

Pyotr Yakir Reported to Have Recanted



'White Terror' in South Vietnam?

Trotsky on Imperialist Intervention in Spain



Zadunaisky in Minnesota

On November 26 more than 300 persons at the University of Minnesota heard Daniel Zadunaisky, who is touring the United States and Canada for the U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners (USLA), describe the plight of Argentine political prisoners. He spoke to classes on Argentine and Latin American history and politics and to a gathering at the university's student union.

These programs were part of a day-long teach-in on Latin America sponsored by the Minnesota International Student Association, the Chicano Studies Department, Latin Liberation Front, Latin American Studies Council, International and Cultural Affairs Committee of the Minnesota Student Association, International Studies Center, and USLA.

At a news conference held the previous day, the Reverend Vincent Hawkinson, a member of the international affairs committee of the Minnesota Council of Churches, announced the formation of a Twin Cities USLA chapter.

In his talks, Zadunaisky read from statements that prisoners had smuggled out of the jails. These described the unsanitary living conditions in the prisons and the use of electric needles and other instruments of brutal torture against imprisoned critics of the regime.

He noted that General Perón has failed thus far to take a decisive stand in favor of the release of all who have been imprisoned for their opposition to Lanusse.

"The weight of world opinion has influenced the Argentine government to free political prisoners, such as Hugo Blanco, in the past," the former medical student told his audiences. "The main thing is that the word gets around and that the Argentine government knows it gets around." □

Schedule

This is a reminder that our last issue of the year will be dated December 25. There will be no issues for January 1 and 8. We will resume our regular weekly schedule with the January 15 issue.

In This Issue

ARGENTINA	1386	Zadunaisky in Minnesota
INDOCHINA WAR	1387	PRG Charges Thieu Plans Mass Murder —by Jon Rothschild
U.S.A.	1388	U.S. Still Doing Germ War Research
	1396	YSA Member Assaulted by YWLL-Led Trio
CHILE	1388	Paris Court Upholds Chile
SOVIET UNION	1389	Kremlin Intensifies Its Repression —by Marilyn Vogt
	1394	Demand Re-Creation of Volga Republic
SPAIN	1390	Writer Appeals for Solidarity
TURKEY	1391	Repression of Left Intensifies
PUERTO RICO	1391	PSP in Campaign for Political Prisoners
NEW ZEALAND	1392	Why the Labour Party Won —by Russell Johnson
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	1395	Teachers Decide to End Strike
IRELAND	1397	For a Mass Movement Against Repression —by Gerry Foley
CYPRUS	1400	Makarios and Grivas Still at Odds
HAITI	1401	"Baby Doc" Takes Over, Hits "Corruption" —by Candida Barberena
INDONESIA	1402	Corruption and Resistance
	1403	Indonesian Youth Threaten Action —by Adam Tidar
SRI LANKA	1405	U.S. Tour Exposes Sri Lanka Repression
HONDURAS	1408	Military Seizes Power
DOCUMENTS	1409	Imperialist Intervention in the Spanish Civil War—by Leon Trotsky
	1410	Cuban Government's Position on Hijacking
	1412	Why PSA Refused to Meet With Peron
	1413	Devlin Calls for Irish Solidarity Actions
	1414	More Slanders From the SLL
	1415	In Reply to "Workers Press" —by George Saunders
PHOTOGRAPHS	1389	Pyotr Yakir
	1393	Norman Kirk confronted by "Socialist Action"
	1394	Anastas Mikoyan
	1407	Sri Lanka soldiers seizing "suspect"
DRAWINGS	1400	Archbishop Makarios; 1402, Suharto; 1413, Bernadette Devlin—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 Guemenee, 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.

PRG Charges Thieu Plans Mass Murder

By Jon Rothschild

After six negotiating sessions in the last final winding-up-the-particulars series of talks, meetings between Hanoi's Le Duc Tho and Henry Kissinger were recessed for two days December 9-10. A U. S. spokesman in Paris announced that the two chief delegates would meet again on the afternoon of December 11. In the interim, "technical experts" representing Washington and Hanoi were to meet to work on the text of the proposed Vietnam settlement.

As usual, no reliable information about the substance of the Kissinger-Tho discussions was forthcoming. U. S. officials in Paris, who at the beginning of December were castigating the news media for displaying too much pessimism about the prospects for a final agreement being signed, changed their minds on December 8, warning reporters against "excessive optimism."

The American staple of metaphors about the negotiations was increased by one on December 10, as an unidentified "Administration expert on Asia" remarked that the two sides were now in the "dotting-the-'i' stage."

While the signing of the accord may not be as close at hand as U. S. officials suggest, it is clear that the Thieu regime is thoroughly resigned to the proclamation of a cease-fire and is acting accordingly. A series of new decrees aimed at increasing Saigon's military control over the uncertain South Vietnamese countryside has been enacted, and representatives of the liberation forces have charged that Thieu is preparing the execution of thousands of political prisoners.

The new decrees, according to the December 3-4 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde*, provide for establishing military tribunals that will have the power to pass death sentences against persons found guilty of deliberately disseminating "false information concerning the present and future situation" in the economic sphere. Ostensibly, the measure is aimed at black-market speculators. But it can easily

be applied to those conducting economic activity in trade unions.

Further decrees grant the president the right to consign civilian functions to the military in cases of "clear and present serious danger to national security." Courts martial have been established in combat zones to try persons charged with offenses relating to identity papers, a measure aimed at stemming the whopping desertion rate in the puppet army. These tribunals will also reportedly deal with "infiltration" problems after the cease-fire. *Le Monde* observed without comment that the tribunals may call into question the right of free travel supposedly guaranteed in the Tho-Kissinger accord.

The December 9 *Christian Science Monitor* reported passage of still another decree in South Vietnam, this one granting province chiefs the right to dismiss elected village leaders who "violate a national policy." Earlier this year, Thieu eliminated elections on the hamlet level, declaring that hamlet chiefs would be appointed by provincial governors. Villages normally consist of between two and eight hamlets, and election of village heads is guaranteed in the South Vietnamese constitution. The new decree will enable Thieu to get around that minor detail without going to the trouble of amending the constitution.

Among the first to suffer in any post-cessate-fire escalation of terror by the Thieu regime will be the thousands of political prisoners in Saigon's jails. The Provisional Revolutionary Government reportedly raised once again the issue of the prisoners during the regular Paris talks of the first week in December. (The PRG does not participate in the Tho-Kissinger negotiations.)

On December 5 the PRG published a long statement accusing Thieu of "having prepared a so-called security plan that will be set in motion if a bilateral [Hanoi-Washington] accord is reached." The plan, the PRG said, calls for the suppression of all dem-

ocratic rights and the arrest of all opponents of the Saigon regime. The statement said that Thieu has drawn up a list of oppositionists to be assassinated. In the province of Haung-hia, this list is said to include 40 percent of the prisoners now being held.

The PRG specifically called attention to conditions in the prison camps of Phuchoc, Poulocondor, and the Chihoa prison. "The torturers in the puppet administration have transferred prisoners from one camp to another," the PRG said, "in order to make it easier to carry out the assassination plans . . ." The statement called on the prisoners to "unite in struggle against the prison system."

The North Vietnamese Communist party newspaper, *Nhan Dan*, charged in its December 5 issue that Thieu, with U. S. support, was on the verge of unleashing a "white terror" in the South. According to the December 6 *Christian Science Monitor*, Radio Hanoi announced early in December that more than 500 political prisoners interned at Conson Island off the South Vietnamese coast had gone on a hunger strike during September after guards beat up thirty prisoners who had protested the death of another inmate from dysentery. "The fast lasted for 15 days without any solution granted by the U. S. and Thieu clique to the demands [for better conditions]," Radio Hanoi reported. "On the 16th day of the fast, almost all the inmates were exhausted and passed out. At this time, the cruel clique had ordered their soldiers to come in and savagely beat up the inmates."

In an interview published December 8 by Agence France-Presse, PRG Foreign Minister Nguyen Thi Binh referred to the question of Saigon's prisoners in the strongest terms yet used publicly by the liberation forces: "There is no reason why we should free American prisoners while our compatriots remain in jail."

The Thieu white terror in the South has been accompanied by continued U. S. pounding of the North. *Nhan Dan* reported that during November U. S. fighter-bombers flew 5,500 sorties against the North; B-52s flew 850 sorties; the North was bombarded by a total of more than 36,000 tons of bombs and more than 10 million artillery shells.

Despite the continuing talk of peace, and while the furious U. S. bombing

goes on, the focal point of the war remains the villages of South Vietnam. The December 6 *New York Times* reported that U. S. intelligence agencies have concluded that Hanoi plans to integrate its army into the National Liberation Front in order to wage a post-cease-fire struggle for control over the southern countryside. North Vietnamese army units will reportedly break down into groups of not more than 300 men each and will link up with local partisan forces on a village-by-village basis.

This "decentralization plan" also reportedly calls for the construction of secret arms factories in South Vietnam's rural areas. The *New York Times* reported that Kissinger may raise objections to this alleged North Vietnamese plan in his talks with Le Duc Tho and may insist that such actions—pure self-defense against Thieu's repressive apparatus—constitute violations of the peace agreement.

The puppet army is apparently waging a feeble propaganda campaign to counter the influence of the liberation forces in the countryside. In the December 5 *Washington Post* correspondent Thomas Lippman described Saigon's activities in the

heavily populated Mekong Delta region. In one village in the province of Dinh Tuong Lippman witnessed Saigon Cadet Officer Tran Van Muoc—one of the 5,200 "cadres" Thieu has sent into the countryside to conduct propaganda—reading a statement to assembled villagers.

"No one was listening, and one villager after another said he had no idea what it was all about," Lippman wrote.

"Muoc said that in two weeks of repeating the message in that village, he had not been asked a single question, and that if he were asked a question not covered in the document he would have to consult his superior, the district chief, for the answer. At night, he said, his instructions were not to remain in the village but to retreat to a nearby military post."

The local military commander in the village of Hauthanh offered perhaps the most realistic brief evaluation of the terms of the Tho-Kissinger accord. Explaining that—agreement or not—the puppet army could not afford to tolerate the existence of the liberation forces, he told Lippman, "In the sky there is only one sun, and in our territory there can be only one ruler." □

mittee of the U. S. House of Representatives in 1969 that ". . . [security deletion] percent of the work that we are doing under the CB [chemical and biological] program is offensive in nature but it is very difficult to make any clear line of delineation between the two because there is such an intermingling."

Not all stores of deadly bacteria were destroyed when Nixon issued his order. The command at Dugway Proving Ground told Fineberg that "some biological agents . . . in test tube quantities" were stored there. But a scoffing Dugway employee described filling an unmarked truck with biological agents being sent to a new storage facility in 1970.

Nor have the large germ-producing fermenters been dismantled. Instead, they have been "sealed off." "They're mothballing it," said Dr. T. J. Haley of the Food and Drug Administration. In addition, the delivery systems for bacteriological weapons, complicated mechanisms which cannot be put to other uses, have been preserved.

Further doubt about the "defensive" character of this research is raised by the view expressed by Colonel Crozier in the July-August issue of *Ordnance* that "biological weapons are not considered a major strategic threat against the U. S. population at this time." The U. S. lead in the development of such weapons of mass murder is universally admitted.

Representative Richard McCarthy, a New York Democrat, said in 1969, "I have been amazed to discover that the US has absolutely no hard evidence of any Russian offensive biological warfare activity." □

'Ban' Ignored Despite Fanfare

U.S. Still Doing Germ War Research

Three years ago, Nixon announced that as a demonstration of his desire for peace he was ending U. S. germ warfare research. On November 4, 1972, as his reelection campaign ended, he pointed with pride to some "results" of this decision:

"For years, Fort Detrick [a military installation in Maryland] was one of the most secret places in our country, dedicated to research on biological warfare—perfecting the instruments of death. But last year we decided to convert it into a laboratory for research on cancer—dedicated to the preservation of life."

An article by Richard A. Fineberg published in the December 2, 1972, issue of the liberal New York weekly *The New Republic* presents evidence that such weapons are still being

developed and stored as part of the imperialist arsenal.

Some of Fort Detrick's facilities have been turned over to the U. S. Army Medical Research Institute of Infectious Diseases (USAMRIID). In the past year, its budget has increased by 50 percent. Its staff is expected to triple in size by the end of 1973. USAMRIID's commanding officer, Colonel Dan Crozier, describes its task as "developing workable medical defensive measures against biological agents." According to Fineberg, "the offensive skills of producing, stabilizing and disseminating disease agents" are viewed as a necessary part of such "defensive" research. Because of this, Colonel Nelson W. Tobey, an army research and development officer, told the Appropriations Com-

Paris Court Upholds Chile

Kennecott Copper Corporation suffered a setback in its campaign against the Popular Unity regime of Chilean President Salvador Allende when a Paris court on November 29 ordered the lifting of a prior, court-obtained authorization to seize without payment a shipload of Chilean copper to two French companies. The court order had been obtained by Kennecott's American-owned subsidiary, Braden Copper Corporation, in retaliation for the fact that it received no compensation for its El Teniente mine when Chile nationalized the copper industry in 1971. The Chilean government ruled at the time that it was not entitled to any because of excess profits that it had made.

Kremlin Intensifies Its Repression

By Marilyn Vogt

"If I commit suicide, that means they have murdered me, and if I confess, that means they tortured me." This was the statement of Pyotr Yakir, prominent Soviet dissident Communist and civil rights leader, prior to his arrest June 21, 1972. He was arrested under Article 70 of the Russian Criminal Code, which deals with "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda." (See *Intercontinental Press*, July 3, p. 762.)

Separate dispatches by Moscow correspondents for the London *Observer*, London *Daily Telegraph*, *Washington Post*, and Agence France-Presse reported during the first week of December that Yakir, who has undergone almost constant interrogation for the past five months in the notorious Lefortovo prison, had allegedly recanted. They state that Yakir has renounced his activities against the Soviet bureaucracy's suppression of democratic rights and has called for the dissolution of the democratic opposition movement.

The reports generally state that Yakir's daughter (Irina, also an activist in the democratic opposition movement) has visited him in prison and reported to his family that he stated he had been wrong in his activities and now calls for the disbanding of the civil rights movement.

Robert Kaiser's report from Moscow in the December 6 *Washington Post* stated that "Yakir . . . is cooperating with Soviet authorities and providing information about former colleagues according to reports circulating in reliable circles here." The same report indicated that twenty-five people had been brought in for questioning by the KGB but that no arrests had yet been made. Some of those questioned reportedly held official or academic positions and, although they were acquainted with Yakir, had not seen him for "a long time." Some had "personal, officially supervised confrontations" with Yakir in which he is reported to have said that it was best to admit what went on in the past and that he now saw the error of his ways. "Yakir reported-



PYOTR YAKIR

ly said he realized he had gone too far in his dissident activities by establishing connections with emigre groups in the West," Kaiser wrote.

Dev Murarka, reporting in the December 3 London *Observer*, told of rumors that Yakir, as a Marxist, has taken the position that he "cannot condone the non-Marxist aspects of the movement. Therefore, he has confessed his own guilt and that of others."

A release from Agence France-Presse in the December 4 *Le Devoir* of Montréal stated that Yakir confessed to being an editor of the *Chronicle of Current Events*, a samizdat journal that has appeared bimonthly since 1968, reporting on the activities of the democratic opposition movement and the Kremlin's efforts to suppress it. An attempt by the Soviet bureaucrats to link Yakir with the *Chronicle* would not be surprising. The KGB has en-

gaged in a year-long campaign of arrests, searches, and interrogations in an attempt to crush the *Chronicle*. But the underground journal has so far eluded repression and has continued to appear. Yakir allegedly named other "editors," whose arrest is said to be imminent.

The reports state that the Kremlin authorities are planning to use Yakir as the star witness in a "show trial" to implicate a large number of dissidents in "anti-Soviet" activities.

Pyotr Yakir is the son of Iona Yakir, a Soviet army general who was executed by Stalin in 1937. After his father's execution, Pyotr (then fourteen years old) and his mother were interned in a concentration camp, where she died and where he remained confined for seventeen years.

He was released from the camp following the rehabilitation of his father during the de-Stalinization period in the late 1950s. In his "secret speech" to the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist party, Khrushchev referred to Pyotr Yakir as one of the innocent victims of Stalin's repression.

After his release, Yakir worked as a historian and edited a collection of articles about his father. He also compiled memoirs of his camp life. These circulated, like many of his other writings, in samizdat. The first part of the memoirs was published in Britain in November under the title *A Childhood in Prison*.

Yakir was instrumental in the formation in May 1969 of the Initiative Group for the Defense of Human Rights in the USSR. As a member of that group and as an individual, he signed numerous statements protesting against the trials and convictions of opposition activists and against what he saw as a growing revival of Stalin's methods of police terror.

In a letter to the Twenty-fourth Congress of the Soviet Communist party Yakir wrote, "For the last few years a dangerous tendency toward the re-birth of Stalinist methods of government has become apparent, and there is a tendency toward the rehabilitation of Stalin himself—one of the greatest criminals of the 20th century. . . ."

Yakir, with oppositionists Vladimir Bukovsky and Andrei Amalrik, gave a filmed interview in July 1970 to television correspondent William Cole of

CBS [Columbia Broadcasting System, a major U. S. network]. In it, they discussed the struggle for socialist democracy in the Soviet Union. Both Bukovsky and Amalrik are presently serving prison sentences after being convicted on charges of "anti-Soviet activity." The television interview was part of the evidence used to convict Bukovsky.

