

Intercontinental Press

combined with **IMPRECOR**

Vol. 17, No. 19

©1979 by Intercontinental Press

May 21, 1979

USA 75¢

UK 30p



125,000 March on Washington

SALT Treaty—Cover for Stepped-up U.S. War Drive

By Will Reissner

On May 9 the governments of the United States and the Soviet Union announced agreement on a new Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II) to regulate the growth in the number of long-range missile launchers and bombers each may possess.

The SALT II agreement will be signed in Vienna in mid-June, and will then have to be ratified by the U.S. Senate. An earlier treaty, SALT I, was signed in 1972.

While SALT II is being hailed by President Carter as a major step toward peace and arms reductions, in fact it is no such thing.

The main provisions of the SALT II treaty are:

- Each side is "limited" to 2,400 long-range missile launchers and bombers until the end of 1981, and then to 2,250 until the expiration of the treaty in 1985.

- Within that total, there are various subtotals regarding the mix of land-based, submarine-based, and bomber-based missiles.

- Bombers are limited to carrying 28 cruise missiles per plane.

- Land-based missiles are limited to carrying 10 nuclear warheads each, and submarine-based missiles can have a maximum of 14 warheads.

- Each side can develop one new land-based missile system during the course of the treaty. But there are no limits on the number of new submarine-based systems that can be established.

Even this cursory examination of the treaty is enough to show that SALT II has nothing to do with reducing the nuclear arsenal. For example, while the treaty "limits" the number of missile launchers and nuclear bombers to 2,400, the U.S. presently has only 2,058, plus another 224 bombers in storage. This means that under SALT II the U.S. can *increase* its arsenal substantially. To comply with the 1981

limit of 2,250, the U.S. need only scrap 32 of its mothballed bombers.

Similarly, although the treaty "restricts" the number of cruise missiles per bomber to 28, *present bombers* are only capable of carrying 20.

The Pentagon is already developing the new generation of ballistic missiles allowed under the treaty—the MX blockbuster. This system is expected to cost \$40 billion. The U.S. is also speeding construction of Trident nuclear-powered submarines and Trident II missiles for subs. It is developing major new conventional weapons systems as well, such as a new attack helicopter, the Pershing II missile, an antisubmarine helicopter, and the X-M tank and gun.

Under the SALT I treaty the number of U.S. nuclear warheads grew from 4,600 in 1972 to 9,000 at present, and is expected to reach 12,000 in the 1980s. SALT II "limits" the number of warheads to 17,000.

Far from limiting the nuclear arms build-up, SALT II simply redirects portions of it, freeing up some of the Pentagon budget for increased spending on conventional systems.

President Carter's 1980 budget increases war spending by \$10 billion. Secretary of Defense Harold Brown projects that the Pentagon's budget will increase to \$178 billion in five years, a 44 percent increase over 1979, due to "modernization" programs now in the works.

In addition, the Pentagon is planning to establish a new, permanent naval fleet in the Indian Ocean to protect imperialist interests in the Middle East. This fleet will

be based at the island of Diego Garcia.

Carter is also asking for \$5 million to build up the stand-by draft system. Trial balloons are being raised in Congress about reinstating the draft, and a House subcommittee has already voted to start registration.

The Senate debate over ratification of SALT II promises to be a great deal of hot air that has little to do with reality.

Senate conservatives are raising a hue and cry over how SALT II will weaken U.S. military power, while President Carter defends the treaty as a big step toward peace.

Both positions are self-serving lies. Under SALT II the U.S. nuclear and conventional arsenal will grow dramatically. But the treaty will let Carter increase the armed strength of U.S. imperialism under the cover of "arms limitation."

In this effort Carter is being aided by the Communist Party in the U.S., which parrots the class-collaborationist policy of its mentors in Moscow. Rather than expose the real nature of Carter's arms buildup, the American CP's forces have been mobilized for some time to build support for SALT II. Front page headlines in its newspaper, the *Daily World*, announce that SALT II will save \$30 billion. It quotes President Carter at length and *ad nauseum* about the dire consequences if SALT II is not ratified.

The April 27 *Daily World*, for example, notes that "Carter warned that the alternative to SALT II 'is a dark nightmare of unrestrained arms competition,' with sharp increases in military spending 'at the expense of other necessary programs for our people.'"

But nowhere does the CP point out that this is exactly what Carter's 1980 budget does. Through its uncritical support for the administration on SALT II the CP is covering up Carter's real policy—to increase preparations for war under the guise of seeking "disarmament" and "peace." □

The Thatcher Victory in Britain

By Gerry Foley

The international capitalist press had been looking forward for a long time to a Tory victory in the May 3 British elections. And when the hoped-for event arrived, it was immediately pointed to as the harbinger of a general shift to the right in Europe.

The British stock market soared. In South Africa and Rhodesia, the ruling groups rejoiced. In Northern Ireland also, the Tory victory was an encouragement to the most reactionary British colonialists

and their allies.

But the hope expressed most in the international capitalist press was that a Tory government would set about cleaning up the "mess" in Britain—that is, breaking the power of the unions.

In its preelection issue, one of the most authoritative British business magazines, the weekly *Economist*, argued that there was no longer any room for concessions to the labor movement.

"British politicians have pretended at

... Next Week

"South Africa After Soweto." A four-part series by Ernest Harsch, based on eyewitness coverage, interviews, and research conducted during a recent trip to South Africa.

The first installment, "The Evolving Straitjacket of Apartheid," begins next week. Reserve your copy now.

each postwar election that the electorate can vote for and afford both the guns of prosperous private enterprise and the butter of social programmes: but international creditors have long since known that Britain cannot."

Obviously the ability of any British bourgeois government to pursue a more aggressive imperialist policy in southern Africa and Ireland ultimately depends on the capitalists' success in "restoring order" on the home front.

But if the British capitalists looked forward to a chance to open an offensive against the unions, they seemed fearful of the outcome.

In its postelection issue, for example, the *Economist* wrote:

"In the preparation of the Tory manifesto, aggressiveness toward the trade unions became almost a totem of Thatcherite rectitude. This may have been good electioneering, but it makes very bad government. The British trade unions are not badly behaved schoolboys requiring only a stern usher with a big stick. They are an immensely powerful estate of the realm with quite sufficient power to savage, if not obliterate, Mrs. Thatcher's strength of purpose. Tory ministers are foolish if they neglect this clear lesson of the past 10 years."

The "lesson" the *Economist* was referring to was the result of the last Tory victory. In 1970, the workers' disillusion with a Labour government following capitalist policies allowed the Conservatives to get into office. But the Tory cabinet was finally brought down by a militant miners strike. A radicalization also began in the Labour Party itself.

British capitalists obviously fear that this process may be repeated now on a grander scale.

In fact, the *Economist* debated openly with itself in its preelection issue: "... a vote for Tory in 1979 could mean the election of a perfectly awful Labour government by 1984—one far worse than the respectable alternative available today, a house-trained party gone rabid again in the kennels of opposition."

It pointed out that such a confrontation would make life "impossible" for the "moderates" in the unions. That would also promote a turn to the left in the Labour Party, whose "finances and ... votes depend directly on the trade unions—unlike West Germany's more healthy Social Democratic party. . . ."

The British capitalists know that this Tory victory, like the one in 1970, does not reflect a change in the basic relationship of forces between the classes, but rather the workers' lack of enthusiasm for a government that presided over a catastrophic decline in their standard of living.

