriate.

For us, Dutch Communists, the concept of socialism is indissolubly linked with democracy, with the will of the majority of the people, and with the independence of the country.

In a CTK interview Bilak stated that he considers any protests or concern voiced against the present trials to be merely "attempts to divert attention from the crimes against the Vietnamese people and the killing of Irish children."

It is certainly true that Bilak's attitude and the trials themselves, as reported by CTK, give well-known enemies of socialism an opportunity

to slander socialism as a social system and to cover up and minimize the American crimes in Vietnam and the evils of capitalism elsewhere.

This only makes matters worse—and this at a moment when it is necessary to weld together the unity of

Italy: Trials Are Cause for Concern

[The following article, "Prague Trials 'Cause for Political Concern,'" appeared in the July 22 issue of *L'Unità*, organ of the Italian Communist party.]

* * *

Three trials have been going on in Prague this week against people accused of "conspiring to engage in subversive activity against the republic and its international interests." We have reported these trials of party leaders and intellectuals previously and we now do so again.

According to information provided by CTK, the accused "had prepared and mimeographed various publications of an antistate nature which they had distributed together with other slanderous publications printed in hostile countries." This was the main accusation against the group, to which belonged the two people who received the heaviest sentences yesterday—six years and five and a half years imprisonment. The sentence was pronounced in accordance with the laws of the Czech state.

Our position on the whole Czechoslovak problem is well known and was confirmed at our thirteenth Congress. We have criticized and continue to criticize all those actions and events that are contrary to the principles that we consider common to our movement. We do not consider in any way legitimate the criticisms and accusations raised against the socialist countries by those reactionary and conservative groups which are guilty in their own countries of the gravest crimes against the workers and humanity. Further, we have always stressed our desire not to interfere in the domestic affairs of the socialist countries and communist parties. Having said this, however, it is obvious, in our opinion, that the trials which have taken place in Prague do not concern solely internal affairs, but raise questions and problems for us also.

the masses in solidarity with the people of Vietnam.

In this, the stakes are really high; they concern the settling of accounts with imperialist crimes. The recent declarations from Prague seem completely unaware of this.

First, little is known about these trials because the real public was excluded. This is certainly detrimental to anyone who would like to form a considered and informed opinion; but, even more than that, it casts a dark shadow on the legal proceedings. There should be no fear of publicity concerning the crimes which are by their nature manifest or considered to be so.

Second, to reach the point of trials and sentences on the basis of the facts as they have been officially announced is certainly an alarming political sign.

It should be possible to answer accusations of "publications of an anti-state nature" and "slanderous publications" by a reasoned defense and public controversy, by an ideological and political counterattack, and by a campaign where truth confronts possible slander.

To resort in these cases to administrative and judicial methods does not resolve matters but aggravates them. This is precisely what strikes us most, as an indication of a situation that has not been resolved and of problems that are certainly not easy, but not for this reason less serious or less grave. □

Karachi Workers Occupy Two Mills

The Bhutto regime has decided to come down hard on workers seeking to defend their meager standard of living. When strikers occupied two textile mills in Karachi, the police moved in October 18. They opened fire, killing at least ten of the strikers. According to Associated Press, more than thirty workers and policemen were injured.

At Dawood mill the police claimed that they had asked the workers to evacuate the building. The workers refused and became "violent," according to the police. Thereupon the cops started firing.

Following this, the police went to Gul Ahmed mill. Upon meeting with "similar resistance," they used tear gas to drive the workers out.

The mills had been occupied by the workers for four days, according to the Associated Press. The occupation was part of a struggle to gain a wage increase.

Jenness Denounces Persecution of Arabs

[The following statement was released by Socialist Workers party presidential candidate Linda Jenness at a news conference in Austin, Texas, on October 10.]

* * *

The Nixon administration has announced it is "screening" all Arabs living in this country or traveling through the U. S. What does this mean? Representatives of various Arab organizations in the U. S. have reported that FBI or other government agents have been following them around, holding them for interrogation, fingerprinting them, and issuing threats of unspecified reprisals against them.