Until his arrest in June, Yakir was one of the few members of the Initiative Group who had not been jailed in a psychiatric hospital-prison. The KGB had obviously been reluctant to arrest him previously for fear that a legal case involving Yakir would revive too many memories of the 1936-1938 purges. However, his flat had been searched repeatedly and the authorities had warned him to terminate his activities, which he refused to do.

The rumors that this militant fighter has recanted, although they have been widely publicized in the Western press, have not been verified in any statement by a member of the opposition movement. Nor has the Stalinist press published any statement of recantation by Yakir. The information is said to come from "reliable circles" or to

be "circulating" in Moscow "among dissident groups." The entire episode thus could be a KGB fabrication designed to demoralize and intimidate the democratic opposition.

But even if the rumors are not true, the fact that they are being circulated indicates that Brezhnev and company are stepping up their campaign to crush the opposition movement—a campaign that has already reached intense proportions this year with the arrest of hundreds of activists and the sentencing of many to harsh terms of confinement.

The reports of Yakir's alleged "confession" also point toward a revival by the Kremlin bureaucrats of practices utilized by Stalin during the 1936-1938 Moscow trials, when well-known Communists and revolutionary heroes were first physically and psychologically broken under interrogation and then paraded forth as witnesses in show trials where they "confessed" that they had betrayed the revolution—the repentant witnesses subsequently being used to establish fraudulent links between the anti-Stalinist opposition and imperialist agencies. □

public a shocking piece of news that, far from having the intended effect, helped to increase the wave of anguish and indignation that is sweeping over the majority of my countrymen . . . Against ten working-class leaders, arrested on June 24 and accused of "criminal conspiracy," the public prosecutor asked for the following prison terms:

Marcelino Camacho Abad, 20 years; Eduardo Galen, 20 years; Nicolas Alvarez, 19 years; Francisco Garcia, 19 years; Fernando Soto Martin, 16 years; Fernando Marcos Ruiz, 18 years; Francisco Acosta, 12 years; Miguel Angel Zamora, 12 years; Pedro Hurtado, 12 years; Luis Fernandez Costilla, 12 years.

I do not think it is necessary to make any further comment on the juridical monstrosity of the request for these terms. But one ought to compare the harshness that is being applied to these workers—ten desperate men who are powerless and who are attempting to assert themselves in union work as representatives for thousands of workers—with the indulgence that was recently shown persons who had swindled the Spanish people [Alvarez is alluding here to the fraud scandal in the big firm MATESA (Maquinaria Textil Sociedad Anónima—Textile Works Corporation)—*Information*]. Everyone can draw his own conclusions as to the nature of a political regime that has such a concept of justice and that defends it in this way.

But you who read this must also consider the fact that we live in a world in which day by day, fortunately, it is becoming more difficult to evade that portion of the burden of responsibility that each and every one of us must assume in the face of injustice of any kind, no matter where it may be committed on the face of this earth—which, when all is said and done, is the only and indivisible country in which we live.

International solidarity, which is both a duty and a right, must fraternally and generously go out to whoever has need of it, no matter what his geographic or political latitude may happen to be. Only then can a citizen of any country feel truly free. Only then can man find human dimensions in this world that is skidding headlong toward the pit of cynicism.

Thank you for reading this letter. □

Denounces Trial of Workers' Leaders

Spanish Writer Appeals for Solidarity

[The following is the text of a letter from the Spanish author Carlos Alvarez that was published, in a Danish translation, in the November 16 issue of the Copenhagen daily *Information*. The letter, dated November 9, is addressed to the world press. It denounces the severe sentences that had just been asked for ten Spanish workers. Alvarez himself, *Information* noted in its introduction, "has been brought to trial several times, charged with illegal, Communist activity." The translation, from the Danish, is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

A few weeks ago, I was interviewed at home by a team from Swedish TV. They wanted a detailed account of the latest trial in which I, along with eight

companions, am charged with having taken part in a so-called "meeting of a nonpeaceful nature" in a church in Madrid while the Burgos trial was being conducted (December 1970). As you will recall, a number of members of the ETA [Euzkadi ta Azkatasuna—Basque Nation and Freedom] were being tried at the time by a military court, which was being asked to give six of them the death penalty. I explained (to Swedish TV) that a close cooperation existed between an extreme right-wing action group called Guerrilleros de Cristo Rey [Partisans of Christ the King] and the political police. I explained further the repressive character of the judges and the court and the clear indulgence they showed the police and the government authorities . . .

On November 8, the press made

Repression of Left Intensifies

After nineteen months of martial law in Turkey 1,047 leftist students, professors, journalists, and others are in prisons awaiting trial. Martial law was imposed in April 1971 in eleven of Turkey's sixty-seven provinces, including those in which the most populous cities are located. Since then, reported Juan de Onís in the December 6 *New York Times*, 3,300 people have been tried before military courts.

In November the government passed legislation banning all existing student organizations as well as any group based on class or on "extremist" ideology. According to de Onís, "all the big universities here [Ankara] and in Istanbul are under military control, with soldiers at the doors of buildings and plainclothesmen mingling in classes and in student meeting places."

The government is preparing a new law that would permit it to take over any campus and control faculty appointments.

The regime has taken direct control of the state radio, and several leftist publications have been prevented from publishing. On October 26 a military court sentenced a writer, Nasih Nuri Ileri, to seven and a half years in prison for translating a book on the life of Lenin.

This repression against journalists and restrictions on freedom of the press were condemned in September by a Congress of the International Federation of Journalists which was held in Istanbul. The president of the Turkish journalists' union told delegates to the congress that 754 cases were pending against Turkish journalists.

The December 3 *New York Times* reported that at least 1,000 persons were being hunted by the Turkish regime for suspected "connection with a 'worker-peasant' Communist movement."

Although the government denies the use of torture against prisoners, the *Times* account asserts that "there is substantial evidence that the civilian secret police have been using electric shock, beating and a traditional method of loosening up suspects in which the victim's feet are flayed."

Apparently the many months of martial law and severe repression have not been sufficient to wipe out expressions of the widespread dissent and unrest among workers, students, and the Kurdish minority in Turkey. Martial law was declared soon after a new government was formed by Nihat Erim on March 26, 1971. Erim was brought to power by the military, who had ousted the government of former Premier Suleyman Demirel of the conservative, openly pro-American Justice party.

The current government, headed by Premier Ferit Melen, is the fourth army-backed coalition government since the overthrow of Demirel. The president of Turkey is Cevdet Sunay, a former military chief of staff, and the army is the most powerful political force in the country. In a nation of 35 million, Turkey's army of 500,000 is the second-largest within NATO, second only to the U.S. army.

Under the Demirel government, the Turkish student movement had grown to massive proportions in 1970, precipitating a crisis for the regime. Demonstrations of as many as 70,000 students and workers occurred against antilabor legislation and against the docking of U.S. ships from the Sixth Fleet.

The army's ouster of Demirel was

PSP in Campaign for Political Prisoners

Juan Mari Brás, general secretary of the Partido Socialista Puertorriqueño (PSP—Puerto Rican Socialist party), arrived in the United States at the beginning of December in order to visit Puerto Rican political prisoners and to publicize his party's campaign to gain their release.

The campaign received a boost near the end of November when the governor of Puerto Rico, Luis Ferré, pardoned and released from prison four nationalists held for more than twenty years for their role in the 1950 Puerto Rican uprising.

undoubtedly aimed at crushing this growing opposition movement, although the military commanders cloaked their action with rhetoric about the need for social and economic reforms. The military has been pressing the Turkish parliament to pass legislation to effect token land reform, educational reforms, and limitations on foreign investment in mineral resources.

Since the imposition of martial law, bombing and kidnapping incidents have mounted. The military-dominated regime has accused two banned groups of responsibility for these acts—the Turkish People's Liberation Army, and the Dev Genç (Revolutionary Youth). Using the terrorist incidents as a pretext, the government has widened its repressive dragnet against the entirety of the student and the workers' movements.

Elections are scheduled to take place in Turkey in October 1973. To give them at least the appearance of legitimacy, the Melen regime has proposed constitutional amendments that would allow for continued repression of the left without martial law. According to the August 3 *Christian Science Monitor*, these measures include setting up "special security courts that would deal with terrorists and other extremists, enforcing stricter control in the universities particularly over the academic staff, limiting the powers of the Constitutional Court and high judicial organs, and giving more powers to the executive in appointing or removing civil servants in senior administrative posts." □

The Puerto Rican nationalists imprisoned in the United States for whom the PSP is seeking freedom include Oscar Collazo, arrested for an attempted assassination of President Harry Truman in 1950; Lolita Lebrón, Rafael Cancel Miranda, Andrés Figueroa Cordero, and Irving Flores, all members of the Nationalist party of Puerto Rico arrested in an attack on the U.S. Congress in 1954. One of these prisoners, Andrés Figueroa Cordero, is ill with intestinal cancer. A PSP-sponsored picket line at the White House to demand their release is scheduled for December 11.

Why the Labour Party Won in New Zealand

By Russell Johnson

The Labour party's sweep of the November 25 general elections in New Zealand represented the biggest electoral shift the country had seen in nearly four decades. In fact, only once before had there been a larger voting shift—in the 1935 elections that brought the first Labour government to power.

The 1935 Labour government, elected as a result of a mass radicalisation spawned by the depression of the thirties, introduced sweeping reforms, particularly in the areas of housing and social welfare, which secured for the party the enduring political loyalty of the New Zealand workers.

Like the 1935 victory, Labour's win in 1972 reflects first and foremost the depth of the general discontent and radicalisation in this country. This has been reflected in escalating strike activity over the past decade, and above all by the rapid rise of the antiwar movement during the past three years. The more than 30,000-strong antiwar mobilisations of 1971 and 1972 represented the biggest street demonstrations New Zealand has experienced since the 1930s. They have given powerful impetus to mass protests over a whole range of issues, from capitalist destruction of the environment and New Zealand's sporting relations with South Africa, to abortion and French nuclear testing in the Pacific.

The growth of the independent protest movements challenging the government on key questions has been a major factor in creating the political climate for the Labour win.

The elections showed that the radicalisation has even had an impact among political sectors regarded as traditional bases of National support. The government, despite attempts by Prime Minister Marshall to present a "liberal" image, lost significant numbers of votes in some wealthy suburbs. The Values party was an electoral formation that presented a liberal platform on questions such as women's

rights and the environment and attracted significant support from young professional and executive layers, the National party "youth."

The electoral result represents a swing against National, the party of big business. Dissatisfaction with Tory rule, a feeling that the government had to go at any cost, was no doubt a factor in bringing out many previous nonvoters (usually Labour votes), and in encouraging minority party supporters to switch to Labour.

But Labour also gained because it came across as a definite alternative to National on many issues. It pledged to end the country's housing crisis and to take measures against skyrocketing rents. Labour promised to reverse National's erosion of social welfare and to abolish the wage-freeze board. It pledged that it would move against inflation and unemployment and would take a strong stand against further French nuclear testing in the Pacific—to the extent of sending a navy frigate into the test area.

Labour was identified with opposition to military involvement in Southeast Asia and to the raising of Lake Manapouri.* It indicated that it would abolish military conscription. The sweeping victory was a clear mandate to take firm action on these questions, and popular expectation that Labour will do so is high.

But no sooner was the Labour win clearly established than the Kirk leadership began to backtrack on its election promises. Reassuring the business establishment took top priority: "No one has anything to fear from the election of Labour. This is the point I want everyone in this country to know. We are not going to turn

*The damming and raising of Lake Manapouri to provide power for an international aluminum smelting combine has been a central issue for New Zealand conservationists. In 1970 a petition protesting the raising of the lake was signed by 250,000 people and presented to parliament.

the country upside down," was one of Kirk's first reported comments.

In fact, the country's business circles were not at all alarmed by Labour's win and are hoping that a Labour government will be better able to hold down wages than National was. A November 27 Christchurch *Press* editorial put it quite plainly: "The new Government is committed to abolishing the Remuneration Authority; but any trade unionist who thinks that this will mean the end of any form of wage restraint is probably deluding himself. The Government will attempt to restore the Arbitration Court to its former position of authority. . . ." But, the *Press* warned, no matter how "it attempts to restrain wages, it will incur the displeasure of the militant unions, and the first real test of the new Cabinet may well be its ability to handle the unions."

The ruling class is also confident that Kirk has no intention of breaking from the proimperialist foreign policy of the National government. The *NZ Herald's* diplomatic correspondent, J C Graham, wrote November 29: "A notable aspect of Mr Kirk's methods while in Opposition has been the manner in which he has kept his options open in foreign affairs. While proclaiming principles, he has shown an appreciation of the conflicting pressures on a Government in office."

Already Kirk has pulled back on the question of withdrawing New Zealand's armed forces from Malaysia and Singapore. His twisting of the 1971 Labour Conference's demand for withdrawal from SEATO into a demand for its replacement by a "more effective" alliance illustrates what the *Herald* means by Kirk's keeping his options open and indicates his plans on other questions involving "principles."

Kirk was not allowed to go unchallenged in his attempt to avoid important issues. Activists from the antiwar, women's liberation, gay, and other protest movements were much more active than in previous elections, intervening at candidates' meetings and demanding that Labour politicians take a stand on key issues. Antiwar and proabortion pickets were held outside the meetings of both National and Labour leaders.

But the most determined opposition to the Kirk misleadership came from

revolutionary socialists. Taking advantage of the opportunity for reaching a wide and receptive audience, the Socialist Action League initiated a "Socialists for Labour" campaign at the May 1972 Labour party conference. While unconditionally supporting the return to power of the mass party independent of the business establishment, Socialists for Labour emphasised the need to develop a socialist alternative to the current reformist programme and leadership of the Labour party.

The Socialists for Labour campaign was not a "sideline" or "commentary" intervention into the elections. It was an election campaign in its own right. Tens of thousands of leaflets, posters, buttons, and other campaign materials were circulated across the country by campaign activists, who were organised in the Young Socialists for a Labour Government (YSLG). Several hundred people signed up for the YSLG in about twenty towns and cities, mostly during the last month of the campaign. The circulation of the revolutionary-socialist biweekly *Socialist Action* doubled in the course of the election period. Hundreds of copies of the paper were sold at the major election meetings, sellers often running completely out as people queued to buy them.

YSLG representatives debated official Labour candidates, spoke at Socialists for Labour rallies, and fired questions at Labour candidates. The official campaign was forced to relate to what one newspaper columnist referred to as one of Labour's most "vociferous groups of supporters."

"The Socialist Action League has a different idea of what are the real issues in this election," began the address of one candidate who is now Labour's Junior Whip. "Left-wing fascists," muttered another.

The negative response of Labour's defence spokesman to a YSLG question on whether a Labour government would break all ties with the "U. S. war machine" received nationwide press coverage.

Even National party politicians referred to the campaign. In a national broadcast the Tory minister of labour identified the Socialists for Labour campaign as one of the forces which were pressuring Labour to take action against antiunion legislation.

The Labour leadership took the



Photograph, showing Labour party chief Norman Kirk passing up "Socialist Action" seller at a campaign meeting, appeared on the front page of "Otago Daily Times."

challenge very seriously. Soon after the socialist campaign was launched Labour's National Executive declared that members of the Socialist Action League could not remain in the Labour party. Later, the leadership prevented a leading figure in the socialist campaign, Kay Goodger, from speaking at a Wellington regional seminar of the party.

Young Socialists for a Labour Government organised teams that toured the country publicising the campaign. Through these teams the campaign was able to assert its presence at almost every major meeting of Kirk's during the election period. The Labour leader was obviously rattled at having to constantly walk a gauntlet of *Socialist Action* sellers to get into his meetings. He frequently made snide remarks and more than once became abusive. One encounter merited a front-page photograph and comment in one of the major dailies. In some cases, local party officials tried to prevent socialist literature from being distributed in the foyers of meeting halls. This also received press coverage. During his final election address the day before polling, Kirk devoted two minutes of his speech to a full-blown attack on *Socialist Action*.

Outside the Socialist Action League, almost the entire radical left rejected a serious orientation towards the election. Ultraleft student forces and the remnants of the Communist party combined in formations with grand sounding names such as the "Radical Election Campaign" and the "Red Federation." The aim of these forces was to prove to the people that parliament was a "fraud" and a "farce." The means they selected to enlighten the voting public was to disrupt the meetings of the major parties.

In general, the Socialists for Labour campaign was successful in getting socialist ideas and the Socialist Action League more widely known than ever before. And of course one goal of the campaign, the election of a Labour Government, has been achieved. But the fight for a socialist alternative to the status quo policies of the present party leadership has only just begun. The wide support and interest in the socialist campaign, and the aggressive intervention into the elections of activists from the rising independent movements, show that there are today more forces than ever before in New Zealand to carry this struggle forward. □

Demand Re-creation of Volga Republic

[One of the results of the West German-Soviet détente that was initiated by Willy Brandt's *Ostpolitik* has been the easing of emigration restrictions on the Soviet-German population. The consequent increased resettlement has brought the Soviet Germans to world attention.

[According to the 1970 census, there are nearly 2 million Soviet-Germans; they constitute one of the USSR's many national minorities. Some 40,000, or about 2 percent of this population, have reportedly asked to leave the Soviet Union for West Germany. The statistics on actual emigration provide a barometer of Moscow-Bonn relations. In 1970, only 340 left the Soviet Union; in 1971 the figure rose to 1,150; during the first ten months of 1972 some 1,500 were allowed to leave; an equal number will have departed by the end of the year.