Harder times obviously lie ahead for the British workers, but also great battles that the capitalists are far from confident that they can win. □

In This Issue

Closing News Date: May 12, 1979

USA	500	125,000 Join Antinuclear March on Washington—by Fred Murphy
COLOMBIA	502	Tens of Thousands in May Day Protests—by Miguel Fuentes
BRAZIL	503	200,000 Workers in May Day Rally
IRAN	504	Arabs Begin to Fight for Their Rights—by Gerry Foley
	505	Iranian Trotskyists Condemn Assassination
EL SALVADOR	505	20,000 Protest Police Massacre
CHINA	507	Torture of Political Prisoners Denounced
CHILE	508	May Day Demonstrators Outfox Pinochet's Police
WESTERN EUROPE	509	What Program for Revolutionists in EEC Elections?—by Anna Libera
INDONESIA	512	Students on Trial for "Insulting" Suharto—by Dan Dickeson
NEWS ANALYSIS	498	SALT Treaty—Cover for Stepped-up U.S. War Drive—by Will Reissner
	498	The Thatcher Victory in Britain—by Gerry Foley
SELECTIONS FROM THE LEFT	506	
DRAWINGS	504	Mehdi Bazargan—by Copain
COVER PHOTO	497	May 6 March on Washington—by Anne Teesdale/Militant

Intercontinental Press (ISSN 0162-5594). Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Village Station, New York, N.Y. 10014. Published in New York each Monday except the first in January and third and fourth in August.

Second-class postage paid at New York, N.Y.

Editor: Mary-Alice Waters.
Contributing Editors: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, Ernest Mandel, George Novack.
Managing Editor: Michael Baumann.
Editorial Staff: Jon Britton, Dan Dickeson, Gerry Foley, Ernest Harsch, Fred Murphy, Susan Wald, Will Reissner.
Business Manager: Harvey McArthur.
Copy Editor: David Martin.

Technical Staff: Paul Deveze, Larry Ingram, Arthur Lobman, Kevin McGuire, James M. Morgan, Sally Rhett.

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 stands on the program of the Fourth International.

To Subscribe: For one year send \$24 to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Village Station, New York, N.Y. 10014. Write for rates on first class and airmail.

In Europe: For air-speeded subscriptions, write to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 50, London N1 2XP, England. In Australia: Write to Pathfinder Press, P.O. Box K208, Haymarket 2000. In New Zealand: Write to Socialist Books, P.O. Box 3774, Auckland.

Subscription correspondence should be addressed to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Village Station, New York, N.Y. 10014.

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.

Intercontinental Press is published by the 408 Printing and Publishing Corporation, 408 West Street, New York, N.Y. 10014. Offices at 408 West Street, New York, N.Y.

Copyright © 1979 by Intercontinental Press.

125,000 Join Antinuclear March on Washington

By Fred Murphy

Led off by a contingent of several thousand residents from the area around the Three Mile Island power plant near Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 125,000 persons joined in an antinuclear demonstration in Washington, D.C., on May 6.

The one-and-a-half mile march down Pennsylvania Avenue to the U.S. Capitol building was by far the biggest antinuclear protest ever held in the United States and one of the largest in the history of the movement internationally.

Marchers came from throughout the eastern United States, and from as far away as Colorado, Illinois, and Alabama. They carried banners and homemade signs calling for an end to nuclear power. It was the first major demonstration to put the blame for the nuclear threat squarely on the Carter administration: "Uncle Sam lies about nuclear safety" and "Split peanuts, not atoms" were two typical slogans.

Many demonstrators came to protest not only nuclear power but nuclear weapons as well. "No more Hiroshimas, no more Harrisburgs" was a popular chant.

The vast majority of the marchers were young people—college and high-school students. For most, it was undoubtedly their first big demonstration of any kind.

Many working people also participated. Rail workers marched under a banner from Lodge 190 of the Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, which had voted unanimously on May 4 to oppose nuclear power and support the march.

Contingents from United Steelworkers Locals 1010 and 6787 in the Chicago area took part, and many more unionists came as individuals—auto workers, postal workers, coal miners, and electrical workers, among others.

Banners identified a chapter of the National Organization for Women, gay rights groups, the National Black Veterans Association, and political groups such as the Socialist Workers Party, Young Socialist Alliance, Communist Party, Youth Against War and Fascism, and the Revolutionary Communist Party.

The march had been called on April 18 after a series of emergency meetings of U.S. antinuclear groups seeking to respond to the near-disaster at the Three Mile Island nuclear plant. The demonstration was organized and built in less than three weeks by a coalition of some 200 antinuclear, community, and political organizations.

Rally at the Capitol

The demonstrators massed in front of

the Capitol building for a rally after the march.

While trade-union participation in the day's events was limited, one of the first speakers at the rally was William Winpisinger, president of the International Association of Machinists. Winpisinger is also a member of the AFL-CIO Executive Council; his presence marked an important break from the pronuclear stance of most of the AFL-CIO hierarchy.

Winpisinger termed nuclear power and the energy issue life-or-death questions for trade unionists. He explained: "Workers slowly die of radiation making nuclear fuel and operating nuclear power plants. Workers transport the fuel. [They] are front-line economic, health, and safety casualties whenever nuclear accidents and mishaps occur."

Nobel laureate Dr. George Wald got an enthusiastic response from the crowd when he stressed the need to build a movement against nuclear weapons as well as nuclear power. "Don't ever stop marching," Wald urged. "Teach your children to march. . . ."

Several of the most prominent speakers—consumer advocate Ralph Nader, actress Jane Fonda, and one-time antiwar activist Tom Hayden—tried to orient the movement toward the 1980 elections. Having taken for good coin Carter's vague 1976 statements about nuclear power being a "last resort," they now blasted his "betrayal." Hayden urged the crowd to seek an "alternate president" and an "alternate program."

Soon after Hayden finished, Governor Jerry Brown of California mounted the platform to a mixture of boos and cheers. Brown has carried out sharp cuts in social services in his home state and advocates doing the same on a national scale. Now he is trying to climb on the antinuclear bandwagon in hopes of defeating Carter for the 1980 Democratic Presidential nomination. But he failed to generate much enthusiasm in Washington with his call to "join the politics of the future."

The dangers of nuclear power were explained by such experts as pediatrician Helen Caldicott, physicist John Gofman, and ecologist Barry Commoner. Commoner focused much of his talk on the need for solar power, but he differentiated his stance from that of Governor Brown, another solar advocate: "There is no sensible way, as some politicians would have it, to favor solar energy and at the same time call for cutbacks in social services, a lower federal budget, or 'voluntary poverty.'"

Commoner called for "rebuilding the economy, creating new industries and new jobs, raising the standard of living, and restoring economic progress to the nation."

Other rally speakers included American Indian leader Elsie Peshlaker, who spoke of the dangers her people face from uranium mining; Susan Cassidy, a pregnant woman forced to flee her home near the Three Mile Island nuclear plant; and Orville Kelly, a cancer-stricken veteran of the U.S. atomic weapons tests in the Marshall Islands in 1958.

The huge turnout on May 6 far exceeded the organizers' expectations. It provided proof that the Three Mile Island accident and its aftermath have sharply alerted the American people to the deadly threat of the nuclear industry.

Fresh Revelations

The size of the crowd was undoubtedly swelled further by the flood of fresh revelations that came in the days leading up to the march. Among the government cover-ups, heightened radiation dangers, and cases of industry incompetence made known were the following:

- Documents released at Congressional hearings in late April showed that the Atomic Energy Commission and President Dwight Eisenhower were aware by 1955 that nuclear weapons tests in Nevada were dumping high levels of radioactive fallout on populated areas in Nevada, Utah, and Arizona. But the tests went on until 1963, while the government continually reassured the public that there was no danger.

- "At no time were we told or talked to about the effects of radiation," Nevada resident Martha Laird told an April 23 hearing in Las Vegas. "All this time we were feeding this to our children. We were feeding our children and families poison from those bombs." Mrs. Laird's husband and son were both stricken with leukemia after the 1950s bomb tests.