Freedom of travel for all noncitizens, but especially Arabs, has been infringed, with the U. S. now requiring visas even for people simply stopping here to change planes in transit to some other country. All Arabs face special screening at airports.

Another repressive move was the congressional passage of a bill authorizing the death penalty for airplane hijackers, even though the Supreme Court has declared the death penalty unconstitutional.

These moves pose grave dangers for democratic rights in this country.

In the first place, they represent blatant racism against the Arab peoples. All Arabs are being subjected to harassment and restrictions on freedom to travel, not because of any illegal actions, but simply because they are Arabs.

If these measures are allowed to continue without protest, the government could well move to more drastic measures, such as deportations or detention in this country. During World War II similar racist treatment against Japanese-Americans culminated in the incarceration of Japanese-Americans in concentration camps.

Second, such measures as surveillance, detention, interrogation, and travel restrictions are infringements on civil rights guaranteed in the Constitution. They set the precedent for even more severe police-state policies.

These are precisely the same kind of measures that were instituted during the McCarthyite witch-hunt period

in the 1950s. Members of my party, for example, were denied the right to travel. They were denied passports, not because of any illegal acts, but simply because of our political views.

We can expect that the Nixon administration will continue as far as it can in extending these repressive measures not only to Arabs but to all supporters of the Arab liberation movement and to other movements fighting for social change. Nixon will extend these undemocratic measures until he is confronted with an outcry of protest making it clear the American people will not put up with any such abrogation of our civil rights.

So far my Democratic opponent, George McGovern, has said nothing about whether he supports these anti-Arab, antidemocratic measures by the

Nixon administration. McGovern's calls for international sanctions against the Arab liberation movement, and his all-out support of Zionist Israel against the Palestinians fighting for a democratic, secular Palestine, raise serious doubts about his support for the democratic rights of Arabs on the question of these new measures.

I challenge George McGovern to say where he stands on this question of civil liberties. Does he support the racist "screening" of all Arabs? Does he support Nixon's restrictions on freedom to travel? Does he support the death penalty against hijackers?

I urge all supporters of democratic rights—whether they support McGovern, Nixon, or myself—to unite in defense of any persons victimized by these new measures and to speak out immediately against these measures before they lead to even greater restrictions on our rights. □

'A Matter of a Little Inconvenience'

Marcos Drives Peasants Into Camps

Philippines Brigadier General Tranquilino Paranis, commander of northeast Luzon, has estimated that there are all of 500 full-time guerrillas operating in his province, about 200 miles northeast of Manila. To eliminate that threat to the Marcos regime he has embarked on a campaign to uproot thousands of villagers.

According to the October 20 *New York Times*, Paranis expects to empty 100 to 120 villages by the end of the month. The general claims that 3,000 families—a total of 20,000 people—will be affected by the move, but provincial authorities say the number of refugees will be nearly 50,000.

'Everybody who remains in the area is an N.P.A. [New Popular Army, the guerrilla organization]. I can swoop upon them and pound them,' Paranis explained in an interview at his headquarters.

But so far, it is peasants that have taken the pounding. Villagers were displaced before they could harvest their rice crop; deprived of food, they have been forced to sell their animals to survive. Although a so-called calamity fund has been established to aid the refugees, no funds have been made available from Manila, and the

displaced peasants have no access to means of subsistence.

Province Governor Faustino N. Dy called the mass displacement "a matter of a little inconvenience," and said it was part of President Marcos's building of the "New Society." He said he was sure that refugees would be given new land to cultivate under a newly proclaimed land reform.

But Paranis disagreed, claiming he would need just sixty days to "sanitize" the area in "a big-scale military operation." Then, he said, the refugees could go home, the implication being that refugees will be held in the camps for at least two months.

Paranis's antipeasant operation actually began two weeks before Marcos proclaimed martial law, but the general insists that the proclamation has made local officials considerably more cooperative. "The local officials think something will come to them if they are remiss," Paranis said "with a twinkle."

Governor Dy, it should be noted, was elected as an opponent of Marcos. Paranis was sent into the region in response to a request from Dy for military aid against his opposition. Dy is now an enthusiastic Marcos supporter. □