[But the vast majority of Soviet-Germans intend to remain in the Soviet Union. Like many other Soviet nationalities, they have been victims of Stalin's violation of the Leninist policy on the national question. In recent years they have begun to stir against their continuing oppression.

[The Soviet-Germans originally inhabited the Volga region, where some 27,000 of them settled in the late eighteenth century. In 1916, during the first world war, the czar ordered them deported to central Russia. But the October Revolution blocked the implementation of that decree.

[The Leninist government recognized the Volga Germans as a national group, and in 1918 some 200 German villages with about 500,000 inhabitants were grouped into an "autonomous workers' commune." In 1924, the Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic of Volga Germans was founded. Apart from the Volga Republic, seventeen other areas of the Soviet Union were designated German "national districts."

[After the Nazi invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941, Stalin, aping the czar, dissolved the Volga Republic and ordered the population deported to Soviet Asia. Thousands were interned in concentration camps; all German

officials were purged from the party; the population was collectively characterized as potential Nazis on the grounds that they were German. Like the Crimean Tatars and other nationalities, they were sacrificed on the altar of Stalin's Great Patriotic War.

[In 1964, Khrushchev issued a decree absolving the Volga Germans of the charge that they were Nazi sympathizers. But the Volga Republic was not reestablished, and most of the German population remains in Kazakhstan, in central Asia.

[In 1965, a delegation of Soviet-Germans met with Anastas Ivanovich Mikoyan, who was then Soviet head of state, to discuss the possibility of re-creating the republic. The following transcript of excerpts of that meeting has recently become available through the underground samizdat press. It appeared, in German translation, in the December 4 issue of the West German weekly *Der Spiegel*, from which we have taken it. The participants are identified only by last names. The translation from the German is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Schessler: We have already appealed repeatedly to the Central Committee [of the Communist party] and to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet for the reestablishment of our republic, but we have received no concrete response. The charges against us have been lifted, but the penalties remain in force. Settlement of our former territory began in 1794. Our ancestors paid 4 million rubles for it.

During the civil war we fought for Soviet power at the side of the Russian people, and this land was given to us by law. The rural areas of this territory are now only 25 to 30 percent settled. Most of the villages lie in ruins. For a genuine rehabilitation, the Volga Republic must be reestablished. Only such a step would free us from the disgrace and distrust that is now our lot.

Bornemann: I come from Kotovo, a village in the Volgograd [formerly

Stalingrad] area. Today, seventy Germans live in our village. . . . Rehabilitation means not only restoration of honor, but also reestablishment of our former position. That means the Volga



MIKOYAN: A "Communist" who thinks historical injustice is uncorrectable.

Republic must be reestablished. The 1964 decree stated that the Germans had "put down roots" in their new homeland. This meant that the Kalmyks, and other peoples from the Caucasus who were not able to "put down roots," were again granted autonomy; but the Germans, who had worked hard and "put down roots," were forbidden to return to their homeland.

Wormsbecher: Up until the war the republic of the Volga Germans was one of the most advanced republics, both economically and culturally. But what is the area like now? All together we have only two newspapers. There is not a single German school. Such conditions were not even imposed on us in czarist Russia. All the peoples of the Soviet Union are entitled to their own states, but not the Soviet Germans. This legitimately raises the question, Are we a Soviet people?

Kaiser: Elementary logic dictates that the innocent should not be punished. After a forcible expulsion, people do not put down real roots. Territory for the reestablishment of the Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic of

the Volga Germans is available. It was given to us through the great October Revolution; it is where the Germans founded Soviet power, and where Lenin in the October 19, 1918, decree established the first autonomous German republic in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republics.

Welz: We once had five high schools, 400 elementary and secondary schools, a national theater, a publishing house, five interregional and twenty regional newspapers and journals. Now we don't have a single school. We have but one newspaper, published in Moscow. But no Germans work on it; they aren't trusted. Even though we were not allowed to fight against the fascists, two Volga Germans who fell at the front were named Heroes of the Soviet Union. Some German families have been resettled as many as six or eight times.

Bersch: It's not just some little group of Germans that wants the republic reestablished. If we could collect signatures, we could bring in a million of them. In spite of the persecution, we have not lost our faith in the party or the government.

Mikoyan: . . . I think enough has been said on this subject. It is incontestable that during and after the war Soviet Germans suffered injustices and that they still do. They work hard. Management of the virgin lands [in Kazakhstan] would be impossible without the Germans. The Germans have been completely rehabilitated.

You raise the question of reestablishing a republic. We understand very well that this would be the best solution to the problem. But it is not possible, because half a million people would have to be resettled. We cannot correct everything that has happened in the course of history. No one confuses you with the West Germans. You are Soviet citizens and have the right to newspapers, schools. But in the present situation, the republic cannot be reestablished, because that would entail monstrous economic losses. As far as cultural needs are concerned, we can work something out.

Some offenses are still committed because there are people in the apparatus who do not follow the rules. If you come across examples of what you could call mistreatment, inform one of the comrades here. [The meeting was also attended by CP Central

Committee Secretary Shelepin.] We will take care of it. I wish you success. Good-bye.

Letter of the German Delegation Written After the Meeting

. . . We are in no way satisfied with the results of this meeting. The people did not send us to play games with the government, but to achieve the complete rehabilitation of two million people, the establishment of their equal rights with other citizens of the USSR, and the reestablishment of their right to form a state. . . .

A purely utilitarian attitude toward the Soviet Germans was displayed; their national hopes were ignored. Lenin's policy on the national question was not applied to the Soviet Germans because that "might entail economic losses."

We are Soviet people, Communists, and not deviationists. We do not need

some kind of national autonomy in cultural matters, but our own state institutions. Since its foundation, the German Democratic Republic has received every attention and assistance from the USSR, but the Soviet-Germans are left to carry the moral burden of the war. You would think that the fascists were not in Germany, but among the Soviet Germans. . . . What would have been your life's goal, Anastas Ivanovich, if one black day the all-powerful Beria had banished the Armenians? [Mikoyan is Armenian.]

What do you mean by saying that not all history's injustices can be corrected? Yes, injustices against people who are dead, against those who have been senselessly killed—those cannot be corrected. But Soviet power lives, and will live! And so long as a people that has been mistreated lives, injustices can and must be corrected. □

Accuse Government of 'Intransigence'

Dominican Teachers Decide to End Strike

A strike that virtually paralyzed the public educational system in the Dominican Republic ended December 9, twenty-five days after it began. The decision to call off the strike was reached during a tumultuous meeting of the Dominican Professors Association (ADP—Asociación Dominicana de Profesores).

The strike, according to a United Press International dispatch in the December 10 issue of the New York Spanish-language daily *El Diario-La Prensa*, "lost all its strength the day before yesterday when hundreds of teachers returned to their classrooms in anticipation of a harsh move on the part of President Joaquín Balaguer." Balaguer had threatened to close the schools indefinitely, suspend the teachers, and place responsibility for maintaining public order in the hands of the armed forces if the strike continued.

While they voted to call off the strike, UPI reported, "the strikers also decided to 'condemn' the speech in which Balaguer threatened on Tuesday [December 5] to use forceful measures to

deal with the educational crisis and in which he also characterized the majority of the teachers as 'incompetent' and pedagogically 'illiterate' persons as far as exercising their profession was concerned."

The striking teachers met with what they called "intransigence" on the part of the secretary of education, Altigracia Bautista de Suárez. She refused, for instance, to meet with a delegation of teachers that attempted to see her on December 1.

The teachers' demands included a salary increase, a wage scale guaranteed by law, allocation of 30 percent of public expenditures to education to help correct, among other things, the shortage of classrooms, and the convening of the National Education Council (in which the teachers have voice and vote), which would seek solutions to the crisis in education. The government appears to have responded favorably only to the demand on a wage scale, asserting that it planned to make the wage scale official in 1973. □

YSA Member Assaulted by YWLL-Led Trio

A hysterical campaign by U.S. Stalinists to bar the Young Socialist Alliance from a predominantly Black and Puerto Rican New York City college campus culminated November 29 in a physical assault on YSA member Will Stanley. At least three persons, led by Richard Hoyen, national peace director of the Young Workers' Liberation League (YWLL), a youth group affiliated to the CP, participated in the attack.

The assault took place after a meeting of the Student Government Association at Borough of Manhattan Community College (BMCC) during which Stanley and Joseph Harris, another member of the YSA, tried to reverse a student government decision to revoke the YSA's charter. At BMCC a political organization cannot distribute leaflets or call meetings in its own name without a charter.

The student government is led by the Third World Coalition, a group strongly influenced by the YWLL. For two years the YWLL succeeded in blocking the YSA, a youth organization in political solidarity with the Socialist Workers party, from getting a charter.

Early in 1972, the editor of the campus newspaper announced that no "Trotskyite" articles would be printed. At one student government meeting, the discussion of the YSA's request for a charter was designated on the agenda as "Trotskyite dogs."

Since then, Stanley and Harris have won support for their right to carry out revolutionary-socialist political activity at BMCC. At a November 1 meeting the student government voted to give a charter to the YSA. The majority of the supporters of this motion were new members of the Third World Coalition.

At the November 22 meeting of the Student Government Association, YWLL leader Hoyen presented a motion calling for revocation of the YSA's charter, barring of YSA members from any meeting involving the Third World Coalition, and the ouster of YSA members from the editorial board of the campus newspaper, *The Third Eye*.

During the hour of discussion that followed, Hoyen said of one YSA member, Joseph Harris:

"I would like to take him downstairs, put some ropes on him, and throw him in the river, and then I'm sure he won't come back. Unfortunately, the political situation won't allow us to do that."

The full range of Stalinist slanders against revolutionary socialism were dredged up during the hour-long session. Trotskyists were branded as "agents," "counterrevolutionaries," "splitters," "wreckers," and "manipulators."

In the atmosphere of intimidation created by Hoyen's threats, six people voted for revocation of the YSA's charter, none voted against, and fourteen abstained.

At the November 29 student government meeting, the YSA returned to appeal the decision. Third World Coalition leaders told the meeting that new members would be barred from voting. Two members defended the YSA's right to a charter. At this point a motion was passed to refer the question to the Political Education Committee, and to uphold revocation of the YSA charter pending the committee's decision. In this way, TWC leaders sought to ensure that the issue of the YSA's right to a charter would not be discussed again at student government meetings.

As the two YSA members left the meeting, Hoyen grabbed Stanley and tried to force him to leave the building. When Stanley refused, the YWLL leader and two members of the Third World Coalition threw him to the ground, kicking him several times in the face and body.

On December 1, YSA national chairman Andy Rose wrote to YWLL chairman Jarvis Tyner, "The Young Socialist Alliance is outraged at this physical assault against two of our members. We are also very concerned that the YWLL initiated and supported the denial of a student charter to the YSA at BMCC. . . ."

"Where does the YWLL stand on democracy in the movement? Does the

YWLL condone such undemocratic actions as the physical attack on two YSA members last November 29?"

Tyner has not yet responded to this letter. In a telephone conversation YWLL National Organization Secretary Matty Berkelhammer told YSA Organization Secretary Laura Miller that the YWLL opposes violence within the movement, but he refused to criticize the attack on Stanley, saying that it depended on "what the situation was." Berkelhammer said the YWLL supports the "right" of student governments to bar political groups they disagree with from the campuses.

The YSA has announced plans to distribute the facts about the attack on the YSA and the beating led by Hoyen to radical organizations, student groups, and campus newspapers around the country.

An editorial in the December 15 issue of the revolutionary-socialist weekly *The Militant* said:

"The YWLL attacks are one of the consequences of a stepped-up anti-Trotskyist propaganda campaign presently being waged by the bureaucrats in Moscow and the Communist Party in the U.S. Slanderous articles that have appeared recently in Soviet 'theoretical' journals and CPUSA magazines and newspapers brand Trotskyism . . . as 'a vulgar weapon of imperialism and reaction,' a 'counter-revolutionary element within the Left,' an 'advocate of blatant racism,' and an 'enemy of peace.'"

The editors continued: "The effect of these lies and the call to fight 'counter-revolutionary' Trotskyists is to whip up an atmosphere among young CP and YWLL members that any measures against the SWP and YSA are justified if they can get away with them.

"This hooligan conduct against socialists with whom they disagree harks back to the 1930s and 1940s, when such measures were the stock-in-trade of the Stalinized Communist Party. Attempts to revive these poisonous methods and to try to employ them today will not succeed in intimidating the SWP, YSA, or any other critical-minded revolutionists. Such tactics will backfire and expose the true nature of the CP and YWLL's bankrupt politics, which are subordinated to the policies of the privileged bureaucracy in the USSR." □

For a Mass Movement Against Repression

By Gerry Foley

"Irish trade unionists are anxious that their country should not be listed with South Africa, Rhodesia and the Portuguese territories at the top of the repressive legislation league," the Irish Transport and General Workers Union said November 28 in a statement criticizing the Dublin government's new bill against the Irish Republican Army.

The Amalgamated Transport and General Workers Union denounced the bill also, referring to the statements of protest it was receiving from its various branches:

"The resolutions see in this Bill, should it become law, a threat to all trade unions, tenants' associations and minority political groups, and demand that the Irish Congress of Trade Unions and the Labour Party resist this legislation by calling a general strike."

The union protests were accompanied by actions in several areas. The *Irish Times* of November 29-30 reported a number of incidents like the following: "Yesterday, a party of workers from the new £20m Ferenka plant at Lisnagry joined C. I. E. road freight workers in a march through the city, and later they clashed with the Mayor, Councillor Patrick Kiely, as he was about to enter the Chamber of Commerce Building to make the annual appeal for the St. Vincent de Paul Society. . . ."

On November 29 most of the newspapers in Dublin did not publish. The National Union of Journalists (NUJ) declared a one-day strike in protest against the Lynch government's actions intended to terrorize the press (which included firing the board of the state broadcasting network, RTE). On November 28, some 300 journalists marched through Dublin to make a public demonstration of their protest. The NUJ statement said:

"We understand and accept the responsibility which rests upon us to report the increasing unemployment, weekly rise in redundancies and factory closures and continuing increase in the cost of living affecting partic-

ularly the poorer members of the community. We believe that we must draw attention to those issues in the national interest, that is, in the interests of all the people of this country.

"Reluctantly, therefore, we have stopped work and come to Dail Eireann [the Irish parliament] to tell the Government and Opposition Deputies that we fear intolerable restriction on freedom of expression in the Bill which has been circulated and which is to come before the Dail tomorrow. We fear further imprisonment for our members if they, like Mr. O'Kelly, refuse to abrogate their words as journalists and to become part of public prosecutions."

On the same day, 5,000 people demonstrated at the Dáil against the bill. There was a wide range of speakers, from Father Ryan of Tipperary, who told the crowd, "We have no quarrel with the Garda Siochana [the police]—it is the politicians we want to see," to Bernadette Devlin, who said in part, in the words of an *Irish Times* summary:

"The confrontation was between the people of Ireland struggling against all oppression, whether British or native, and there were only two sides for the people to choose from. They would have to either stand firm and square against repression and fight it [or give up]. The Government had now swept away the sidelines on which the majority of the people in the South had stood. There were now no sidelines left for the liberals and moderates and respectables to stand on. These were the people who were opposed to oppression as long as it was 10,000 miles away and as long as the oppressed people did not fight back. To stand in the middle was to stand in the way."

Inside the Dáil, deputies opposed the bill from a wide range of positions. Neil Blaney, a former minister purged from Lynch's cabinet because of an alleged attempt to import arms for the Northern Catholic minority in May 1970, argued against the gov-

ernment's legislation in these terms, as summarized in the December 2 *Irish Times*:

"The Provisional I. R. A., who seemed to be the resistance forces who fought the occupation forces in the Six Counties, seemed to have been singled out and condemned in a propaganda smear campaign. He [Blaney] was satisfied that the Provisional I. R. A. posed no threat to the State. The Provisional I. R. A. had arisen and developed out of the protests on the streets of Belfast and Derry, and without them no leaders of the Irish Government would have been allowed into Downing Street or Chequers or anywhere else to talk about the problem of the Six Counties. . . .

"I and a whole lot of others helped to bring, and encouraged to bring, into existence what very shortly afterwards became what are now condemned as terrorists, murderers and gunmen of the Provisional I. R. A.," Mr. Blaney said. . . .

"He said that it was a fact that the I. R. A. was defending the minority in the North. The proposals of the Bill could only have one connotation for the oppressed minority there—to take away the only vestige of defense which the minority had against the marauding hardliners in Belfast. The I. R. A. had made it quite clear that they had no intention of engaging in a campaign of violence south of the Border—'They have been telling us that'

"Mr. Jim Tunney (F. F. [Fianna Fáil] of Dublin N. W.)—That's nice of them.

"Mr. Blaney said that whether it was nice or not, it was a fact. That was why there was no crisis so far as the institutions of the Republic were concerned."

Stephen Coughlan, the rightist, anti-Semitic mayor of Limerick, said (again according to an *Irish Times* summary): "Mac Stiofain [the reputed leader of the Provisional IRA arrested November 18 on charges of membership in an illegal organization] had been accused of trying to create civil war, but he had sent a message asking for peaceful protest only on his behalf and stated that he did not want injury, hurt or any bloodshed in this part of the country, that the fight lay in the Six Counties."

The reputed Provisional IRA leader had said, according to the December 1 *Irish Times*:

"In the name of God, I want people out on the streets protesting on my behalf. I want all protests to be peaceful, by which I mean no rioting, no stone-throwing, no abuse or name-calling of 26-County forces.

"The fight is centred in the North and must be kept there. I do not want anybody hurt or blood spilled on my behalf in the 26 Counties. That is why I am taking liquids."