- On April 27 the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) finally agreed to insist on recommendations by its own staff and ordered the temporary closing of two reactors manufactured by the Babcock & Wilcox Company, which produced the Three Mile Island plant. But the NRC allowed two other B&W reactors to remain in operation for several more weeks owing to power company claims that immediate shutdowns would cause power shortages.

Five other B&W plants had already halted operations for refueling or repairs. All nine reactors are to undergo technical modifications that the NRC claims will

lessen the chances of a Three Mile Island-type accident. The Union of Concerned Scientists has termed these changes "superficial and cosmetic."

• Two new radiation studies were released by the National Academy of Sciences on April 29. One, financed by the Department of Energy, predicted that 2,000 U.S. residents would die of cancer in the next twenty years as a result of exposure to man-made radiation sources. But the other study reported that one American in a thousand—some 220,000 persons—would contract cancer as a result of exposure to man-made or natural radiation.

• On May 2 the Oyster Creek nuclear plant near Atlantic City, New Jersey, underwent an emergency shutdown, apparently owing to faulty instrument readings. Cooling water pumps failed to work, and the water level in the reactor core dropped to dangerously low levels. The accident was not announced publicly until two days later.

Oyster Creek, which has experienced four unscheduled closings since December, belongs to the same company that owns Three Mile Island.

• On May 3, Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Joseph Califano told a Senate committee that between one and ten persons would probably die from cancer as a result of exposure to radiation from Three Mile Island and that ten additional "nonfatal" cancers could be expected. Califano had claimed a month earlier that there was *no* cancer risk to persons living near the plant.

Even Califano's new figures were highly suspect. Radiation physicist Dr. Ernest Sternglass pointed out that the government was failing to take into account damage done by inhaled radioactive gases and that if this were done estimated eventual deaths would range between 300 and 2,500.

• During the first week of May long-forgotten quantities of radioactive waste were discovered in an old warehouse in Elizabeth, New Jersey; in a water silo in Lewiston, New York; and at a shopping center construction site in Jersey City, New Jersey. The Lewiston and Jersey City wastes had been left over from the Manhattan Project—Washington's crash effort to build an atomic bomb in the 1940s.

Labor's Alternative to Nuclear Power

All this new information on the nuclear danger lends added urgency to the demand for an immediate shutdown of the nuclear industry—the overwhelming sentiment of the May 6 demonstrators.

President Carter gave his answer the day after the march. "It's out of the question to peremptorily shut down all of the nuclear power plants in this country," he told a delegation of May 6 organizers.

In fact, Carter was only expressing more bluntly the position he holds in common

Steelworkers Joining Antinuclear Fight



Mike Olszanski

[Below are excerpts from remarks made by Mike Olszanski at a rally at the beginning of the May 6 march. Olszanski is head of the environmental committee of United Steelworkers Local 1010 in East Chicago, Indiana, and a leading labor spokesperson against nuclear power.]

* * *

I'm proud to be a part of this movement and proud to be here representing the 18,000 steelworkers of Local 1010, the largest in the Steelworkers union. Ours was the first Steelworkers local, in 1976, to publicly oppose nuclear power plants.

Even more importantly, our Steelworkers District 31, representing 120,000 steelworkers in Chicago and northwest Indiana, went on record last year opposing construction of the Bailly nuclear plant by Lake Michigan.

The significance of my being here today is not in anything I might say but in the fact that we in District 31 can add to this struggle the support, the clout of 120,000 steelworkers.

We in the labor movement must recognize the options in terms of energy use and insist that those options com-

patible with our goals of full employment, a high standard of living, and the health, safety, and quality of life of our members are adopted.

The struggle in this country today is a political one between corporate monopolies and people. The antinuclear movement should see that and remind us which side we're on.

People can control our own destinies. People can share in the benefits of our technological, automated society. People can prevent the destructive misuse of technology, both in the building of weapons of war and in the destruction of the environment, our health and lives, through shortsighted and greedy application of industrial technology like nuclear power.

People can get control over our own collective lives. The name of the game is political power. There may come a time in the not-too-distant future when environmentalists may join steelworkers on the picket lines to force the giant corporations to obey the law. But now we are joining your picket line. We can stand together. Solidarity is the watchword of the labor movement.

But, in the words of an old song, "Freedom doesn't come like a bird on the wing. You've got to work for it, fight for it, day and night for it. And every generation has to win it again."

with the Democratic Party politicians who are now weighing a challenge to him for the 1980 Presidential nomination. Although California Governor Brown and Massachusetts Senator Edward Kennedy both seek to win support from the antinuclear movement, neither opposes the continued operation of nuclear plants now in place.

The best Brown could offer the demonstrators when he showed up to speak on May 6 was a call for a "moratorium" on the building of new reactors. Kennedy sent a vaguely worded message about how "glad" he is to be part of "a national reassessment . . . to determine whether any additional commitments to nuclear power should be made."

Many of the more conservative organizations and figures in the U.S. antinuclear movement express similar views, holding that a "gradual" or "phased" shutdown of nuclear plants may be called for. But the crowd at the May 6 rally was considerably more radical, reserving its heaviest applause for those who made an unequivocal call for "No nukes!"

The Socialist Workers Party is putting forward proposals to the trade unions and to antinuclear activists that point toward a

realistic way to implement that demand. An editorial in the May 18 issue of the *Militant* explains:

... the capitalist politicians say they can't shut down nuclear plants because there are no immediate alternatives. They say we have to wait until these are developed.

But there is an immediate alternative: Shut the nukes down today! Use the coal plants already in existence and expand coal production to meet the nation's needs for electric power. This could be done *right now* while other energy sources are developed.

The United Mine Workers union points out that there is no need to devote gigantic federal subsidies to the nuclear risk. There are vast coal reserves waiting to be mined.

The entire labor movement should be fighting for this alternative.

If the energy industry says it can't "afford" to use coal because of the costs of environmental standards and union safety demands, the unions should respond: "Let's open the books of the energy corporations to public inspection. Let's see just how small the costs are compared with the profits the companies rake in."

"Such a campaign by the labor movement," the editorial concludes, "would provide a real answer to the lies and crimes of the nuclear industry and the government." □

Colombia—Tens of Thousands Join May Day Protests

By Miguel Fuentes

BOGOTA—Workers, peasants, slum dwellers, students, and women poured into the streets of Colombia's major cities on May 1 to protest government torture and repression and the skyrocketing cost of living.

Solidarity with the striking steel and iron-ore workers of Paz del Rio was also a central theme of the demonstrations.

Despite a massive military and police presence—including tanks, riot vehicles, jeeps mounted with machine guns, and troops armed with automatic weapons—more than 40,000 persons joined the May Day demonstration and rally in Bogotá sponsored by the National Trade-Union Council (CNS). The CNS had called for a "united May 1," and united it was. Almost every union in the country was represented, along with peasant organizations, women's groups, and professional organizations.

For more than three hours the various contingents marched from the Plaza de Toros to the Plaza Bolívar in front of the capitol building. Among the marchers were contingents from the Revolutionary Socialist Party and the Socialist Workers Party, Colombian sympathizing organizations of the Fourth International. Nearly 1,000 persons marched under the Trotskyists' banners.

Despite the provocative show of military force, no incidents occurred at the rally site. Representatives of Colombia's four main union federations addressed the demonstrators.

The turnout in Bogotá was clearly larger than that for May Day here a year ago. Reports indicate heavier participation as well in other major cities such as Cali, Medellín, and Sogamoso. This reflects the growing militancy of the working class in face of the government's austerity program and repression aimed increasingly at the labor movement.