Nonetheless, except for Blaney, two other independents, Seán Sherwin of Aontacht Eireann [the United Ireland party], and two maverick members of the major bourgeois opposition party Fine Gael, the entire body of the parliament accepted the legislation. The government party voted down the line for it. The opposition party abstained.

Lynch's victory over the broad bloc opposing the bill was anticipated by the *Economist*, one of the most authoritative voices of British big business. Its Dublin correspondent wrote in the December 2 issue of the weekly magazine:

"Despite the public demonstrations of sympathy with Mr MacStiofain, there are no signs of the massive reaction expected by the IRA and Sinn Fein organisations. The 5,000 people who demonstrated outside the Mater hospital in Dublin last Sunday were all the republican movement could muster on such an emotional occasion and many in the crowd were sensation seekers rather than sympathisers. . . .

"In the long run the RTE affair is likely to cause the government more trouble than its moves against the IRA. The sacking of the broadcasting service's authority shocked liberal opinion and brought forth a spate of protests, although the man in the street is prepared to support the government in anything it does to keep the IRA in check. . . . But, however bitter the feeling with the RTE or in the country as a whole, Mr. Lynch's new toughness looks like ensuring that the government will win through."

The *Christian Science Monitor's* Dublin correspondent Jonathan Harsch claimed also in the December 1 issue of the Boston daily that the protests had been a relative failure:

"Clearly the IRA leadership has been dismayed by the poor response to its calls for massive protest demonstrations North and South. In IRA eyes there were ample excuses for such pro-

tests. There was an opportunity to protest the Dublin government's firing of the Irish radio and TV board of directors and the sweeping new 'offenses against the state' legislation. Protesters could, and some did, join with openly IRA groups demanding the release of IRA chief Sean MacStiofain.

"But despite this opportunity to show sympathy with the IRA indirectly, relatively small numbers joined in the protests. And in those which were held, protesters were often outnumbered by police and troops in riot gear.

"One call repeatedly made at such rallies was to the police and soldiers to join the demonstrators. There was no response to this call."

Harsch drew this conclusion: "The message was clear. The IRA's strength lies in its ability to mount limited guerrilla attacks. It has not found the key to mobilizing large numbers of people."

In response to this situation, the *Monitor* correspondent wrote, the Provisional republicans were rethinking their strategy:

"As a rapid reassessment takes place within the IRA leadership, voices not heard since 1969 are reemerging.

"IRA 'provos' had credited their guerrilla campaign with the overthrow of the North's provincial government at Stormont, Belfast. They came to believe they could topple the Dublin government with the same tactics.

"Now they recall the part played by the northern civil-rights movement prior to the IRA's own involvement, in bathing the North in an international spotlight, forcing London to focus its attention on the North and provide the IRA with an opportunity to capitalize on Catholic resentment."

Before the last crisis, moreover, the Irish commentators saw a shift occurring in the policy of the Provisional republican movement. In the *Irish Times* of October 31, Dick Grogan wrote that the Provisional Sinn Fein seemed to be orienting toward participating in elections in the formally independent part of the country, at least at the local level. Even leaders most identified publicly with the military campaign in the North seemed to be turning in this direction:

"Mr. Mac Stiofain's statement [to an October 29 Sinn Fein meeting (*ard-fheis*)], it was said, stressed the need for increasing emphasis on political

work, to parallel the military campaign, and the whole tenor of the *ard-fheis* seemed to hold some indication that this was the way the tide is turning in the Provisional Republican Movement—as in the Official Movement before them."

Furthermore, although Mac Stiofain conducted himself after his arrest in accordance with the highest traditional ideals of the IRA, he also departed from past practice in one important respect—he defended himself before his persecutors. This caused a reaction among some members.

"Mr. MacStiofain's decision to defend himself before the three-judge Dublin panel, breaking with tradition, has been greeted with derision among younger men," Bernard Weinraub cabled to the *New York Times* November 29 from Belfast.

Regardless of the feelings of Provisional fighters who may have suffered jail terms as a result of refusing to recognize the courts of either the Irish states established by the capitulationist treaty of 1921, it seems clear that Mac Stiofain's decision was a wise one.

The Lynch government's prosecution of the reputed Provisional leader was obviously a test case aimed at establishing a precedent for interning nationalist fighters in the South. Anything that could be done to block or discredit this legal attack by winning the support of sections of the population that have not yet developed a clear national consciousness, or of sections that for various reasons may have divided loyalties, was in the best interests of the Irish nation and the exploited and deprived people of Ireland.

Likewise, participating in elections can be an opportunity for reaching out to sections of the population that still have illusions about the Southern government as well as for offering the people a chance to use what remains of the democratic rights they won in 1916-1921 to protest against the corrupt proimperialist Free State parties. Electoral activity, in a way, is very much like legal defense in court cases, in which persecuted revolutionists have to take advantage of the contradictions in the ruling class's hypocritical legal codes to expose the system and thereby hamper the ability of the dominant minority to carry out repression.

The Provisional leadership has seen from the whole development since April that the Dublin government's ability to repress them depends on its winning either active or passive support for such measures in the general population. Lynch did not launch an all-out attack while the struggle of the Northern nationalists still had a clear mass focus and international support. Furthermore, this onslaught came just after publication of the British government's "green paper," which gave Lynch a chance to hold up the prospect of peaceful reunification of the country over the long run.

The Lynch government needed the December 2 bombings to ram its unpopular repressive legislation through parliament.

The bombings seemed expressly designed to convince the Southern population that they were facing a campaign of apparently uncontrolled violence such as the people of Northern Ireland have experienced this year in particular. The fear of such seemingly useless carnage spreading to the South could be depended upon to stampede the majority of the Southern Irish people who are not yet convinced of the possibility or even the desirability of a national revolution, into accepting repression.

The older IRA veterans were probably reminded of the period during World War II that followed on the heels of a bombing campaign against England. By capitalizing on the fears of the people, and at the same time holding out the prospect of peaceful means of achieving Irish national aspirations, De Valera was able to get the people to accept wholesale repression of the republican movement. His most powerful argument was that the actions of a small uncontrolled minority could bring terrible disasters to the Irish people, who are all too aware of their weakness vis-à-vis the great imperialist states that surround them.

Likewise, the Lynch government has argued that the Provisionals were trying to force the Irish people into a bloody civil war by provocative military actions. Unfortunately the failure of the Provisionals to organize large masses of people in both the South and the North independently of the established institutions and politicians has not only lent credence to the government's charges but has left the nationalist fighters without substantial

organized support beyond their own ranks and traditional following in face of Lynch's offensive.

The problem was that despite the support they won by their bravery and daring, the Provisionals did not seem to have a program for organizing the masses of the Irish people. Their political platform called for regional decentralization and democratization of political and economic life. But whatever its merits as a scheme for reform, this project did not grow directly out of the concrete preoccupations of the Irish people and their struggles against a socially iniquitous and antinational system. The proof of this is that none of the bodies set up to propagandize for regional parliaments has become a focus of the day-to-day battles of the Irish people against the immediate effects of the colonial system on their lives.

One of the things that has prevented republicans from building mass movements in opposition to the system in the past has been the memory of repeated betrayals by various wings that began by engaging in practical political and organizing work and ended up by accepting the status quo.

Such an outcome is a real danger, and there are many examples of it in all countries. But the price for abstaining from practical political work is fossilization. And even abstention is no guarantee of consistent opposition to the system. De facto relationships can develop between nonpolitical militant organizations and opportunist politicians. For example, even though the IRA majority disavowed De Valera, it was an important force in bringing him to power and keeping him there in a period of instability in the Free State. Then, since it had not built a mass political alternative to De Valera, when the opportune time came he could turn on the IRA and virtually destroy it.

Likewise, Blaney seems to feel that a positive result of the Provisional IRA campaign was forcing Heath to negotiate with Lynch. In a sense, this was true, even though London has never dealt with Dublin on anything like equal terms. But at the same time, Lynch has used his position as a negotiator to convince a section of the people that he can get something for Ireland by suppressing the IRA.

Of course, the Provisionals had to seek allies wherever they could find

them, especially allies that could provide much needed material aid to the embattled nationalists in the North.

On the other hand, if the Provisional leaders abstained from building a mass independent movement challenging the government and the status quo in the South in order not to alienate allies such as Blaney, then they clearly made some grave miscalculations for which they and the Irish people will have to pay dearly now.

Nonetheless, the combined assault of the London, Belfast, and Dublin governments (supported cautiously by Washington as well) should reduce the differences that have developed among republicans over the question of alliances at least. And the history of the civil rights movement in the North offers examples of mass united action that can be extended to other areas.

The secret of the civil rights movement's most spectacular successes was that it started off from demands that people could fight for without having to be ready for a national or social revolution, demands that touched the concrete aspirations of the people and united the entire anti-Unionist community, demands that could also win international understanding. The civil rights program essentially posed national demands in a defensive way. That is, it did not call outright for abolishing the imperialist enclave and reuniting the country, but for abolishing the undemocratic methods that were needed basically to maintain disunity. This was the effect of the civil rights program despite the intentions of the Communist party and its followers, who wanted only reform of the Stormont structure, and of the ultraleftists who wanted to drop the national issue in hopes of uniting Catholic and Protestant workers on economic issues.

The greatest achievement of the civil rights movement was probably its ability to reach out to the majority of the Irish population North and South and discredit the repressive governments in the view of decisive layers of the population. Unless a similar movement can be built in the South that can affect the broadest sections of the population, even the most militant and determined actions by a heroic vanguard of thousands of people may not be able to stop Lynch's repression, backed up as it is with the pressure and resources of imperialism.

Makarios and Grivas Still at Odds

Greece and Turkey are close to agreement on the future of Cyprus, according to a report by Alecos Constantinides in the November 28 issue of the Paris daily *Le Monde*. The negotiations, which began in 1971 between leaders of the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities on Cyprus, have recently been enlarged to include representatives of the Greek and Turkish governments and a spokesman for the United Nations, Bilbiano F. Osorio-tafall.

The prospective agreement, Constantinides wrote, will recognize the continued independence of Cyprus. "The central government of the island will include two Turkish Cypriot ministers, and the parliament will be composed of seventy-five deputies, of whom fifteen will be Turkish Cypriots. . . . The Turkish community will have a large degree of autonomy, but the veto power given the Turkish vice president under the Zurich pact [one of the agreements signed in 1960 when Cyprus gained its formal independence from England] will be abolished." Greece will drop its demand for *enosis* (unity of Cyprus with Greece). Turkey will give up its proposal for partitioning the island.

Despite the apparent Athens-Ankara accord, Constantinides reported that a formal pact is not expected to be signed before May 1973.

An uncertain factor in the negotiations is the role of General George Grivas, a right-wing nationalist who led a terrorist campaign for *enosis* during the 1950s. Grivas returned "secretly" to Cyprus from Greece in 1971 and began organizing armed bands for the overthrow of President Makarios, who opposes *enosis*.

In the October 29 London *Observer*, former *Times of Cyprus* editor Charles Foley wrote that Grivas's supposedly secret trip "was, in fact, made with the backing of an old Army friend, General Zoitakis, who became Regent of Greece after King Constantine and his family fled the country. In Athens it is an open secret that the scheme was known to Greek Premier George Papadopoulos and hence to the American Central Intelligence Agency—the CIA



MAKARIOS: General Grivas still says he must go.

acts as paymaster to the Greek secret service, KYP, and Colonel Papadopoulos was liaison chief between the two before the coup.

"One of Papadopoulos's familiars told a mutual friend: 'Under this man Makarios, Cyprus is a focus of opposition in the Greek world. His people abuse and insult us—they even talk of welcoming a Greek government-in-exile and "bringing back democracy to the mainland."'

"With the Russian fleet in the Mediterranean, Makarios insists on strict neutrality. But Papadopoulos says: 'The Americans agree with us that Makarios must go. The day after we're rid of him, we'll see that Cyprus joins NATO.'"

Until recently, Grivas had been receiving material and political support from the Papadopoulos regime. "The younger men in Grivas's organization," Foley wrote, "include many Cypriot cadets from the Greek Army, 'retired' at short notice by an obliging Junta. The most notorious of these is

Christakis Ioannides, 34, now Grivas's leader in the important Famagusta district.

"This man, a former Greek army officer, was tried for his role in an attempt to assassinate Makarios two years ago. . . . The archbishop survived, but a week later his Defence Minister was ambushed and shot dead in a car. Ioannides was an obvious link to Athens in the plot, but he escaped conviction and went underground."

In March and April the Greek junta, backed by Cypriot bishops of the orthodox church and pro-Grivas forces, tried, through extensive maneuverings by its ambassador to Nicosia, Constantine Panayotakis, to pressure Makarios into surrendering power. (See *Intercontinental Press*, April 10, 1972.)

According to Foley, "the [Greek] ambassador, now locally known as 'the Gauleiter,' was summoned, along with the Greek general in command of the National Guard, to Athens for talks that lasted all night. Back the envoys came with an ultimatum: Makarios must install a 'Cabinet of National Unity' with Grivas's ultra-rightist political allies.

"When the Archbishop asked how the Junta planned to reconcile their demands for *Enosis* with Turkish objections, Panayotakis replied: 'Once Grivas's men are in the Cabinet, we'll shut them up.'"

Foley continued, "This is the kind of political brinkmanship at which Makarios excels. Summoning his cabinet, he sorrowfully declared that, rather than spill Greek blood, he was ready to resign. Indeed, his abdication statement had already been prepared. The news spread throughout the island in hours. It brought together the biggest crowds ever seen in Cyprus, screaming in frenzied protest against the 'Judas Bishops' and the Junta."

Although Makarios's defense minister, who was regarded as hostile to the colonels, resigned shortly after the crisis, Makarios's regime survived. He was backed by the island's powerful Communist party (its official name is the Progress party of the Working People), which considers the "neutralist" bourgeois government to be "progressive."

Since then, Foley believes, the Greek government has lost some of its enthusiasm for Grivas.

Despite the talk of an impending

settlement, Grivas has expressed his determination to topple Makarios. Foley interviewed Grivas at the "small, prim suburban house in a residential area of a south coast seaport," where the general lives while technically "in hiding."

"Grivas has worked out a series of contingency plans to achieve his goal. Lists of enemies and traitors are kept up to date. . . .

"Grivas swings a band of amber worry-beads as he speaks: there can

be no peace, he warns, until Archbishop Makarios, President of Cyprus, is deposed. The new organisation has plenty of guns and the men to use them. 'Even if Cyprus is reduced to ashes, from those ashes Enosis will arise.'"

Le Monde's correspondent, however, writes that many observers believe that the Greek regime, should it decide to do so, "could neutralize General Grivas in forty-eight hours." □

life to transform him from playboy to moral crusader? Francis Kent addresses himself to this central question in his dispatch in the November 20 *Los Angeles Times*:

"What motivated young Duvalier has not been made public. It seems clear, however, that he acted to eliminate the final element of corruption linking his government with that of his late father.

"There is speculation, too, that international pressure was brought to bear. Following an Organization of American States gathering here recently, it was reported unofficially that young Duvalier was instructed to get rid of Cambronne or face the loss of much-needed financial assistance."

The Dantesque stories surrounding mass executions and torture of scores of political opponents during the regime of Duvalier père, reported over the years by some who managed to escape to the United States and Canada, have also been a great source of embarrassment in Haiti's attempts to enlist international financial aid in mending its economic ills.

This would go a long way toward explaining the proclamation on November 28 of the first amnesty decree in decades, granting full pardon to sixty prisoners, presumably common criminals or minor conspirators, and halving the sentences of twenty-nine others, including ten rebels captured in abortive uprisings in 1968 and 1970.

The act was presented as another step in "Haiti's 'irreversible' march toward economic and social improvement," wrote Kent in the November 29 *Los Angeles Times*.

Even should Duvalier succeed in terminating literal flesh and blood enterprise in Haiti, the ordinary excesses of a chronically impoverished and repressive semicolonial regime will remain. Any serious "irreversible march toward economic and social improvement" will come only out of a political movement with the anticapitalist outlook and popular base that is hardly likely to be generated by any of the bourgeois circles surrounding the court at Port-au-Prince. □

More Arrests in Ceylon

Seventy persons were arrested during November in Sri Lanka on charges of "subversive activities," according to the December 7 *Ceylon News*. One of those seized was the brother of JVP leader Rohanna Wijeweera.

Prisoners Granted Amnesty in Haiti

'Baby Doc' Takes Over, Hits 'Corruption'

By Candida Barberena

In the first major shake-up of Haiti's dictatorship since April 1971, when Jean-Claude Duvalier succeeded his father, the notoriously ruthless and tyrannical François "Papa Doc" Duvalier, the twenty-one-year-old ruler, on November 15 dismissed Luckner Cambronne, minister of the interior, minister of defense, and henchman of Papa Doc's old guard.

Cambronne, who had gradually assumed control of the nation through his command of the army, police, and a newly created counterinsurgency force called the Leopards, apparently made no attempt to use force to resist his dismissal, but slipped into the Colombian embassy and from there into exile. Despite rumors of opposition, the capital remained quiet. Duvalier's first major decision apparently left the young president in total control of the nation. Haiti's political establishment, accustomed to regard the president as a playboy figurehead and to refer to him derisively as "Baby Doc," was astonished by his action.

Within a week, Baby Doc had issued and extensively publicized a stern proclamation that "under-the-table" pay-offs in connection with government contracts would be met with severe punishment. Just what prompted this hard-sounding decree becomes evident on viewing Cambronne's record.

Staff writer Francis Kent wrote from Port-au-Prince in the November 20 *Los Angeles Times* that the former minister was widely reported to have

exactd a personal financial interest in many export ventures, several based on U. S. capital. Among the most lucrative of these enterprises was trafficking in human blood through American intermediary Joseph B. Gorinstein, owner of Hemo-Caribbean. The company offered \$3.00 and a can of soft drink for every 1.58 pints of Haitian blood it could draw. Blood plasma was then sold at \$25.00 a quart in the United States.

Werner Theill, an Austrian biochemist and technical director of Hemo-Caribbean, claimed that a single company center had been shipping 10,000 pints of plasma to the United States every two weeks. Last June a second center went into operation, presumably doubling that figure.

What Cambronne did not drain out of the Haitian people in blood, he took out in flesh. Another U. S. enterprise he was connected with was Aero-trade Inc. It dealt in transporting and selling unclaimed bodies to U. S. and Canadian medical schools. The Miami-based Aerotrade company was also known to furnish Cambronne's elite Leopards with U. S. instructors and with materiel such as Sikorsky helicopters, trucks, jeeps, and M-18 rifles.

Named as Cambronne's successor was the present consul general in New York, who in the opinion of the new regime is untainted by the kind of "improprieties" associated with Cambronne.

What happened in young Duvalier's

Corruption and Resistance in Indonesia

[The following interview with a correspondent for the Dutch socialist weekly *De Groene Amsterdamer* appeared in the November 25 issue of the French revolutionary-socialist newspaper *Rouge*.

[Schumacher, the correspondent, is one of the few journalists who has been able to visit the notorious prison island of Buru. (For an account of living conditions there, see "10,000 Without Hope in Jungle Prison," *Intercontinental Press*, May 1, 1972, p. 485.)

[The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Rouge: Often the only thing that comes to mind when one thinks of Indonesia is military dictatorship. What exactly is the case?

Schumacher: Officially it is not a military government. But the reality is otherwise. The military completely controls the country. In the smallest village, for example, there are soldiers ready to intervene at the least pretext. Any form of protest, even the most limited, is immediately suppressed.

There is no law. Anyone suspected of having communist sympathies, or of being connected in any way with the events of 1965, is arrested. There is no recourse against such arbitrary acts. Today there are tens of thousands of political prisoners. Many of them have been in prison since 1965, others are more recent.

Rouge: How many political prisoners are there and what are their living conditions?

Schumacher: There is some confusion about the number of prisoners. The most "optimistic" estimate would put them at 50,000. But some estimates speak of 100,000. Numbers of political prisoners are held throughout the country, but the main prison camp is on the small island of Buru in the Molucca Islands some 3,000 kilometers from Java. Some 10,000 prisoners who have never been tried and



SUHARTO: He and Mrs. 10 Percent want to open economy to imperialism.

never will be tried are wasting away there. The government says that there is not sufficient evidence to prove they participated in the 1965 events but that they are dangerous to society anyway because of their membership in organizations banned since then or because of their sympathies with the PKI [Partai Komunis Indonesia — Indonesian Communist party].

Most other political prisoners are in the same position. But there is a small category of prisoners consisting of a few thousand who are supposed to be tried. After seven years, fewer than 200 of them have come to trial. And these trials are nothing but propaganda devices aimed at discrediting the communists and presenting them as people dangerous to society and to the population.

I spent a day and a half on the island of Buru, taken there officially by the military authorities. So I was able to see only what they wanted to show me. But despite these restrictions, what I was able to see on the condition of the prisoners made a big impression on me. The prisoners are not dying of hunger, but the conditions

of their existence are frightful. They are especially in need of medicine, since the island is extremely unhealthy. Also, it must not be forgotten that most of them are condemned to stay there for the rest of their lives.

Rouge: The military dictatorship corresponds to the interests of imperialism in that area of the world . . .

Schumacher: It is more and more evident that Indonesia is dependent, in a neocolonial sense, on the economies of the Western countries and especially on the Japanese economy. Hundreds of millions of dollars are invested in Indonesia each year by the imperialist powers. Most of the projects they finance are designed either to provide them with new markets or to extract the natural resources of Indonesia — tin, wood, petroleum, etc. — for their superprofits.

It is clear that one of the basic conditions demanded by imperialism for such investments is political stability; thus the military regime's policy of systematic repression is aimed at preventing the development of all social struggle. The massive investments of the Western countries have brought about a certain economic progress; industrial production is being developed. But only a tiny layer of the population profits from this progress: the clique of generals and technocrats who hold power. The vast majority of the population remains outside this development. The price of rice — which is the basic food of most of the population — has risen by 100 percent this year. The general rise in prices, added to the growing social inequalities, has produced a very tense situation. Chances of an explosion have considerably increased and repression can only be on the rise in the period ahead.

Rouge: What forms has the social unrest taken?

Schumacher: I don't know of any powerfully organized opposition. Whatever opposition exists is on a very small scale.

The parliamentary opposition is almost nonexistent. The parliament has no real power, and at the time of last year's elections the fraud was so great that the governmental party (the Golkar) won almost all the seats. Here and there some traditional politicians tried hard to make themselves known.

Likewise the Nahdatul Ulama, the main Muslim party, expressed a certain opposition from the most orthodox religious circles. But when one or another goes a little too far, the repression hits and reduces them to silence.

The students were essentially on the side of the new regime in 1965-66. They played an important role in the overthrow of Sukarno. Most of them have, however, become disappointed. They hoped to see the corruption disappear, but it has become even greater. There have been some student demonstrations these past years against corruption and more recently against the lucrative tourist-attracting schemes of Mrs. Suharto, who has been nicknamed "Mrs. 10 percent" because of this. But they were harshly suppressed. Today many students are in prison; others were given a choice between prison or a scholarship to study in another country. Thus the student opposition has been silenced temporarily.

The PKI and other currents on the left still carry out clandestine activity, but limited and scattered. For example in the central region of the island of Java, traditional stronghold of the Communists, there are cells of oppositionists here and there organized in a very decentralized manner. These activists see their work as a preparatory stage of the struggle. Recently there has been sabotage of the railroads in this region. Perhaps this is the work of these groups, or of the railroad workers, who are traditionally politicized and influenced by the PKI. Or it could be a case of simple accidents due to the bad condition of the equipment which are utilized by the military dictatorship against the Communists. It is impossible to tell, since any contact with these groups involves great risks.

On the other hand, in another region of the country, the West of Kalimantan (Borneo), near Pontianak, the situation is considerably different. Seventy-five percent of the population there is of Chinese origin and most of these Chinese are peasants, which is rather unusual since in other areas they are generally merchants (80 percent of the commerce of Indonesia is in the hands of the Chinese minority, which comprises 3 percent of the population).

These people were very politicized

in the Sukarno period when he developed his policy of confrontation with neighboring Malaysia. This left its mark. Recently guerrillas have been organized based on the region's Chinese community. They have built up a real underground infrastructure. The leader of this sector is M. A. Sofjan, one of the few members of the Political Bureau of the PKI who is still at liberty. The military has put a price on his head. One indication of the strength of this organization is the fact that a few months ago, during the night, they were able to paste up PKI slogans in many villages in the region and raise red flags over a number of public buildings. The military tried to conceal these facts, but one of the local newspapers wrote of it. Certainly there have been other actions that we don't know about owing to the lack

of information from this remote region.

Rouge: What can we do in solidarity?

Schumacher: We must arouse the interest of the population, especially in Europe. Today there is scarcely any perception of what is happening in Indonesia except in Holland, for historical reasons. Perhaps this is because of the war in Indochina.

We must break this wall of silence and circulate information. In all countries we must create committees against the repression in Indonesia.

The decisive struggle will take place in Indonesia itself, but the knowledge of an organized international solidarity effort will give the Indonesian militants confidence and energy to continue their struggle. □

As Inflation Becomes Intolerable

Indonesian Youth Threaten Action

By Adam Tidar

Jakarta

Months of increasing food prices have triggered a rise of the youth movement here. Youth leaders have threatened to call demonstrations (illegal in Indonesia) if the government does not roll back prices of basic necessities.

The current confrontation began on November 21, when a delegation from KAPPI [Kesatuan Aksi Pemuda Pelajar Indonesia — Indonesian Youth and Pupils Action Front] called on J. Naro, vice chairman of the Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat [DPR — Council of People's Representatives, i. e., parliament]. The delegation demanded a decrease in the price of rice and punitive measures against three businessmen whom they accused of manipulating the rice market.

The delegation was led by Buyung Syamsyarbaini, general chairman of KAPPI. He had been briefly detained by police one day earlier, when the plans to call on Naro were announced.

Members of KAPPI and KAPI [Kesatuan Aksi Pemuda Indonesia — Indonesian Youth Action Front] have formed two new organizations to fight the rising prices: Gerakan Anti Lapor

[GAL — Movement Against Hunger] and KOPPERA [Kommando Penyelamat Perut Rakyat — Command for Salvation of the People's Stomachs]. On November 24, a delegation of thirteen members of KOPPERA demonstrated outside the offices of BULOG [Badan Urusan Logistik — Foodstuffs Logistics Board], the government agency responsible for distributing rice to wholesalers. BULOG officials received six of the demonstrators in their offices.

The November 24 edition of the Jakarta daily *Sinar Harapan* reported: "The small delegation, which was led by Buyung Syamsyarbaini, took the opportunity to submit a resolution expressing the hope that BULOG would work more energetically to depress the price of rice, would stop cooperating with rice manipulators, and would fire unsatisfactory BULOG officials."

The seven youths waiting outside spoke even more bluntly to reporters: "We will wait and see how far BULOG will go in dealing with the problem we have brought forward. If necessary we will increase actions such as this and will return to the streets."

While inflation is still well below the rate of the 1960s, when it sometimes reached 600 percent a year, it continues to be a serious problem for the average Indonesian, particularly since the prices of necessities are rising most rapidly.

According to government statistics, the cost of living index (based on prices of sixty-two necessities) rose 3.75% during the month of October alone, reaching a level of 682.52 (1966 equals 100). But the price of rice in Jakarta, which had been around Rp 45 [Rp 414 equal US\$1] per liter in June, had reached Rp 70 by the end of October. Today, the price of a liter in Jakarta is Rp 80, and in Jogjakarta in central Java people are standing in line to buy rice at Rp 85. Similarly, sugar, which sold for about Rp 80 a kilogram at the beginning of the year, is now selling for Rp 116. Flour has risen from Rp 60 to Rp 70 a kilogram in two weeks.

Factors contributing to the rising price of rice are a decrease in production caused by an unusually severe dry-season and poor distribution of existing supplies. The government's failure to understand or deal with the problem—and its exacerbation by speculators—has aggravated the situation.

When the first reports of rice shortages began to appear in the press three months ago, they were loudly denied by government officials. Last March, President Suharto warned publicly of the alleged danger of rice *over-production*, a theme he repeated as recently as mid-August in a speech to the DPR. (This has given rise to bitter jokes based on the rumored interest of Tien Suharto, the president's wife, in a company that mills wheat flour.)

On November 14, *Sinar Harapan* printed reports of actual starvation in Jeneponto county in South Sulawesi. (South Sulawesi normally produces a large rice surplus.) According to the paper, parts of the population there were attempting to subsist on such "foods" as mango seeds and the stems of banana plants. This report also was denied by the government but was confirmed November 22 by a member of the DPR from South Sulawesi, who stated that 54,000 persons in Jeneponto were hungry and that sixty had died of starvation.

On the same day, another DPR member reported that residents of Nu-

satenggara Timur (a province in the southeastern part of Indonesia) had been reduced to a diet of roots and that at least one person had died.

Lebaran, the Muslim holiday marking the end of the fasting month and the beginning of the new year, occurred November 7-8. Normally, prices rise somewhat in the period immediately preceding the holiday. But they usually fall again after Lebaran, and the disappointment of this expectation appears to be the immediate cause of the anger of the youths.

The movement is expressing its position in a "tritura" or three demands: 1) immediate reduction of rice prices to the pre-Lebaran level; 2) hanging of rice manipulators; 3) immediate ratification of a proposed anticorruption law.

However, the movement's position unfortunately is seriously tarnished by elements of anti-Chinese racism. Emphasis is repeatedly placed on the role of businessmen of Chinese descent in the wholesale rice market.

Such feelings echo grievances of the colonial period, when Dutch imperialism promoted the Chinese as middlemen in the economy in the hope of creating a large class of collaborators. As a result, Chinese-owned firms today still play a disproportionate role in the middle levels of the economy.

Since independence, the government has attempted to favor "indigenous" entrepreneurs over the Chinese—who are defined as "nonindigenous" even if their ancestors have lived here for centuries—apparently on the theory that exploitation of the poor is admirable as long as it is carried out by "real" Indonesians. Chinese-Indonesian wholesalers have evaded most of the intended effects of the government's policy by creating what are known as "Ali Baba companies"—firms with a native Indonesian as figurehead but owned by Chinese-Indonesians. (The name not only recalls the Arabian Nights story of Ali Baba and the Forty Thieves, but is also a play on Ali; a common Indonesian name, and Baba, which means an Indonesian of Chinese descent.)

Since the consolidation of the military dictatorship in 1966, an ever-increasing number of generals have found roles as Alis in the Ali Baba companies. Thus, while the anti-Chinese element of the youth movement now obscures the real cause of the rice crisis, there remains a potential

for the anger to turn suddenly against the entire corrupt military regime.

For their part the youth are aware of the power they can exercise under favorable circumstances. The use of the word *tritura* itself deliberately recalls the right-wing student movement of early 1966, which used the same word for its demands of lower prices, replacement of the cabinet, and destruction of the PKI [Partai Komunis Indonesia—Indonesian Communist party]. That movement was used by the generals as an important aid in securing their power, but the present movement occurs at a time when the military's responsibility for even the most minute aspects of government policy is evident to everyone.

Given the illegality of demonstrations and the intimidation of the Indonesian press, it is difficult to judge the present extent of the youth movement. It is clear, however, that a process of differentiation has already begun within it.

On November 28 the executive council of KAPPI, while giving verbal support to the demands of GAL and KOPPERA, publicly repudiated their actions and singled out for criticism Buyung Syamsyarbaini because of his allegedly "undisciplined actions." Whether by design or accident, Buyung has so far been prevented from replying to the executive board. According to the November 28 issue of the Jakarta daily *Abadi*, Buyung has not been heard from or seen since he was called in for questioning by the police November 25, the day after the action at the BULOG office. The police deny any knowledge of his whereabouts.

Meanwhile, the November 29 issue of the student newspaper *Harian Kami* offers the first evidence of the movement spreading beyond Jakarta and beginning to involve college students as well as pupils. On November 28 a delegation representing four different student councils in Bandung called on DPR Vice-Chairman Naro to add their voices to the demand for a solution to the rice crisis. □

Viaux's Sentence Reduced

A Chilean military court has reduced the sentences of ex-General Roberto Viaux and the others found guilty of masterminding the October 1970 assassination of General Rene Schneider as part of a right-wing scheme to prevent Salvador Allende from taking office. Viaux's sentence was reduced from twenty years in jail to two.

U.S. Tour Exposes Sri Lanka Repression

[The following interview with Vijaya Wickrama, an activist in the London-based Ceylon Solidarity Committee, was obtained by *Intercontinental Press* on November 9.

[Wickrama is touring the United States to build support for the international campaign to free Sri Lanka's political prisoners and restore civil liberties to the island's people.

[His tour will take him to Chicago, Los Angeles, Atlanta, Washington, D. C., San Francisco, Berkeley, Philadelphia, Denver, San Diego, Seattle, Boston, and other cities.]

Question. What is the origin of the repressive measures in Sri Lanka?

Answer. The government version is that it had information about a planned uprising, that special measures had to be taken to deal with an "uprising" on April 5, 1971. The facts that have come to light since then show that the repression started long before the April 5 events.

First of all, there was the attack on the American embassy, which it is clear today was an act of provocation. For instance, the chief witness who gave evidence to the Criminal Justice Commission, a Buddhist priest, Sobhita, said that the attack on the American embassy was not organized by the JVP [Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna — People's Liberation Front]. The chief witness against the youths charged with this attack was in fact a member of the right-wing party, UNP [United National party]. The attack on the American embassy was one of the main justifications adduced by the prime minister for declaring a state of emergency. She blamed the JVP for the attack and rounded up more than 1,000 of its members and leaders.

The reports and the evidence in the present inquiry before the Criminal Justice Commission also have indicated that the police tortured these detainees to obtain information. They went from village to village on a search-and-destroy mission looking for members of the JVP. Where they couldn't find them, they burned houses and assaulted parents and relatives.

I have letters from prisoners smuggled out and from parents whose children were arrested well before the so-called uprising of April 1971.

The real reason for the state of emergency was not that the JVP was planning to overthrow the government — it was a step the government had to take in order to carry out the *diktats* the World Bank insisted on as conditions for granting the government a further loan of \$26 million. It is not accidental that the World Bank announced on the day after the state of emergency was instituted the decision to grant this loan. It was clear that if the government had tried to implement the World Bank's demands, including a wage freeze and the drastic reduction of social service expenditure, it would have created a situation similar to that of the 1953 *hartal* [general strike] when the United National party government tried to do the same thing and a popular uprising ensued. In our opinion, the repression was prerequisite to the government enforcement of the very strong measures they inaugurated.

Q. There have been many reports of massacres by government forces in repressing the JVP movement. Is there any knowledge of how many victims these massacres claimed?