Colombia's trade unions are divided among four main federations, each under a leadership with a different political orientation.¹ But pressure from the ranks has forced the bureaucracies to form a coordinating body, the CNS. Class unity is fragile, however, as both the bureaucrats and

1. The CTC and UTC are linked to Colombia's two big capitalist parties, the Liberals and Conservatives respectively. The CGT orients to the Christian Democrats, while the CSTC is controlled by the pro-Moscow Communist Party.

the government maneuver to prevent the formation of a single, united labor federation.

President Julio César Turbay Ayala laid out his government's policy toward the labor movement in a speech printed in the country's main dailies on May 1. After declaring Colombia one of the most advanced countries in the world with regard to labor law, Turbay got to the point:

In its actions, the working class has achieved great maturity, and only in a small number of cases can political ends be attributed to the labor leadership. Experience has shown the organized workers that within the framework of the law they can gain national sympathy for their demands. However, fighting in a sterile fashion against our juridical order diminishes their position and does damage to the very interests they seek to serve.

Turbay was referring to the labor movement's recent involvement in the struggle for democratic rights. At the National Forum for Defense of Human Rights² held here March 30-April 1, the unions joined in condemning government torture, military trials, censorship, arbitrary detention of labor and political leaders, and other violations of human rights. Thus Turbay's message was loud and clear: Stick with economic issues and we can get along, but start raising political demands and we will have to consider the labor movement "unpatriotic" and take harsher measures.

There are some indications that the regime's pressure is having an impact. At the May Day rally, the main banner hanging from the capitol said "Against high prices, for wage increases." Missing was any slogan concerning human and democratic rights. Such slogans had been prominent in the propaganda leading up to the day's protests, and most contingents carried large banners and placards demanding a halt to the torture and repression. So it can hardly be an accident that the theme was missing from the principal banner.

The government held a ceremony on May Day to honor Colombia's "democratic" unions—that is, those directly tied to the two-party system of capitalist rule. UTC leader Alvaro Ramírez Pinilla and CTC leader Tomás Herazo Rios were presented with the "Order of Labor." Turbay himself has held talks with UTC and CTC

2. See *Intercontinental Press/Inprecor*, April 30, p. 430.

officials in recent weeks and has indicated a "conciliatory" attitude toward their economic demands. The government is thus taking pains to recognize the "legitimacy" of these federations while attempting to isolate the Christian Democratic CGT and the CP-led CSTC.

Turbay hopes in this way to block the unification of the four federations and the growth of the unions with more radical leaderships. The UTC and CTC bureaucrats are only too happy to accommodate the regime in this, but they face growing rank-and-file pressure and militancy. This is currently being expressed in a wave of strikes.

The most important of these struggles is that of the 7,500 striking steel and iron-ore workers at the Siderúrgica Nacional (national steel mill) of Paz del Rio. The once-nationalized, now private, company was struck on April 6 for the first time in its thirty-year history. For the last month not a single sheet of steel has left the mills, nor has an ounce of iron ore been mined. Much of Colombia's metalworking industry, employing some 300,000 workers, has already been affected.

The Paz del Rio union is demanding a 50 percent pay hike to make up for inflation—nearly three times the government's wage ceiling of 18 percent. The company has offered 28 percent, but this has been rejected by the strikers. Wide recognition of the strike's importance has brought many demonstrations of labor solidarity—resolutions, money and food donations, and delegations of unionists to help staff the picket lines.

The government also faces an impending strike by the workers of ECOPETROL, the state oil industry. The 7,500 oil workers are organized in the Unión Sindical Obrera (USO—General Workers Union), historically a militant union. The USO can virtually paralyze the Colombian economy if it shuts down the oil center of Bucaramanga. The regime has already militarized that city in an attempt to intimidate the workers, and in the past it has not hesitated to massacre oil strikers.

The central issue in the ECOPETROL negotiations is the USO's demand for the rehiring of 217 workers fired during a 1977 strike. Neither the union nor the company has shown any sign of backing down on this.

May 3, 1979



Part of May Day rally in São Bernardo—the biggest yet held under the dictatorship. O Trabalho

200,000 Workers in Brazil May Day Rally

By Fred Murphy

"It was the biggest May 1 rally since the dictatorship has been in existence," the São Paulo fortnightly *O Trabalho* reported in its May 3-15 issue. "Two hundred thousand persons in the Vila Euclides municipal stadium in São Bernardo. Hundreds of banners with the most varied slogans; delegations arriving in chartered buses from many cities; workers, teachers, public employees—such was the panorama of one of the biggest united demonstrations of Brazilian workers, held in the midst of one of the most intense strike waves the country has ever seen."

The rally in São Bernardo do Campo—one of the three big industrial suburbs southeast of São Paulo known collectively as ABC—was organized by a coalition of some fifty trade unions.

While the rally was taking place, strikes were under way involving 11,000 teachers in Brasília; 200,000 public employees and teachers in São Paulo state; 11,000 students and teachers at Catholic University in Salvador; and most students at the University of São Paulo.

During the weeks before May Day, 18,000 shipyard workers had struck for fourteen days in Niterói and teachers throughout the state of Rio Grande do Sul had stopped work for twelve days. Five thousand bus drivers in the city and suburbs of São Paulo went on strike on May 3, and teachers in Rio de Janeiro and Belo Horizonte were preparing to do the same.

All these strikes have centered around demands for wage increases of about 70%, challenging the 45.4% maximum decreed by the military dictatorship. (Inflation in Brazil is currently running at an annual rate of about 70%.)

The present explosion of strikes began

March 13, when more than 200,000 metalworkers in the big auto and steel plants in ABC and other São Paulo suburbs walked off their jobs to demand trade-union rights and a 78% wage hike. That strike was suspended for forty-five days on March 28 after the Figueiredo government ordered the removal of the elected leadership of the ABC metalworkers unions and arrested some 1,600 strike pickets.

"They thought they were going to finish off the movement in ABC by intervening in the unions," São Bernardo metalworkers union President Luis Inácio da Silva ("Lula") told the massive May Day rally.

They forgot that the union is not only a building. The union is the worker in the factory and the worker in the plaza. And the ABC metalworkers know that we only granted a truce until Sunday the thirteenth [of May, the day the forty-five day strike suspension expires]. We'll have an assembly on that day—and we want to have just as many people as we have here today—and if they don't grant our wage increase, on the fourteenth ABC will be out on strike again.

Benedito Marcílio, Santo André metalworkers union president, termed the huge May Day rally "an answer to this government and this dictatorship." He focused his remarks on an important obstacle Brazilian workers face in their efforts to organize:

Companheiros, we all know that what we have in this country is a fascist union structure, imposed on us, which has served all the governments in this country. But we workers—organized in the plants, with factory commissions, with the organization of the workers, and with strikes—are going to overturn that union structure. . . .

Marcílio explained how trade-union freedom will be won in Brazil:

There is only one solution . . . unity of the workers in the plants, in the neighborhood clubs, in the unions. That is how we will win trade-union freedom, contracts, and the full right to strike. But we won't get freedom and union independence if we don't get a free society. . . .

Companheiros, we are right when we say that the dictatorship will only be done away with in this country through the organization of the masses—of the workers, the students, the teachers, the medical workers—of all the segments of this society.

Marcílio's speech reflected the way in which the fight for democratic rights in Brazil is converging with the big rise in working-class struggles. This was also evident in the speech given at the May Day rally by Luiz Eduardo Greenhalgh, a leader of the Brazilian Committee for Amnesty:

This is a historic May 1 in our country, a May 1 that is going to show the dictatorship that its days are numbered and that the Brazilian people will proceed resolutely in winning their political rights. . . .