A. The state of emergency continues and therefore any inquiry or the publication of any material regarding this is against the emergency regulations. Several attempts have been made to ascertain the number of people who have been killed. During the first two weeks after the fifth of April, any youth who was unfortunate enough to be arrested by the police was definitely shot. Many persons, a large number of them innocent, are reported missing. There are a number of cases which we know of, for instance a teacher in Gunapala, who did not participate in JVP activity but was taken into custody on April 4 and has been missing since then. Unofficially, the police of the district have said he was shot. Members of other organizations than the JVP, such as the Communist

party, have similarly disappeared. The Human and Democratic Rights Organization [HDRO] has tried to ascertain the number of people who have been arrested by the police and are assumed missing; that is, they are not reported in the camps or released after arrest. Their numbers are estimated at around 15,000.

Similarly I have a list of names of a number of people shot by the police. It was smuggled out of jail by a detainee. Comrades of the JVP who were well known, such as one person who was a composer of their songs, were killed by the police. I do not know how long it will take even after the lifting of the emergency to ascertain the actual number of victims.

Q. How many people are still imprisoned in Sri Lanka and what kind of treatment do they receive?

A. The government has given various figures. In June they said 10,000. In September the minister of justice said 15,000. Some have been released. According to the government, there are still 7,000 in custody. It is difficult to say because people are still being arrested. Recently, 400 youths were arrested in the Tamil-speaking area in the north — an area where the JVP was not very strong.

As to the conditions, various reports have come out. The statutory rights of members of parliament to visit prisons has been stopped — illegally stopped by the government.

Mr. Prins Gunasekera, MP, tried to visit some of these prisons, but he was not allowed. Lord Avebury, from Amnesty International, tried to visit some of the prison camps and was not allowed, but we have reports from some of the detainees who were released, for example, from a branch secretary of the CMU [Ceylon Mercantile Union], and the assistant secretary of the LSSP (R) [Lanka Sama Samaja party (revolutionary), Sri Lanka section of the Fourth International] Mr. Prins Rajasooriya.

On various occasions, especially in the last year, the soldiers guarding these prison camps have shot indiscriminately into the camps when there was some insubordination, as the government calls it, or when there had been disorder. A number of detainees have been killed in this way. Unfortunately, the government refused

to release the names of the present detainees.

Although we occasionally hear reports or prisoners escaping, it is difficult to believe that they could escape under such conditions. It is more likely that they have been shot by the police or the army.

In one prison in Welikede 200 persons are crowded into a room fit for forty people. The toilets are not sufficient and they are not properly cleaned; sanitary conditions are very bad. The food is substandard; it is served in buckets that are not adequately cleaned.

There is no proper medical attention. For instance, a letter sent by some women detainees complains that for any ailment or disease, they receive only B-complex tablets and it is only with the greatest difficulty that they can get a doctor. When a doctor does come, he does not examine a patient unless the patient is seriously ill. He just comes near the bars of the cell and prescribes medicine. As a result of overcrowding, there have been a number of epidemics, chicken pox, diarrhea, and so on.

The vast majority of detainees, most of whom had nothing to do with the JVP, have no hope even of being brought to trial. They have been held for eighteen months, and they still do not know what is going to happen to them.

Similarly, they do not receive proper educational facilities or reading material. They can see their parents only once a month and even then such rights are considered favors accorded at the discretion of the various officers at the prison. They are often cancelled for trivial offenses. I would say that the conditions are bad although they have very slightly improved as a result of representations made by the HDRO and the publicity about conditions.

Q. What was the situation in Ceylon with regard to repression when you were there in April?

A. The government is definitely aware of the fact that after a period of confusion that prevailed in the first few months, particularly in the organized working class, masses of people are beginning to realize what actually happened and are increasingly vociferous in their opposition. Organizations that have been trying to expose the var-

ious government claims are getting a hearing in the working class. Masses of people were disillusioned with the government. This is especially so since September 1971, when the government took a number of budgetary measures that attacked living standards. The prices of essential goods like sugar were increased; a large number of food and clothing items were rationed. Because of this, there was a general antigovernment mood.

The people were not yet prepared to take direct action against the government, but the government was aware that there were organizations like the HDRO, Ceylon Mercantile Union, and others that were trying to mobilize the masses. Nor is the government sure that it has arrested all the JVP members and that there are no secret members. But it could not simply continue to hold almost 16,000 people and continue to arrest many others without some cover.

Therefore the government decided to take a number of new measures—to incorporate the temporary laws now in effect such as press censorship and the suspension of normal rights of free speech and defense by attorney into the substantial law of the country, to institutionalize the police state that exists. First the Bandaranaike parliament passed the Criminal Justice Commission Act, which abolished the norms of "natural justice" available under normal law and set up a court of inquisition that has the right to introduce confessions obtained through torture and blackmail, the right to restrict the powers of defense lawyers, and the right to restrict the cross-examination of a witness. Second, the government extended the life of parliament by seven years so that all constitutional means of changing the government were postponed for a long time. Third, it proposed a new bill to control the press. It would replace the press censorship that existed with a permanent board of censors called a press council.

In April when I was last there, the situation was very volatile. On the one hand the masses are beginning to oppose the government and the government is beginning to recognize that it has lost all support among the masses. On the other hand there is selective repression, not publicized but done in a cold way. For instance, twelve members of the LSSP(R) Youth League were arrested on a false

charge of planning an armed attack on the government.

The government is overextending itself by trying to control every political group on the left that is opposed to the government. On the other hand, the masses are beginning to understand the need to take action against this government. I think this situation will continue for some time since mass moods do not develop all at once.

Q. What have the hearings of the Criminal Justice Commission revealed about the government's case against the JVP?

A. First of all, I think the hearings have already defeated the aim of the government. Its aim was to suppress certain facts relating to the initiation of the repression. The government wanted to bring out the fact that this repression was a logical outcome of the activities of the JVP, but under cross-examination a large number of witnesses showed that in reality the repression started before April 5 and that it was planned by the government. All the pretexts that it had adduced earlier failed to stand up under cross-examination. So the first aim of the government was not achieved. It did not suppress the fact that the JVP had been under attack before the fifth of April, and that the attacks on police stations were undertaken in dire desperation by a group of people who had been under attack for three weeks.

The Criminal Justice Commission inquiry has given the Human and Democratic Rights Organisation lawyers an opportunity to break through the censorship and to explain to the masses what really happened. From this point of view, we can say that the government has made a tactical blunder in deciding to hold the inquiry in this way. That doesn't mean that the outcome is going to be favorable to the detainees, because the judges are not impartial and they are also going to take into cognizance the fact that they are living in a police state.

Q. What was the outcome of the October 18 hunger strike?

A. The hunger strike involved over one million people. People from all walks of life participated—peasants, workers, agricultural workers, plantation workers, Tamils, Sinhals: a general mass support in the country.

In every village, groups of people organized themselves in support of the call issued by the HDRO.

It was the first mass action launched against the government's repression. People's open expression of intention to participate is an important development in mobilizing masses in extra-parliamentary direct action against the government. The forces leading the movement against the repression know that they cannot yet take actions such as a general strike without being smashed by the repressive regime. They seek to stir the vast majority of the people, to explain the causes of the repression and the importance of mobilizing the whole mass rather than small groups of people. The leadership of the movement is aware that without steps which can involve the most backward elements and gradually develop their ability to struggle, it will not be possible to take on Bandaranaike and her repressive policies. The "United Front" government knows that it must destroy all forms of opposition in order to maintain itself in power. The only force that can defeat that regime is the organized mass movement. Without that, any struggle against the repression will be doomed from the beginning.

The actual size of the strike was important because the action steered each participant and increased his or her determination to continue the struggle and to take further steps. In addition, it was an important landmark in the effort to expose the regime to the masses. In the past, owing to press censorship, it was impossible for the masses of people to know exactly what was going on. Through the mass meetings that were held up and down the country in all the big cities, in the north and the south, the HDRO was able to explain the facts being hidden from the masses by the government. Finally, it is significant that, for the first time, the masses were willing to come out in a limited action against repression. These people have recognized that the normal constitutional means of change are useless today and that extraparliamentary action is needed to fight the repression.

Q. What was the response of the Bandaranaike regime to the preparations for the hunger strike?

A. At first, the government tried to kill the strike by ridiculing it. Unfor-



Sri Lanka soldiers rounded up thousands of young rebels in 1971 witch-hunt unleashed by Sirimavo Bandaranaike's "United Front" government.

unately for the government, the response from the beginning was so big that it changed its tack. I have copies of letters from various police inspectors to the HDRO. In the beginning, the government and the police were willing to permit posters advertising the strike. And they were prepared to allow meetings which could be advertised.

After the meeting in Colombo, when they saw that the vast number of people who attended overflowed the hall, instructions were given (probably by the government) to the police to put a stop to all forms of advertising for the hunger strike. Subsequently, the police refused to give permission to put up posters or distribute any handbills that announced meetings or the strike or that talked about repression and repressive legislation. It is clear that the government was worried about the potential of this movement. On the other hand, it could not repress the strike outright, because technically, no one was breaking the emergency regulations. The number of people participating was so large that no effective action could be taken against them.

Q. What actions have been carried out internationally in support of Ceylonese political prisoners?

A. The Ceylon Solidarity Committee

in England organized a day of international action to coincide with the hunger strike. We have not yet received reports from all countries that participated. There were pickets and public meetings on October 18 and throughout the preceding week, in Japan, Switzerland, Luxemburg, Denmark, the United States, Australia, etc., as well as in Great Britain.

Q. What are the objectives of your U. S. tour?

A. Everywhere I can go and to whatever section of the U. S. population I can speak, I want to explain the basic facts about the violation of liberties in Ceylon. The vast majority of people—and by that I mean workers, Blacks, Chicanos, women—have not heard the facts about the repression. They do not know the role of various governments and particularly the U. S. government in supporting the corrupt and repressive regime. My main task is to explain the situation and to call upon people to take measures to express solidarity with the people of Ceylon.

Q. What kinds of activities would you encourage people outside Sri Lanka to carry out, and what impact do you think this will have on the Bandaranaike government?

A. Even the most repressive regimes, fascist-type regimes, are worried about their image abroad because these states do not live in a vacuum; they have to obtain aid from other countries, they have to carry out normal commercial transactions, trade, and tourism.

So there are a large number of things people can do. First of all, the main thing is to publicize facts and educate the masses about the nature of the repression and why it takes place. Make it known that it is not some accidental happening, that it has a deepgoing economic and social basis—in other words, that this is the response of a capitalist state to a period of economic and social crisis. This is a lesson the masses of other countries can learn; they don't have to go through the experience, to burn their fingers, before they learn.

Concretely, on a minimum level, people can hold demonstrations, meetings, pickets, and so on. There are other measures which can be taken also, such as propaganda against tourism, because the Ceylonese government is now trying to enlarge foreign exchange earnings by increasing the number of tourists who go there. Ceylon is sometimes referred to as the "pearl of the East," although today I think it is more appropriate to say that it is an island behind bars.

It is also possible to organize boycott campaigns of Ceylonese products, blacking Ceylonese ships and goods. This requires the support of a big section of the workers and depends on the situation in each country, the consciousness of the workers, etc. For instance, the waterside workers of Brisbane, Australia, expressed their sentiments when they said they are prepared to black any Ceylonese ship that comes to Brisbane. It's not possible to prescribe in advance what people involved in solidarity action should do in each country. It is up to local activists to see what can be carried out.

It is clear, however, that whatever is done, the most minimal action, has an important repercussion in Ceylon. First, it embarrasses the Ceylonese government, which wants to retain its image as a democratic and socialist country. Second, it strengthens the morale of those people who are fighting inside Ceylon, particularly those people who have been held in jail for eighteen months, who have no

hope and no idea of what will happen to them. There are means of getting this information to the prisoners—through parents, relatives, and so on—and their determination to fight

against repression is strengthened by the fact that they know that there are people outside Ceylon supporting their cause, that they are not alone, that they are not isolated. □

Couldn't Stand 'Shameful Spectacle' of Civilian Rule

Military Seizes Power in Honduras

After eighteen months in office, the civilian government of Ramón Ernesto Cruz in Honduras was overthrown on December 4 by the country's minister of defense and commander in chief of the armed forces, General Oswaldo López Arellano. The coup—the third led by López Arellano in the last sixteen years—took place, according to a United Press International dispatch from Tegucigalpa published in the December 5 issue of the New York Spanish-language daily *El Diario-La Prensa*, "in such a calm atmosphere that no one was arrested and not one official in the overthrown government had asked for asylum in any foreign embassy, while activities continued normally in this capital of 200,000 inhabitants." No military guards were placed outside the home of the deposed president, who reportedly accepted the news of his ouster without protest. Cruz was nevertheless placed under house arrest.

An armed forces communiqué explained that Cruz had been overthrown because of the "situation of chaos and weakness that the nation is suffering under a coalition of parties which is giving a shameful spectacle."

General López announced that he was installing himself as head of the government for a period of at least five years. In 1963, he overthrew President Ramón Villada Morales, and in 1965 he organized a constituent assembly that voted him a six-year term as president.

Five years later he announced that a new assembly would be chosen in March 1971 that would revise the constitution to allow him to be reelected. In the face of protests, however, he relented and instead pressured the country's two major parties, the Nationalists and the Liberals, into an agreement to share power. They

agreed to divide the cabinet posts and the sixty-four seats in congress evenly between themselves and give tie-breaking votes to the new president. Cruz, the Nationalist party candidate, won.

The Liberals began complaining from the very beginning that they were receiving the short end of the stick in this bargain. The internal squabbling has virtually paralyzed the government during the past year. And through it all, General López continued to retain a great deal of power as minister of defense and head of the armed forces. Under the present constitution—adopted under his guidance—he had the authority to dispute or ignore any order from the president.

General López intends to govern through decrees and laws issued by a Council of Minister, in which the key posts will be filled by military men. The important post of secretary of the home office and justice went to Colonel Juan Alberto Melgar Castro and the new secretary of defense and public safety will be Colonel Raúl Galo Soto. Other figures in the new cabinet include two members of the Liberal party, and two members of a new party called *Innovación y Unidad* (Innovation and Unity). General López is a member of the Nationalist party, as is the president he overthrew.

This was Honduras's 137th coup in 151 years. □

Christmas Shoppers Take Note

Admirers of "great leaders" and their "invincible thoughts" have a treat awaiting them. The eleventh volume of the works of the "Albanian people's great leader," Enver Hoxha, has been published in Albania, according to the November 29 *Hsinhua*.

This book, which contains the complete text of Hoxha's reports to various CP gatherings, may be the perfect gift for the Maoist who has everything.

Imperialist Intervention in the Spanish Civil War

By Leon Trotsky

[The following article, dated March 4, 1939, first appeared in the Russian-language *Bulletin of the Opposition*, number 75-76, March-April 1939. It is included in a collection of Trotsky's writings on Spain, *The Spanish Revolution (1931-39)*, which will be published in January 1973 by Pathfinder Press, New York, N. Y.]

© 1972 Pathfinder Press. Reprinted by permission.

* * *

The Socialist Leon Blum and the Conservative Chamberlain, in equal measure friends of "peace," were for nonintervention in the Spanish affair. Hand in hand with them went Stalin, the ex-Bolshevik, through his ambassador Maisky, the ex-Menshevik. Nuances of programs did not hinder them from friendly collaboration in the name of one and the same high aim.

Now, however, Chamberlain declares that if, after recognition of Franco, Italy and Germany do not withdraw the so-called volunteers from Spain, England is prepared to take the most serious measures, not short of war. The Radical Socialist Daladier, another well-known supporter of the policy of "nonintervention," completely supports Chamberlain in this question. From love of peace, these gentlemen refused to defend democracy with arms. But there is a limit to everything, even to the love of peace of these experienced friends of humanity. Chamberlain openly says: the arrival of Italian and German soldiers on the Iberian Peninsula would break the "balance" in the Mediterranean. This cannot be endured! England and France were not at all inclined to support Spanish democracy; but now, when they have helped Franco to stifle it, they are fully prepared to support with arms the "balance" in the Mediterranean, which mysterious technical term is to be understood as meaning the defense by the enslavers of their colonial possessions and the seaways leading to them.

We humbly ask the gentlemen of the Second and Third Internationals exactly what historical, political, and other conditions are required to establish the promised grand alliance in defense of democracy in the whole world? The government of France relied on the Popular Front. The struggle of the Popular Front in Spain was waged in the name of democracy. What other example can be invented in which the duty to defend democracy would appear in a more imperative form? If a "Socialist" government supported by a "National Front" refused to defend a democracy also headed by "Socialists," then the question arises just where and when will what kind of government occupy itself with the task of defending democracy? Perhaps the augurs of Social Democracy and the Comintern can, nevertheless, manage to explain that?

In fact, the two imperialist democracies, in the person of their ruling classes, were from the very beginning completely on the side of Franco; they merely did not at first believe in the possibility of his victory, and were afraid of compromising themselves by premature disclosure of their sympathies. As Franco's chances improved, however, the real faces of the possessing classes of the "great democracies" were revealed ever more clearly, ever more openly, ever more shamelessly. Both Great Britain and France know perfectly well that it is considerably easier to control colonies, semicolonies, and simply weak nations through a military dictatorship than through a democratic or even semi-democratic regime.

Alliance with the Conservative [Chamberlain] government is just as immutable a commandment for the "Socialist" petty bourgeois Blum as for the most extreme reactionaries of the French Chamber of Deputies. This commandment emanates from the French stock exchange. England's plan in relation to Spain was fixed from the very start: let them fight; whoever wins will need money to re-

vive the economy of the country. Neither Germany nor Italy will be able to give this money; consequently, the victor will have to turn to London, and partly to Paris. Thus it will be possible to dictate terms.

Blum was initiated into the English plan perfectly well from the beginning. He could have no plan of his own because his semisocialist government was completely dependent on the French bourgeoisie, and the French bourgeoisie on Great Britain. Blum shouted about the preservation of peace as an even more sacred task than the salvation of democracy. But in fact he was concealing the plan of British capital. After he had carried out this piece of dirty work, he was thrown into the opposition camp by the French bourgeoisie, and again obtained the possibility of shouting about the sacred duty of helping the Spanish republicans. Without a cheap left phrase, he would not have preserved the possibilities of again rendering other just as treacherous services to the French bourgeoisie at a critical moment.

The Moscow diplomats also, of course, speak somewhat through gritted teeth in favor of Spanish democracy, the very thing they have destroyed by their policy. But in Moscow they now express themselves very carefully, because they are groping for a way to Berlin. The Moscow Bonapartists are ready to betray all the democracies in the world, not to speak of the international proletariat, just to prolong their rule for an additional week. It is possible that both Stalin and Hitler have started with bluff; each wants to frighten Chamberlain, Daladier, and even Roosevelt. But if the "democratic" imperialists are not frightened, the bluff may go considerably further than was at first supposed in Moscow and Berlin. To cover up their maneuvers, the Kremlin clique needs the assistance of the leaders of the Second and Third Internationals, the more so as that does not cost too much.

Crudely speaking, the social-patriotic gentlemen can be divided into con-

scious rogues and semi-sincere fools. However, there are a considerable number of intermediary and combined types. In their time, these gentlemen have endured the nasty comedy of "nonintervention," helping Stalin to slaughter proletarian Spain. When it turned out that republican Spain had been slaughtered along with it, they began to wave their hands in protest, without, however, rejecting in the slightest either the Popular Front or the "alliance of the democracies." In the rituals of imperialism, these people invariably fill the most humiliating and shameful roles.

In the veins of the Spanish people, there still remains unshed blood. Who will dispose of it, Hitler and Mussolini or Chamberlain with his French accomplices, is a question that will be decided by the relations of the imperialist forces in the near future. The struggle for peace, for democracy, for race, for authority, for order, for balance, and for dozens of other high and imponderable things means the struggle for a new division of the world. The Spanish tragedy will go down in

history as an episode on the path of preparation of a new world war. The ruling classes of all shades are afraid of it and at the same time are preparing for it with all their might. The charlatanism of Popular Fronts serves one part of the imperialists to conceal their plans from the popular masses, as the other gang uses phrases about blood, honor, and race for the same purpose. The petty bourgeois windbags and phrasemongers only make it easier for the imperialists to prepare war, by preventing the workers from seeing the naked truth.

Thus, from various ends and by various methods, a new carnage of the people is being prepared. Humanity can be saved from ruin and destruction only by tearing the vanguard of the proletariat away from imperialism and its lackeys; by complete independence of proletarian policy; by complete mistrust of the rituals of imperialism, fascist and democratic; by merciless struggle against the Second and Third Internationals; by stubborn, systematic, untiring preparation for the international proletarian revolution! □

Cuban Government's Position on Hijacking

[Negotiations between the U.S. and Cuban governments began in Havana November 25 with the Swiss ambassador to Cuba representing the United States, which has not maintained diplomatic relations with Cuba since 1961. The aim of the negotiations is to reach agreement on how to handle hijackings involving the two countries. By December 5, U.S. State Department spokesman Charles Bray announced that the talks were proceeding smoothly and that "we now have a promising basis for proceeding to an agreement which would cover hijacking of aircraft and ships."

[The incident that led to the negotiations was the hijacking of an Eastern Airlines plane from the United States to Havana on October 28. It landed in Havana early the following day. This was followed less than two weeks later by the hijacking of a Southern Airways plane en route from Houston to Atlanta. On November 15, the day after the Cuban statement reprinted below was issued, the Cuban and American governments announced their decision to open the talks.

[Subsequently, on November 20, the State Department announced that it had been informed by Cuban officials that the three hijackers of the Southern Airways plane would be put on trial. Agence France-Presse reported that "in addition to charges of felonious acts allegedly committed in Cuban airspace, they are to be accused of entry without authorization in a stolen plane and threatening third parties with deadly weapons.

"The three men are also to be accused of committing a number of offenses on Cuban soil, among them entering the country with stolen goods consisting of the aircraft and \$2-million of ransom money, and aggression against Cuban officials." (The four hijackers of the Eastern Airlines plane are under arrest, but no announcement has been made as to the fate awaiting them; the U.S. government is seeking their extradition.)

[On November 30, the State Department said that the airlift of refugees from Cuba to the United States "will be resumed in the near future." The airlift was suspended May 12 when Cuba stated that there were no more

people ready to leave. "Asked whether this Cuban move had broader significance for Cuban-American relations, a [State Department] spokesman said 'none at all,'" according to a United Press International dispatch from Washington.

[Following is a "Declaration of the Revolutionary Government of Cuba," dated November 14, detailing its position on hijacking and reporting the exchange of messages that has led up to the present negotiations. It was published in the December 1 issue of *Direct From Cuba*, a press service of Prensa Latina. We have summarized, in brackets, the various messages from the U.S. government, which deal mostly with technical matters.]

* * *

U.S. imperialism invented and encouraged the hijacking of airborne aircraft during the first years of the Revolution when it first put into practice its plans to subvert and attack our country, in the same way that it also invented economic blockade, mercenary aggressions, and pirate attacks from CIA ships disguised as merchantmen, from bases located in Central American countries and from within the United States itself.

During those early years our country was the victim of a wave of hijackings of airplanes which landed in the airports of the United States and of vessels which were taken to the coasts of that country, where the authors of these acts were received with approval by the authorities and exalted as heroes. In the carrying out of these deeds, repugnant crimes were frequently committed and sometimes the perpetrators of these deeds arrived in the United States with the still-warm body of a murdered Cuban pilot or sailor. At the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion some of these "heroes" were recruited by the U.S. Government which gave them rank and honor. The CIA, among other things, offered 100,000 dollars to any pilot of the Cuban Air Force who brought a MIG plane to the United States.

At the same time, illegal entries and departures from Cuba to the United States, and vice versa, were abetted for the purpose of subversion and propaganda.

This climate of illegality, piracy with impunity, and violation of the most elementary norms of civilized life—

which in part continues today as the policy of the United States Government against Cuba—unleashed, in all its present-day disturbing magnitude, the serious problem of the hijacking of aircraft and other acts of terrorism which today affect the entire international community.

Some of these acts, such as the hijacking of airplanes, have taken on forms and variations which are becoming more and more unusual and bold. No technical solution, no legal or political recourse, has been found to efficiently solve the problem. No international agreement has been able to go into force, or will be able to, among other things, because the world today is living in a general climate of illegality, terror, and violence which constitute the official policy of the United States in many parts of the world, Southeast Asia among them.

When in a spontaneous way and as the logical and inevitable result of a policy which does not respect principles of legality or morality, the hijacking of airplanes boomeranged against its inventors, Cuba, which was the first victim of these hijackings, became in turn an obligatory landing place for the majority of the planes hijacked in the United States. The authors of these deeds, motivated by many different reasons, ranging from political motives to the committing of common crimes and to mental illness, saw in our country a place where the United States itself had destroyed all international legal instruments that could be used to take action against the hijackers.

Cuba, however, invariably abstained from glorifying, awarding or encouraging by publicity or any other means the authors of these deeds. But the problem could not be solved by Cuba alone, in a unilateral way without reciprocal action by the United States in relation to similar acts that have affected our country.

Therefore, the Revolutionary Government passed Law No. 1226 on September 16, 1969, in an attempt to approach the problem of the skyjackings and other similar types of crimes, within a framework of bilateral agreements with the parties involved in these problems, among them one of the most affected being precisely the United States.

In the opinion of the Government of Cuba, this is the most appropri-

ate, quickest and efficient way to counteract the wave of airplane hijackings and serious violations which have endangered human lives and transgressed other basic interests such as immigration requisites and sanitary measures which the laws of each nation as well as international agreements rigidly establish.

More than two weeks ago, when a Boeing 727 airplane from the Eastern Airlines Company was hijacked and flown to Havana, the government of Cuba reiterated its opinion to the government of the United States.

[At this point, the statement reprints three notes from the U. S. government relayed through the Swiss embassy in Havana. All are dated October 29. They request the return of the hijacked Eastern Airlines plane, its crew, and passengers, and the extradition of the hijackers, who are identified and said to be responsible for killing a ticket clerk in New Orleans, where the hijacked plane stopped to take on fuel. Two of the hijackers were reported to be wanted for a bank robbery in the Washington, D. C. area as well.]

The following day the Cuban Government replied with the following note:

"The Ministry of Foreign Affairs greets the Honorable Embassy of Switzerland, representative of the interests of the United States of America in Cuba, and requests that, as such, it transmit the following text to the State Department of the Government of that country:

"The Government of Cuba has provided facilities for the immediate return of the Eastern Airlines Company, Boeing 727, its crew and passengers, hijacked in flight from Houston to Atlanta yesterday morning.

"The hijackers are under arrest and an investigation into the motives, circumstances and facts concerning the hijacking is under way.

"Concerning the Notes from the State Department of the Government of the United States informing of the facts and requesting that those responsible be handed over to the jurisdiction of that country, the Government of Cuba wishes to say:

"In no way can it be in Cuba's interest nor does Cuba in any way desire that its territory be used as a refuge by persons responsible for com-

mon crimes which take place in some part of the United States. Nor does the Government of Cuba have any interest whatsoever in encouraging the hijackings of planes or ships, or illegal entries and departures to or from the territory of that country in violation of the immigration, sanitary or similar laws.

"But the Government of Cuba cannot solve this matter in a unilateral and isolated way without a broad and reciprocal commitment in this respect on the part of the United States.

"The territory of the United States is the scene of activity of elements who carry out brutal acts against the people and territory of Cuba such as the pirate attack on the port of Boca de Samá last year, with lamentable losses of Cuban lives. In Florida individuals are recruited, organized and openly trained to plan and carry out acts against Cuban vessels, such as the fishing boats "Aguja" and "Plataforma IV", destroyed and sunk off Andros Island. Boats constantly leave the United States and, violating the territorial waters of Cuba, they arrive at our shores to transport persons between Cuba and the United States in violation of the laws of both countries. It is certain that for many years there has been encouragement of illegal departures from Cuba and consequent illegal entries to the United States as part of a policy aimed at harming our country by all means possible.

"We understand that these occurrences and many previous ones which it is not the purpose of this Note to repeat and emphasize, have created a climate of violation and illegality whose consequences are being felt by both countries in one way or another.

"The Government of Cuba finds it difficult to understand why the authorities of the United States cannot investigate, identify and take effective measures to punish, discourage and prevent these acts.

"We believe that it is to the mutual interest of both countries to take steps towards a solution of this question which has arisen repeatedly, with more or less frequency.

"The Government of Cuba, for its part, is disposed to take serious steps and without delay for the adoption of a broad agreement on this specific question if the Government of the

United States shows an equal disposition and interest on its part.

"We understand this to be a problem between the two countries which can be resolved with comparative brevity and that such a solution would also have positive repercussions on the solution of problems which, because they have spread into the international field, have affected several countries.

"If the Government of the United States so desires it can carry out the negotiations for the said agreement on the basis of measures to be adopted with relation to the hijackings of planes and ships and illegal departures and entries between the territories of the two countries, through the representative of its interests in Cuba, the Swiss Embassy.

"The Government of Cuba in expressing with all clarity its position on these problems, and the practical ways and means of solving them, hopes to hear the United States Government's opinion on this matter.

"The Ministry of Foreign Relations takes this opportunity to reiterate to the Honorable Embassy of Switzerland, representative of the interests of the United States in Cuba, its highest and most distinguished consideration.

Havana, October 30, 1972."

The Government of the United States replied saying that the note was being studied.

Scarcely a week and a half afterwards, on November 10 and 11 — as everybody now knows — one of the most dramatic events in the history of hijacking took place in the United States. A hijacked Southern Airways DC-9 flew for almost two hours over a major atomic energy plant, with the hijackers threatening to crash the plane into the plant if their demands for 10 million dollars were not met. They had two million dollars handed to them, but were led to believe they were being given 10. The plane, with its crew and passengers, was forced to fly for 30 hours with touchdowns in more than half a dozen different airports, among them Rancho Boyeros. Finally the United States authorities at the McCoy Base in Orlando, Florida, shot at the plane. The tires of the landing gear were destroyed, causing oil leakages and a hijacker to shoot and seriously wound the co-pilot. The

plane had to make a forced landing at 12.25 a.m. in Rancho Boyeros Airport, where the emergency safety measures taken and the serenity of the crew avoided a catastrophe. The injured and other passengers and crewmen immediately received appropriate attention.

The Government of Cuba makes this statement so that Cuban and international opinion will know our position in relation to these grave problems and the measures which in our opinion

ought to be taken to fight efficaciously against them.

Such measures can be taken immediately, depending on the reply of the Government of the United States.

Although the Government of that country continues to maintain, with relation to Cuba, a policy of blockade and aggression, our consideration for the people of the United States and for the international community is what determines our constructive position on this problem. □

Why PSA Refused to Meet With Peron

[On November 20, former Argentine President Juan Perón met with some fifty political, trade-union, and business leaders in the Nino Restaurant in Buenos Aires in an attempt to bring about a unity of civilian forces as a preliminary step to undertaking any direct negotiations with the military government. Nearly all political forces in the country were invited to the meeting. Only two invited groups, the outlawed Communist party and the Partido Socialista Argentino (PSA — Argentine Socialist party), refused to attend. (The December 1 issue of the Cuban magazine *Bohemia* inaccurately reported only the Communist party as having done so.)

[The following is an interview with the general secretary of the PSA, Juan Carlos Coral, explaining why the PSA refused to take part in the meeting. It was published in the November 29 issue of the PSA's weekly, *Avanzada Socialista*. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Question. Why didn't we attend the meeting in the Nino Restaurant?

Answer. We stayed away from the Nino meeting because we were not prepared to take part in a secret dialogue with the enemies of the working class. There you had Perón meeting not only with Balbín, Amadeo, and Frondizi, but also with the representatives of the exploiters' organization (the CGE [Confederación General Económica — General Economic Confederation]), and the trade-union leaders, who are accomplices of the military

government. The obstinate refusal to allow journalists to cover the event was not incidental: Behind the pretext of discussing the bases for "national reconstruction," what was really involved was an attempt to give concrete form — behind closed doors — to the Great National Agreement called for by the armed forces: in other words, to explicitly lay down the conditions that the organizations in attendance would agree to observe during the next "legal" period. This is the reason not one word was said about political prisoners and repression, about unemployment and the wages of the workers, or about crooked business operations and the surrender of the national economy.

From another point of view, it was the culmination of a laborious effort on the part of Perón that began in 1967 through contacts with Aramburu and Balbín and later evolved with the grouping of the bourgeois parties into various fronts representing all shades, from La Hora del Pueblo [The Hour of the People] to the ENA [Encuentro Nacional de los Argentinos — National Forum of Argentines], with Freccilina [Frente Cívico de Liberación Nacional — Civic Front for National Liberation] and the Alianza de Centro Izquierda [Center-Left Alliance] in between. Perón had his representative in every one of them; he stamped all of them with definite restrictions and an electoralist outlook. Ultimately, it was very easy for him to get them to sit down and attempt to reach agreement with the government's strategy.

In short, our attitude represented a categorical denunciation of the fact that

what was being worked out behind those doors was a kind of "Democratic Union-1972" into which official Peronism, after having exhausted its populist stage, would be incorporated. It was in order to accomplish this task that the armed forces made Perón return, and it is for this reason that he has not denounced the Balbíns, Frondizis, Ruccis, and Corias, or called for any program of struggle against poverty and unemployment.

Q. A Peronist compañero told us that he thought our position was sectarian, since it seemed to him that we were rejecting any dialogue with his party.

A. Not at all. We are ready to en-

gage in a dialogue with General Perón and the Peronist movement, provided that it is public and in the interests of the workers. For example, we have repeatedly called on the Justicialist movement [the Peronist party] and other parties to reach a public agreement on a national mobilization to free the political prisoners. We likewise call on the Justicialist movement to urge the adoption of a "plan for struggle" by the CGT [Confederación General del Trabajo—General Confederation of Labor] and the presentation of workers' candidates [in the upcoming elections]. If General Perón or any other party would like to enter into a public dialogue on questions like these, we will be the first to agree to join them in doing so. □

Devlin Calls for Irish Solidarity Actions

[Bernadette Devlin, independent socialist member of parliament for the Mid-Ulster constituency in Northern Ireland, has issued the following appeal for demonstrations in support of the Irish people's fight against British and British-sponsored repression.]

* * *

Sunday, 28th January 1973 will be the anniversary of Derry's Bloody Sunday.

On January 30th last, British paracommandos murdered thirteen peaceful demonstrators during an attack on a mass civil rights procession in Derry.

The murder of this thirteen, and all those victims of the British Crown Forces who have died before or since then, is part of a calculated policy of the British government to destroy the combativity and confidence of the nationalist population in the North of Ireland. Specifically, it was a last desperate attempt to shore up the corrupt Tory-Unionist regime at Stormont.

It failed. Stormont has been suspended.