Amnesty is a fight that must be part of the democratic and popular struggle right here in Santo André, São Bernardo, and São Caetano [ABC]. . . . We won't accept the intervention [in the metalworkers unions]. We are going to demand that our companheiros in the union leaderships be amnestied, and we will all win that amnesty. . . . We are going to win the release of the political prisoners and the return of the exiles, bring to justice those who murdered the patriots of this country, and put the leaders back in their unions.

Greenhalgh's speech was greeted with chants of "Down with the dictatorship" from the massive crowd of workers.

Other May Day rallies of 8,000 and 3,000 respectively took place in Rio de Janeiro and Belo Horizonte. □

Arabs in Iran Begin to Fight for Their Rights

By Gerry Foley

The Arabs, an oppressed nationality who live in Iran's oil-producing area, the province of Khuzestan, have begun to mobilize in defense of their national rights.

In the first major Arab demonstration, 100,000 persons gathered in Khorramshahr April 27 to protest harassment of Mohammed Taher al-Shobeir Khaqani, the main Arab religious leader, by the Imam's Committees.

The local committees that claim allegiance to Ayatollah Khomeini tend to be Persian racist organizations in areas such as Khuzestan. The population there is divided about equally between the oppressed Arabs and an upper caste of Persians.

Very few Arabs are assimilated into the Persian population. Most can be easily distinguished by their color. In the past, there was a considerable infusion of Black African blood into the local Arab population. A fair sprinkling of them look very much like Black Africans.

In fact, the position of Arabs in Iranian society resembles that of Blacks in the United States and Britain. They form the most exploited section of the large industrial working class in Khuzestan. They are subjected to residential segregation and many other forms of discrimination.

Arab nationalism goes back at least two decades in Iran. But the movement was savagely repressed by the Pahlavi dictatorship, which was able to break or corrupt much of the tribal leadership in Khuzestan.

Any struggle by the Arab people very quickly raises fundamental class questions. A leadership that is unwilling to face these problems and to take a determined stand in defense of the interests of the Arabs as superexploited workers cannot offer a realistic road forward. This came out very clearly in a interview I had with a spokesman of the Arab Cultural Center in Khorramshahr in late April.

The Cultural Center spokesman was a right-wing Maoist, distinguishable from the pro-Moscow Stalinists of the Tudeh Party only by his use of very abstract terminology. The program he presented for the Arab struggle was a carbon copy of that of the Democratic Party of Kurdistan, the Tudeh Party's Kurdish organization. Its centerpiece was the demand for "autonomy," which was defined in an essentially negative way, by specifying first all the fundamental powers that would remain in the hands of the central government.



BAZARGAN: Since referendum, has escalated attacks against Arab people.

However, the Cultural Center had done a lot of work to document the position of the Arab people in the economy of Khuzestan. The spokesman began the interview by reviewing the main facts of this. I asked him how the "autonomy" he described could change the situation of the Arab people. He did not answer the question.

I asked if he thought that the central government could be persuaded to take the kind of deepgoing measures necessary to change the position of the Arabs in the economy. He did not answer that question either.

He had said that the Bazargan government was essentially a good one, "a national government," that is, one not dominated by imperialism, and that the aim was to put pressure on it to grant the Arab demands, not to try to change it.

However, the Bazargan government is obviously not going to transform the economy in a way that could eliminate the superexploitation of the Arabs.

I said that since the Arabs were the most exploited workers, they obviously needed unions the most, and asked what the Cultural Center was doing to promote unionization. The answer was that it was not doing anything because "there are no contradictions among the Arab people." The fact is that the government and Khomeini oppose the formation of unions, and

thus promoting unionization would involve standing up to them.

On the other hand, it was obvious that the membership of the Cultural Center really did want to fight for Arab rights. They gathered around to listen to the interview and became very interested in the possibility of finding allies internationally. They were especially interested in making contacts with Black militants in the U.S.

Khuzestan is a major industrial area, and all the international currents in the workers movement are present there. The Socialist Workers Party, the Iranian Trotskyist organization, for example, has a number of very active branches.

Since the Trotskyists are the only organization on the left that speaks out unequivocally in defense of the oppressed nationalities, they have been developing very fraternal relations with the militant Arab groups.

The day I interviewed the spokesman of the Arab Cultural Center, a reporter for the Iranian Trotskyist paper *Kargar* talked to Abdul Rafursaleh, a representative of the Setad-e Siyasi-ye Khalq-e 'Arab (the Political Front of the Arab People). Rafursaleh is a nationalist fighter with a twenty-year record of struggle. He explained why the Setad had been formed:

When the struggle started against the regime, we fought shoulder to shoulder with our brothers of other nationalities. And we played an important role in winning the victory because of what we did both inside and outside Iran. Internationally we introduced Iranians to other organizations, such as the Palestinians and forces in other Arab countries who were friends of our nationality. . . .

After the great victory of our revolution, the Political Front of the Arab People was formed, not because of any official order or compulsion but because we felt wholeheartedly that since we had freed ourselves from the regime we should have freedom. We thought we should have freedom of speech and freedom of political activity.

The front and other nationalist groups have presented the government with a list of twelve demands. Rafursaleh enumerated them as follows:

Recognition of the Arabic language as the first language of the Arab people at all levels of education.

Freedom of speech and press in the Arabic language.

Representation of the Arab people in the Constituent Assembly.

Formation of Arab councils in Khuzestan to approve the laws applied locally.

Setting up of Arab courts for solving problems according to Islamic rules.

An Arabic broadcasting service independent of the national radio-TV network.

Freedom for disseminating Arab culture.

Use of a percentage of oil revenues for developing Arab education and the Khuzestan area.

Arab delegates in the national parliament.

Arabs in the council of ministers, the army, and the military academies.

Restoration of the original Arabic names of

cities and villages in Khuzestan.

Incorporation of all these points in the constitution of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Rafursaleh stressed:

The Arab people have decided that they will not settle for anything less than all of their demands. We will not settle for one word less. . . .

If the present government tries by some political trick or any other means to deny us our rights, that will be a dark day. Because our people have decided to achieve their rights by any means necessary. . . .

We hope that the present government will not keep on referring to us as just "Arabic speaking people." We are the Arab nationality. And we are proud of belonging to the Arab nationality.

Unlike in Kurdistan and Turkmenistan, in Khuzestan nationalism was not generally expressed in an opposition to Khomeini's proposal of an Islamic republic. The Arabs saw this slogan as meaning closer ties with the rest of the Middle East, specifically the Arab nations. As a result, Khomeini's picture hangs even in the headquarters of Arab organizations that bitterly denounce the government and the activities of the Islamic committees in Arab areas. This is in contrast to Kurdistan, where Khomeini's picture is never seen, and to Turkmenistan, where he is hated.

However, since the referendum on the Islamic republic, the Bazargan government and the procapitalist Muslim groups have been escalating their attacks on the Arab people. A general political confrontation seems to be shaping up between the Arabs and those forces that want to re-stabilize the centralized bourgeois state.

Rafursaleh warned that his organization would actively oppose any deal between the government and so-called representatives of the Arab people that fell short of its demands.

Some of those who want to go to Tehran as delegates are tribal chiefs. They are not the real representatives of the Arab people. They were imposed on it. . . .

If these people go to Tehran and talk to the Bazargan government, and we don't like the agreement they reach, we will express our disagreement with telegrams and demonstrations. Only those who prove themselves in the struggle that is going on now can represent the Arab people.

"Our fight is inseparable from that of the other oppressed nationalities," Rafursaleh concluded. "We hope that the Iranian working class, which shut down the factories and shut off the oil, will get its rights, because it has not yet done so. . . . We think that it is most important that its demands be met, because if it were not for the working class, it would have been impossible to overthrow the corrupt regime. . . . Because it is the working class that is going to reconstruct Iranian society." □

Statement of Iranian Trotskyists

'We Condemn Assassination of Ayatollah Motahari'

[The following statement on the assassination of Ayatollah Motahari, a close associate of Khomeini, was issued May 2 by the Hezb-e Kargaran-e Sosialist (Socialist Workers Party, the Iranian Trotskyist organization). It was published in the May 5 issue of *Ayendegan*, the Iranian national morning paper under the headline, "The Reaction of the Socialist Workers Party." The translation is by *Intercontinental Press/Inprecor*.]

* * *

The terrorist attack on Ayatollah Motahari was a counterrevolutionary act. It was an act against the toilers. The consequences of it can only be harmful to their interests.

Terrorist actions give the counterrevolutionary forces an opportunity to mobilize their forces against the toilers and the workers organizations by helping to create an atmosphere of confusion and intimidation.

What the workers and the toilers need today is an opportunity to express themselves politically. They need freedom and democracy so that they can organize their forces to overcome the deep economic, social, and political crisis in our country. This crisis is the legacy of the former regime that was tied to imperialism. And in the present situation of the capitalist economy, it has assumed a more acute form.

Anything that disrupts this political advance of the broad masses can only serve the interests of the counterrevolutionary forces.

Basing itself on the tradition of revolutionary Marxism, the Socialist Workers Party condemns all forms of individual terror as an obstacle to a conscious struggle by the workers and all the oppressed for socialism. Reaffirming this historic position, we deplore the assassination of Ayatollah Motahari and express our sorrow at his death. □

20,000 Protest Police Massacre in El Salvador

Twenty thousand persons marched in San Salvador on May 10, in a funeral procession for seventeen of the twenty-three demonstrators gunned down by Gen. Carlos Humberto Romero's cops two days earlier.

"As the long lines of mourners walked the two miles from the Metropolitan Cathedral to the cemetery," Alan Riding reported in a May 10 dispatch to the *New York Times*, "thousands of people came out of markets and from behind stalls to applaud and shout their support, while youths painted anti-Government graffiti on walls and buildings."

On May 8, Romero's police had opened fire on a peaceful demonstration of about 300 workers and peasants outside the Metropolitan Cathedral in San Salvador. "They just mowed us down like chickens," wounded mechanic Andres Flores told *Times* correspondent Riding.

At least thirty-eight persons were wounded in the assault, in addition to those killed.

Activists from the Revolutionary People's Bloc (BPR)—a coalition of trade unions, peasant organizations, and student and community groups—began a sit-in at the cathedral on May 4 to demand the release of BPR General Secretary Faundo Guardado and four other labor and

student leaders arrested in late April. Protesters also occupied the French and Costa Rican embassies in San Salvador on that date.

Romero's government claimed that the May 8 shooting began when snipers opened fire on the cops from inside the cathedral. "But many witnesses, including several foreign reporters who were at the scene, said that the security forces opened fire without warning at demonstrators sitting on the street and sidewalks in front of the cathedral," Riding reported in a May 9 dispatch.

The demonstration was one of at least five in the Salvadoran capital on May 8. Groups of 200 to 300 protesters rallied at several points in the city to express support for the BPR's demands and listen to antigovernment speakers.

The sit-in at the cathedral was continuing as of May 10, while the occupiers at the French embassy continued to hold the ambassador and several officials as hostages. The occupation at the Costa Rican embassy ended May 9 when the BPR activists there were granted safe conduct out of the country.

In addition to the street demonstrations one-hour solidarity strikes by teachers, brewery workers, construction workers, and other unions were held on May 8.

Selections From the Left

[Much of the left press around the world has expressed opposition to nuclear power in the wake of the near-meltdown at Three Mile Island in the United States on March 28. In this week's column, we note some of the more outstanding exceptions to this.]

* * *

ИЗВЕСТИЯ

"Izvestia" (News), organ of the Soviets of Workers Deputies of the USSR. Published daily in Moscow.

In a lengthy April 11 article under the headline "Energy Perspectives," Academician A. Aleksandrov (three time Hero of Socialist Labor and president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences) explains that there are "excellent prospects for atomic energy" in the Soviet Union and that the country's energy sources in the coming decades will be primarily coal and nuclear power.

Aleksandrov notes that nuclear energy does have "an important adverse side to it"—radioactive wastes—but that this amounts to no more than an "engineering problem" that can be "safely solved, whatever the scale of energy involved."

The Kremlin's leading scientific hack claims that "detailed studies of the negative effects on the environment by coal-fired electric plants have shown that they essentially do greater harm than atomic plants." Thus, "the uproar surrounding the construction of nuclear power plants has its real source in something else altogether. The development of atomic plants of great capacity could jeopardize the profits of the fuel monopolies.

"The treatment by the Western press of the accident at the atomic reactor in Harrisburg, U.S.A., with essentially minor (!) unfavorable consequences being described in greatly exaggerated fashion, is also a continuation of the campaign against atomic energy. . . .

"The inconsistent position of the U.S. authorities on questions of energy development is caused by their impotence in the face of the oil monopolies on the one hand, and on the other, their understanding of the inevitability of the extensive development of atomic energy. . . ."

DAILY WORLD

Newspaper of the Communist Party U.S.A. Published in New York.

The editors' initial response to the Three Mile Island accident came in the March 30 issue. They found in the Pennsylvania events a "dire warning"—not that all nuclear plants must be shut down, but

"that the fight for adequate safeguards must be stepped up."

The only way to "guarantee" such safeguards, they said, is "through nationalization of the energy industry under people's control."

The editors returned to this theme on April 3. While admitting that "nuclear power is lethal," they reiterated that "the nuclear energy industry is a public property which must be nationalized, taken out of the hands of the Energy Department and administered by special public bodies representative of the entire population."

All this, along with the authoritative-sounding and categorical statement by CP leader Victor Perlo in the *People's World* (see selection on this page) could understandably have led American CP members to the conclusion that they should oppose the growing antinuclear movement—which is more and more taking up the demand for immediately shutting down the entire industry.

But this was evidently not what the Stalinist leadership had in mind. In an attempt to clear up the confusion, CP General Secretary Gus Hall explained in the April 21 *Daily World* that it is the "inherent, socially irresponsible nature of capitalism that gives rise to the movements and struggles around nuclear power."

"Any idea," Hall declared, "that this broad movement is 'masterminded by oil monopolies' is not only false, but a slander."

The principal source of such slanders—and of the American CP's obvious squirming on the nuclear question—is Hall's own Soviet mentors. They are proceeding full speed ahead with the construction of atomic plants and have no interest in seeing a strong antinuclear movement arise internationally. (See the selection from *Izvestia* on this page.)

As the date for the huge May 6 antinuclear march on Washington grew closer, the *Daily World* took a generally friendly attitude. Michael Myerson explained why in a May 5 column. He criticized those who "sit out the anti-nuclear movement, preferring to point out its weaknesses. . . ."

Myerson continued:

Of course the movement has weaknesses, serious ones. It is by and large provincial, reflecting the impetus it gets from those who live closest to the reactors, for the most part suburbanites. . . . Still, those who think of themselves as Marxists should understand that, while the working class is the leading revolutionary class, it has and needs allies; that in the United States an anti-monopoly coalition requires progressive middle-class components.

The American Stalinists' strategic goal is to forge an "antimonopoly coalition" with the "progressive" bourgeois politi-

cians and labor bureaucrats inside the Democratic Party. And these elements are beginning to feel the heat of the antinuclear movement, just as the CP is.

The *Daily World's* report on the massive march on Washington was generally favorable. But its May 8 article did allude to the direction the CP would like to see the movement take, noting a "glaring weakness" in the "failure of organizers to project the demand for Senate ratification of the SALT II agreement with the Soviet Union."

PEOPLE'S WORLD

West Coast newspaper of the Communist Party U.S.A. Published weekly in Berkeley, California.