But British aggression in Ireland continues. Since the abolition of Stormont, the British propaganda service has attempted to give the impression to the world that Britain is playing the role of arbitrator between two warring Irish tribes. Whitelaw, the British Gau-



BERNADETTE DEVLIN

leiter, is depicted as a gentle and impartial referee.

The reality is very different.

The essential conflict in Ireland is between the Irish people and British imperialism, supported by native reaction. The specific form it takes is an attempt by Britain to suppress the struggle of the nationalist-Catholic population, and to crush its vanguard, the Irish Republican Army.

What this means is the continuation of concentration camps, the imprisonment and torture of thousands of polit-

ical prisoners, daily harassment and mass intimidation of the total Catholic population—highlighted by the situation in West Belfast, where over half of the total male population has been arrested, questioned, or had their homes raided by the British Army. When people in this area talk of the British Army of Occupation, it is no idle slogan. It is the literal truth. Andersonstown today is as brutally and effectively occupied as Warsaw was under the Nazis.

But the people have not been cowed. By demonstrations, by armed struggle, by rent and rate strikes, they display their continued combativity.

They must not fight alone. The international anti-imperialist movement must rally to the defence of the heroic people of Ireland.

The week-end of 27th-28th January 1973 provides an opportunity for a worldwide week-end of activity to focus world attention on this struggle, and I appeal to all revolutionary groups, to the student movement, and to the workers' movement throughout the world to organise on that week-end, in every major city in Europe, America, Australia, Asia and Africa, demonstrations, protest meetings, pickets and other activities, to demand the withdrawal of British troops from Ireland, self-determination for the Irish people, the ending of internment and release of all Irish political prisoners, to show their solidarity with those socialist and republican forces struggling against British imperialism in Ireland. □

Petition for Argentine Prisoners

A petition demanding an end to political repression in Argentina was sent November 27 to President Alejandro Lanusse by fifty-six New Zealand political figures, trade unionists, educators, student activists, and religious leaders.

"Thousands of political dissidents have been arrested," the petition states, "and these are not infrequently tortured and/or murdered. This is what happened to the 16 political prisoners who were executed at Trelew on August 22.

"We call upon you to cease this abrogation of human rights and to grant the immediate release of all political prisoners in your country."

Signers of the appeal include six Labour party members of parliament, the mayor of Christchurch, the presidents of the Wellington and Canterbury trades councils, and the associated general secretary of the National Council of Churches.

More Slanders From the SLL

[The preceding issue of *Intercontinental Press* published two documents relating to the Conference of Radical Scholars of Soviet and Eastern European Studies, held in London October 20-22. The first was an attack on the conference that appeared in the October 24 issue of *Workers Press*, the organ of the British Socialist Labour League, a sectarian outfit that falsely claims to be Trotskyist.

[The second, a reply to the SLL and an account of the conference, was an open letter sent by the conference organizers to several radical newspapers. In its November 13 issue, *Workers Press* printed the open letter and renewed its polemic against the conference.

[Below we reprint this second SLL slander, followed by some comments on it by George Saunders, who attended the conference.]

* * *

The real point behind this letter is not about the way a conference was reported. *Workers Press* did not misrepresent its proceedings in any way. What the conference organizers object to is the political exposure of their aims.

The political purpose is to provide an 'academic' front behind which various revisionists and their allies can adapt to Stalinism and provide an alternative to Trotskyism.

The Socialist Labour League fights on the Trotskyist basis that Stalinism as a bureaucratic agency of imperialism is the main counter-revolutionary force on the world arena.

Ever since 1953, when the great movement of workers against the Stalinist bureaucracy in eastern Europe and the USSR came right out into the open, another tendency, Pabloism, has broken from Trotskyism. Its line is that the Stalinist bureaucracy, or certain wings of it, can play a progressive and revolutionary role. The contemporary followers of this line in Britain today are the International Marxist Group.

It was IMG members and sympathizers who organized the 'Conference of Radical Scholars'.

The other tendency largely represented there was the 'state capitalist'

group International Socialists, who oppose the defence of the Soviet Union, eastern Europe and China against imperialism.

There can be no mincing of words about the reactionary role played here by the IMG revisionists, such as Tariq Ali, Robin Blackburn and their international leader Ernest Mandel. They bring together people like Jiri Pelikan, who have had to break with the most obvious and brutal manifestations of Stalinist rule, with anti-communist elements like the 'state capitalists'.

Under the deliberately-confusionist umbrella of the 'non-Stalinist left', they exclude the main question facing the working class of East Europe and Russia, as well as the capitalist countries: the construction of alternative revolutionary leadership to defend the gains of October 1917 through the extension of the Russian proletarian revolution throughout the world, combined with the political revolution against the bureaucracy in the deformed and degenerated workers' states.

By working in this way, the IMG opens the door to Stalinists like Monty Johnstone.

Activities like the 'Radical Scholars' Conference' become a sphere of work for the Stalinist bureaucracy itself, aiding it in its repressive preparations.

The first question to be posed to a man like Pelikan is to explain the fate of the wing of the bureaucracy of which he was a part. Because Alexander Dubcek's road did not break from Stalinism, did not turn to the Czech working class through the building of a party independent of the bureaucracy, led where it had to lead—defeat at the hands of the Kremlin bureaucracy.

Otta Sik, part of the Dubcek leadership, now in the west, has put his 'Marxist' services to aiding the capitalist class in designing incomes policy and writes in the US State Department's 'Problems of Communism'.

Pelikan is not Sik, but only through the hardest struggle for Trotskyism against him can he be shown any other road.

This is why the remarks of Mandel at the conference are so criminal. Right at the point where the fundamental historical differences between Stalinism and Trotskyism are the es-

sence of the question of alternative leadership in eastern Europe, as everywhere else, Mandel dismisses these matters.

This is entirely in line with the insistence of Mandel and the IMG in recent years that it is no longer correct to use the term 'Stalinism'.

At the conference he told one questioner that it was 'much easier to interest workers in Marxism by talking to them about what's happening in Britain' than by 'making words against Stalin or accusing the bureaucracy'.

The organizers refer to Mandel's 'six essential prerequisites of socialism' in the light of which Pelikan discussed the Czechoslovak movement of 1968. They were as follows:

Workers' management of the economy; political socialist democracy; growth of the productive forces and reduction in labour time; withering away of commodity and money economy; a cultural revolution; and the international extension of revolution.

So this is the way to discuss with potential opponents of the Stalinist bureaucracy in eastern Europe and the USSR!

For Marxism—Trotskyism—there can be not even a beginning of discussion of the prerequisites of socialist economy outside of the questions of political revolution and the building of the Fourth International. Mandel adapts to the 'socialism with a human face' of Dubcek and Pelikan, a socialism to be achieved by *reform* of the Stalinist regimes. This is why he prefers a conference of 'radical' scholars to revolutionary preparation.

The implication that the SLL advised its members to ignore Kuron and Modzelewski and leave them to their fate is a scurrilous fabrication.

We have always fought for the release of these and all other political prisoners. But we insist above all that all protests about these repressions which are separated from the struggle against Stalinism in every country are hypocrisy. While the IMG and its supporters protest against the imprisonments, they actively support Stalinism against the Socialist Labour League.

We are told that most of the conference participants 'accepted the analysis by Trotsky of the Soviet Union as their point of departure'. This is a lie.

These people want to use Trotsky's name to get right away from everything he taught. Trotsky never stopped insisting that his fight against Stalinism was based on the Bolshevik Party, the October Revolution and its gains, and the first Four Congresses of the Communist International.

Do the state capitalists 'accept' Trotsky's analysis of the USSR? On the contrary: they reject it entirely. Does Monty Johnstone accept it? On the contrary: he is the most 'sophisticated' defender of Stalin's theory of 'socialism in a single country'.

When these people say their discussion 'cannot be contained within the limits of analyses made in the 1930s and 1940s', they mean, exactly, that they do not accept the Fourth International and its programme.

The writers of this letter are not as 'radical' as they make out. Like all revisionists they prefer to operate under a stolen flag.

In one sentence they claim that Johnstone was 'not invited to speak, nor did he attend the conference'. Later the letter says 'Johnstone arrived on Sunday, after the final paper of the conference'.

Workers Press did not claim that Johnstone spoke at the conference, with or without invitation. We simply noted that when he turned up there (at the beginning, not the end, of the final session) he was warmly greeted by Pelikan, Blackburn and Ali.

In view of Johnstone's revolting political record, this is not a small point. And when the writers of the 'open letter' claim that the revisionists do not accord Johnstone status as a 'radical scholar', they are again covering up.

Blackburn is one of the oldest-established chiefs of 'New Left Review', which publishes Johnstone, Krasso and other virulent anti-Trotskyists, as well as providing a medium for every variety of revisionism.

Its editor, Perry Anderson, sits with Johnstone, presumably as a co-expert on Marxism, on the jury for the Isaac Deutscher Memorial Prize.

It seems Johnstone qualifies as a Marxist in one place, but fails to qualify even as a 'radical' in another!

This unprincipled relationship with Johnstone is indicative of the whole relationship of the conference to Stalinism. Among the publications of the conference's 'Committee to Defend Czechoslovak Socialists' is a leaflet

reproducing four cuttings from the British Communist Party's 'Morning Star'!

The cuttings include an editorial headed 'Czech Trials', which states that political differences between the opposition and the regime in Czechoslovakia 'should be resolved by political means and not by trials and imprisonment'.

By publishing these cuttings the New Left organizers of the defence committee give a totally unmerited boost to the Gollan leadership of the Communist Party, which opposes the present Czechoslovak regime from a totally unprincipled and right-wing standpoint.

They also deliberately conceal the fact that the British Stalinist leaders share complicity in the torture and execution of thousands of communists in the past.

Strengthening the 'Morning Star' in Britain means strengthening the Kremlin bureaucracy which imprisons its opponents in Czechoslovakia.

The leaders of the British Communist Party are politically discredited men. They justified in their entirety the crimes committed by Stalin and his henchmen against the workers of the USSR and eastern Europe.

They are on record in wholehearted support of the frame-up Moscow Trials and the liquidation of the Bolshevik leadership built by Lenin. They

also supported completely the frame-up trials of Rudolf Slansky and other Czechoslovak Party leaders in 1952.

Johnstone was a particularly enthusiastic supporter of this crime, which has now officially been admitted as a frame-up from start to finish. Like the rest of the Party leadership, he has never attempted to explain his slavish backing for the bureaucratic counter-revolution.

Quite the reverse. The New Left may have forgotten Stalin, but the Communist Party certainly has not. With Mrs Betty Reid, Johnstone continues to churn out Party literature containing the crudest distortions and lies about Trotskyism.

As long ago as April 18, 1972, Johnstone wrote a slanderous attack in the 'Morning Star' on the Young Socialists' Right-to-Work marches and the All Trades Unions Alliance.

SLL Central Committee member Michael Banda exposed Johnstone's fabrication of quotations and his unscrupulous disrespect for elementary truth in a reply to Johnstone's article.

Who are the New Left defending? The Czechoslovak prisoners or the British Communist Party? They cannot do both. And no amount of radical scholarship can cover up the reactionary nature of this political amalgam and the need to fight against it.

John Spencer

In Reply to 'Workers Press'

By George Saunders

The *Workers Press* attacks on the conference contain such deliberate distortions as might sooner be expected from a bourgeois journal, or from the press of the bureaucratized Communist parties themselves.

The most glaring *Workers Press* fabrication appeared in its original article on the conference. Between photographs of the Trotskyist leader Ernest Mandel and the Czech oppositionist Jiri Pelikan—both keynote speakers at the conference—the *Workers Press* printed a photograph of the British Stalinist Monty Johnstone. For added effect, Johnstone was depicted standing before a microphone and was described as one of "three main participants" at the conference. The article made much of the fact that Johnstone had "appeared" at the conference,

which was advanced as evidence that the gathering served the interests of Stalinism.

In point of fact—if the SLL will allow a descent into empiricism—Johnstone had nothing to do with the conference. He did not speak there; the *Workers Press* photograph was not taken at the conference.

The conference organizers explained this in their reply to the *Workers Press* article. But the SLL is not fazed. In its answer to the open letter, *Workers Press* does not acknowledge the organizers' statement that "Johnstone was not invited to speak," nor does it explain its fraudulent photograph. Instead, the *Workers Press* author seizes on some damning evidence.

The conference organizers, it seems, stated that the "only basis for these

accusations is that Johnstone arrived on Sunday, after the final paper of the conference." Thereby, exults the sectarian polemicist, they admitted that Johnstone *was* at the conference. We can only heave a sigh of relief that no campus policeman appeared at the gathering, thus subjecting the conference to SLL accusations of alliance with the armed bodies of the bourgeois state.

But there is more. Two participants at the conference, Tariq Ali and Robin Blackburn, both leaders of the International Marxist Group, British section of the Fourth International, "warmly greeted" Johnstone. If only the SLL reporter had paid as much attention to the conference proceedings as to the alleged social observances of its participants.

Small matter that the conference organizers deny even this little detail of the *Workers Press* report. "In view of Johnstone's revolting political record this is not a small point," insists the *Workers Press*.

Presumably, Ali and Blackburn's failure to display sufficient lack of social grace is a manifestation of "Pabloite revisionism." To support this thesis, and to extend it to the entire proceedings, the SLL resorts to some very tortured argumentation—and in the process unwittingly condemns itself.

The *New Left Review*, of which Blackburn is an editor, has published Johnstone. Another editor of *NLR*, Perry Anderson, is a member of the jury that selects the Isaac Deutscher Memorial Prize, which jury also includes Johnstone. Here we have two firm links between the British Communist party and someone who attended the conference. The British CP is now present at the conference several times over. But that is not all.

At the conference, a publication of the Committee to Defend Czechoslovak Socialists was displayed. (Leave aside the fact that the committee and the conference are two different things. The former was present at the latter, caught at the scene of the crime, so to speak.) Included in the publication in question were clippings from the British CP newspaper, *Morning Star*.

The *Morning Star* had printed some articles criticizing the repressive trials conducted in Czechoslovakia last summer. By reprinting such statements—that is, by trying to utilize divisions in the world Stalinist movement

to defend the victims of Stalinist repression—one is supporting the Stalinist bureaucracy, according to the SLL. This position is quite interesting. It is, in fact, the essence of the political sectarianism that underlies the *Workers Press* lies about Johnstone's influence in the conference.

Is it permissible, we might ask, to quote sections of Khrushchev's "secret speech" to the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist party, the speech that revealed, even if only in part, the truth of Trotsky's assertions about the crimes of Stalin? Certainly Khrushchev qualifies as a much more dangerous Stalinist counterrevolutionary than the rather insignificant Johnstone. Would quoting from the secret speech constitute a "totally unmerited boost" to the Khrushchev leadership?

We urge the *Workers Press* to ponder the answer carefully. Not merely because the entire Trotskyist movement has recognized the Khrushchev speech as a valuable tool in exposing Stalinism and in gaining fresh recruits to Trotskyism, but also because the SLL itself once published the *entire text* of the Khrushchev speech.

No, the alleged influence of the Communist party has nothing to do with the SLL's hostility to this conference. Its participants came from at least seven British institutes of Soviet and East European studies; several trade unionists attended, and interested persons came from many countries, among them Canada, France, Germany, Sweden, and the United States.

The conference represented the first such radical organization in this field so long dominated by imperialist intelligence-gathering agencies. Its aim was to "stimulate a wide-ranging discussion of the social structure and of social change in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe from a critical left-wing and Marxist viewpoint."

The speeches, each one followed by an hour of discussion, dealt with the central issues of society in transition from capitalism to socialism. Moreover, the central debate at the meeting was between the theory that the system prevailing in the workers states is "state capitalism" and Trotsky's concept of transitional society.

The latter position was presented by Ernest Mandel, and it was one of the best-received talks at the conference. When Peter Sedgwick, a leader of the International Socialists group, attempted to challenge the Trotskyist

analysis, he was answered at length by Mandel, whose rebuttal was met by a burst of applause, showing clearly that the majority of the audience shared the Trotskyist view.

Jiri Pelikan, elected to the leadership of the Czechoslovak Communist party at its underground congress held after the Kremlin invasion, also comes in for his share of denunciation. His "crime" is having been an official during the Dubcek regime. The SLL appears not to care that in his speech Pelikan advanced the view that the workers states are *transitional* between capitalism and socialism, or that he stressed the link between the antibureaucratic struggle in the workers states and the socialist revolution in the capitalist world. To be sure, Pelikan is no Trotskyist. But that the SLL views with scorn his political evolution and the work he is doing in defense of victims of Stalinism is evidence of the SLL's degeneration, and not Pelikan's.

The *Workers Press* attitude toward Pelikan epitomizes the sectarianism of the Socialist Labour League. Its refusal to engage in united action to defend the victims of Stalinism parallels its refusal to engage in united action to defend the Vietnamese revolution against imperialist attack. Its refusal to discuss honestly with persons such as Pelikan parallels its refusal to engage in honest debate with the world Trotskyist movement. Slander and distortion are its stock-in-trade.

The SLL pretends to be the sole representative of genuine Trotskyism—along with its American sister sect, the Workers League, and a few other scattered forces. So it must attack a conference at which the views of the real Fourth International are presented to hundreds of people. And if such behavior hinders the defense of those imprisoned by Stalinist bureaucrats, so be it. The sectarian purity of the SLL is of greater importance. □

Friendly Relations Promoted

Israel and South Vietnam announced December 7 that they were establishing diplomatic relations at the ambassadorial level. The text of the agreement, released by the Israeli Foreign Ministry, said the move was aimed at "promoting friendly relations and cooperation in the economic, technological, and cultural spheres. . . ."