Under the headline "In Defense of Nuclear Power," veteran CP leader Victor Perlo stated in a two-page letter to the editor published in the March 31 issue that "it is clear that the Party supports the peaceful use of atomic energy as having 'already brought great benefits to mankind' and promising 'tremendous' future benefits. Hence it disagrees with opposition to peaceful uses of atomic energy."

Perlo was quoting from a November 1978 statement on nuclear power by the CP leadership, which had touched off a debate on the question in the pages of *People's World*.

Since radioactive steam from the damaged Three Mile Island reactor was already drifting over Pennsylvania as *People's World* was going to press, editor Carl Bloice felt compelled to comment in an adjacent editorial that ". . . I fear [Perlo] is too sanguine about the matter."

Readers responded to Perlo in the April 14 issue. One called Perlo's arguments "almost incredible," while another declared that "publishing Victor Perlo's 'Defense of Nuclear Power' on the heels of the Three Mile Island disaster was certainly a grotesque way to celebrate April Fool's Day."

Bulletin

Twice-weekly organ of the Central Committee of the Workers League. Published in New York.

The American adepts of Gerry Healy Thought saw in the May 6 march on Washington "an attempt to revive the antiwar protest movement of the 1960s around the issue of nuclear power. Prominent among the organizers of the rally were the Stalinists of the Communist Party and the revisionists of the FBI-led [sic] Socialist Workers Party."

For the Healyites, the march was "a completely bankrupt protest, offering no perspective for struggle to anyone seriously concerned about the dangers posed by the development of nuclear power under capitalist private ownership."

WORKERS VANGUARD

Marxist working-class biweekly of the Spartacist League of the U.S. Published in New York.

"Thousands of hippies crawled out of the

woodwork to wave balloons and languish in the tulips," the May 11 issue reported, referring to the May 6 antinuclear march on Washington.

The Spartacist League, a tiny U.S. sect that claims to be Trotskyist, termed the huge action "a rally for know-nothing populism within the framework of the Democratic Party."

Workers Vanguard bears the dubious distinction of being the only publication on the American left to campaign for nuclear power. The April 13 issue, for example, denounced "anti-industrial eco-faddists" and declared the Spartacists' decided opposition to "those who would arrest the

development of the productive forces essential to the future of mankind."

For the Spartacists, nuclear power tops the list of such "essential" productive forces. Among the ingenious suggestions they offer for furthering its development are the following:

"... why not test an actual meltdown in the desert to see how to protect against it? Perhaps the water table (which blows the hot radioactive material back up to the surface) can be dropped. Or an enormous underground concrete silo could be constructed as part of the containment guarding against the most destructive effects of a meltdown."

Beijing Wall Poster Tells of Conditions Behind Bars

Torture of Political Prisoners Denounced in China

[The following are excerpts from the article "The Twentieth Century Bastille—Qin Cheng No. 1 Prison," written by Wei Jingsheng, one of China's best-known fighters for democratic rights. The article, dated March 3, 1979, is circulating in mimeograph form in Beijing and has been widely reprinted in Chinese publications outside of China, including the pro-Peking Hong Kong monthly *Jeng Ming* (Contention) and the Hong Kong *Huang He* (Yellow River), published by former Red Guards. This translation is from the May 7, 1979, *New York Times*, taken from the original mimeograph edition obtained in Beijing.]

[Wei's article documents the widespread use of torture against political prisoners by the Mao regime, a fact long denied by the Chinese government. It is striking for the revelations of the treatment given to even the highest officials who were attacked by the government during the "Cultural Revolution" of the 1960s. It cites in particular the case of Wang Guangmei, the wife of Liu Shaoqi, (Liu Shao-ch'i) China's head of state until 1968. Wang, one of the most famous women in China, was an active political leader and a deputy to the National People's Congress. Wei Jingsheng describes the many years of torture she underwent in Qin Cheng No. 1, before her release and "rehabilitation" early this year.]

[Wei Jingsheng, who is an electrical worker and an editor of the opposition mimeographed journal *Explorations*, was himself arrested March 29. He is charged with "counterrevolutionary activity," which under the practice of the Chinese Communist Party can bring anything up to a death sentence. This example of Wei's journalism is an indication of why the

Stalinist leaders of the Chinese CP are so anxious to silence the dissidents.]

* * *

Traveling by car along the main road in the Changping suburb of Peking, you will come upon a hot-spring resort set in scenery as beautiful as a painting. You will be looking at the famous spa called Xiao Tang Shan. Tradition has it that the Dowager Empress, Tzu Hsi, often came to take the waters here.

If you continue toward the north, after a few minutes you will see a sign the size of a table on which it is written in several languages: "Foreigners not admitted." The uninitiated will think they have come to a prohibited military area. Those who know a little more of what is going on will instantly feel a pang of hidden terror, because if you keep on for a short stretch, you will come to the penitentiary for important political prisoners that is famous throughout China: Qin Cheng No. 1.

Electrified Barbed Wire

Both the main gate and the sentinel box are very ordinary looking. A stranger who wandered down here would not imagine that there was anything amiss. Beyond is the main part of Qin Cheng Prison, enclosed by walls three meters high topped with electrified barbed wire.

Qin Cheng is kept carefully isolated from the outside world. Only former prisoners and their families and close friends know about it. The prison is administered by the Fifth Department of the Ministry of Security, whose members alone handle its affairs; even ordinary police agents know nothing about them. The guards are also carefully selected. One criterion is age: prisoners report never seeing guards over

20. The guards are replaced by batches at regular intervals.

Prisoners are divided into four classes according to the amount they have to pay for their meals. However, corruption on both the personal and the institutional level prevents the prisoners from getting what they are officially allotted.

The official ration, for instance, is about 35 pounds of food a month for each prisoner; but prisoners who never get to exercise cannot eat even half of that. The entire amount is nonetheless purchased every month, even though what is left over cannot be stored. According to some, it is fed to pigs that the guards raise and in turn sell to supplement their own diet. Others report more ingenious methods.

Certain of these methods double as punitive measures. For example, one of the lightest and most common punishments at Qin Cheng is to first starve the prisoner and then give him or her a bowl of noodles heavy with grease as "compensation." Most, of course, get sick upon eating this and have to miss the next few meals as well.

All the inmates are in separate cells. Their 3-by-9 foot cells contain a bunk made of planks covered with thin bedding, a chamber pot and a basin of water. There is one black uniform for the summer and one for the winter.

Privilege to Read Newspaper

It is something of a special privilege to be allowed to read Marxist-Leninist works or The People's Daily newspaper. Ordinarily prisoners whose attitude is judged to be "cooperative" can engage in a number of nonremunerative activities such as making rope or hats out of straw, or exercising to keep the body from getting stiff.

Those who leave a bad impression on the prison authorities are subject to all sorts of punitive or restrictive measures, including the banning of all exercise, such as walks or even movement within their cell, for periods sometimes as long as half a year. One example is the Deputy Director of the People's National Army Institute, formerly Deputy Chief of Staff during the Korean War: By the time an enforced immobility was finally lifted after half a year, he was no longer able to walk.

Irrational regulations of every sort govern the lives of the inmates. For instance, they have to sleep facing the door; to turn one's back to it is against the rules. Should you turn in your sleep, you will be awakened, and awakened repeatedly until you have learned to keep your face to the glass pane.

A certain Tibetan, after sleeping on one side of his face for more than 10 years, developed a swollen ear that became numb and eventually infected. He tried sleeping on his other side, but was incessantly awakened and scolded by the guards until, driven beyond endurance, he went berserk and tried to strangle them. Only then was he granted a special dispensation to turn in his sleep.

One Bath a Month Permitted

Sanitary conditions are also poor for the prisoners. No soap is ever given. The regulations permit bathing, but only once a month, regardless of the season.

The irony is that these unusually gifted individuals joined the Communist Party to fight for the freedom and well-being of China and of mankind, and consequently devoted the better part of their lives to obtaining and maintaining the party's political dominance.

The torments of daily life alone would not suffice to break these people of exceptional willpower. Qin Cheng is also supposed to be equipped with various modern instruments of torture, for example, exposing the victim day and night to a light so strong that after a while he feels he is going crazy.

Wang Guangmei, when she was eating her corn bread and cabbage soup at Qin Cheng, supposedly lost her reason as a result of prolonged torture. When the wife of a high cadre went to visit her, her appearance was hardly human. The sight was such that this woman could not rest with its memory and at the risk of impairing her own family interests, wrote a letter to Mao Zedong.

More 'Civilized' Treatment

This letter, together with a general feeling of indignation among the cadres, eventually led to a change in command after the end of the Cultural Revolution, from the Ministry of Security to Unit 8341, which restored the administration of Qin Cheng to a "relatively civilized" level.

The most common form of torture is

simple beating. You are called out and surrounded by a group of men who slug and kick until you are bruised and bloody and completely breathless.

There are those who, unable to endure such conditions, try to commit suicide. Others go on hunger strikes. The Panchen Lama, for instance, once refused nourishment, declaring that he did not want to go on living: "You can take my body to the Central Committee."

That Qin Cheng should have remained unknown for so long was due in large part to the fact that almost no one was let out before the 1970's. It was also extremely rare before the end of the Cultural Revolution for anyone to receive permission to visit. Thus it was common for people to remain incarcerated for more than 10 years.

Deaths were also frequent. Neither family nor friend could know whether the person was dead or alive. Prisoners were identified only by their prison numbers; not even their overseers knew their names.

Only during the interrogation sessions did the prisoners have a chance to talk with people. One prisoner, after ten years of confinement, was so overwhelmed when he at last heard his name called out at an interrogation that he was literally unable to speak.

Final Summary of Case

In 1975 Deng Xiaoping suggested releasing Qin Cheng's political prisoners. Going

Chile—Demonstrators Outfox Pinochet's Police

The Chilean junta wanted the workers to celebrate May Day by listening to General Pinochet give a speech extolling the virtues of labor.

The five underground union organizations issued a public call for a demonstration at the Plaza Aguirre Cerda.

What happened was reported on by Bengt Lindström in a dispatch to the Stockholm daily *Dagens Nyheter*:

At 11:00, while General Pinochet was praising the Chilean working men and women, a wall of green-uniformed police stood at the Plaza Aguirre Cerda. But there were more police than demonstrators.

The workers had gathered at five other places in the city. The tactic worked perfectly. It took the police an hour to redeploy their troops.

In the meantime, the demonstrators, most of whom were youth, with a notably large proportion of women, shouted slogans calling for freedom and democracy.

But then the tear gas and clubs went into action. The demonstrators ran into bars, and about forty of them sought refuge in the cathedral, where Santiago's bishops were celebrating mass. About two score specially invited union representatives from nearly all the countries in the Western world were attending the service.

The police rushed in and arrested the demon-

strators, along with the "reversal of verdicts" movement of the time, many old party members were freed. To them this was an altogether unexpected piece of luck.

But a sudden overwhelming emotion of joy can sometimes be dangerous. To "insure safety and health," the Central Committee adopted a policy of exile. In 1975, all who left Qin Cheng had to first spend some time at a hospital to absorb the shock of going back into the world. After 1977, the hospital was no longer considered necessary. Instead the prisoners were sent to distant, out-of-the-way villages whose quiet surrounding supposedly served just as well to soften the violent shock of liberation.

Before leaving, you are made to shoulder a number of groundless accusations. A final summary of your case is then drawn up showing why your 10 or 15 years of imprisonment were well deserved.

We must permanently get rid of Qin Cheng Prison. We must permanently get rid of political persecution and imprisonment. It is not the few unfortunate victims but the basic political and personal rights of the entire people that are at stake. We might ask the high cadres who have come out of Qin Cheng: When you suppressed the right of others to express freely their political views, did you secure your own? When you persecuted others using political pretexts, did you foresee yourselves being subjected to the same kind of persecution?

strators, along with two priests who protested against the violation of the church.

Lindström continued:

The demonstrators marched into the center of the city. In the middle of the tangle of demonstrators, police cars, and children eating ice cream cones and holding balloons, the morning paper *La Tercera* was holding its festival.

It was the strangest procession I have ever seen. Sweating, shuffling notables were greeted with loud cheers. The streets suddenly filled with thousands of applauding young people. But instead of shouting "hurray," they were shouting "bread, work, peace, freedom."

Whenever there was enough of an opening in the crowd, the police attacked, and threw as many demonstrators as possible into their buses. . . .

The official report was that seventy persons were arrested, Lindström said, "but unofficial estimates are that about five hundred were taken in." □

Keep your files complete and up-to-date. Missing issues for the current year may be ordered by sending 75¢ per copy. Write for information about previous years.

What Program for Revolutionists in European Elections?

By Anna Libera

In face of the unbridled class collaborationism and nationalism put forward by the organizations that represent a majority of the working class, the voice of internationalism is making itself heard with difficulty in the campaign for the elections to the European parliament. Especially since all those who sing the praises of "democratic Europe" have carefully set up ballot requirements that make it very hard for revolutionary currents to take part in the electoral race. This does not diminish the need to carry out a thoroughly internationalist campaign, and, in doing so, to discuss all the opportunities to run a joint campaign with other forces, without sectarianism or opportunism.

We do not have principled differences with the organizations that claim to be Trotskyist over our analysis of the capitalist Common Market and the need to fight for the Socialist United States of Europe. However, a tactical difference exists between us and the comrades of the OCRFI (Organizing Committee for the Reconstruction of the Fourth International, whose main organization is the OCI in France).

The OCRFI has called for a boycott of the European elections. They say that the European parliament is not a real parliament, and that the European elections are not real elections. Rather, what is involved, according to them, is a plebiscite tending to legitimize the institutions of capitalist Europe and the division of Europe decided on at Yalta and Potsdam. By participating in the elections, they say, the Fourth International would in turn be lending its endorsement to these institutions.

This line of argument is hardly convincing. When revolutionary Marxists participate in elections to bourgeois institutions, this never implies a recognition that these institutions have any kind of legitimacy. Otherwise, a boycott would have to be raised to the level of principle, for to us, no bourgeois parliament is ever legitimate.

It is true that the European parliament does not have real powers and is not, therefore, a parliamentary body in the traditional sense of the term. But such was also the case with the Fourth Duma elected in 1912 in tsarist Russia. This did not prevent the Bolsheviks from taking part in elections to the Duma.

The question of whether revolutionists should participate in the elections is a tactical one. The answer depends essentially on what opportunities exist for us to

carry out more effective propaganda and/or agitation—which can reach more workers than our current activities—and the general response of the workers movement. These factors argue today in favor of the Fourth International participating in the European elections, which would make it possible to expose the bourgeois and anti-working-class nature of the European institutions more effectively, and to step up our propaganda for a Socialist United States of Europe.

An isolated boycott by the Trotskyists at a time when all the mass organizations of the workers movement are taking part in the European elections could only isolate our movement from the growing layers of the working class who are becoming more and more critical of the bureaucratic leaderships in general and their European policy in particular.

Different European centrist organizations—including Democrazia Proletaria, OCT, PSU, PT, MC, Pour le Socialisme, and the KB*—have drawn up a platform for this European campaign with which we have major disagreements. We feel it is not possible to offer any kind of alternative in such a campaign by trying to unite all those who oppose a capitalist Europe on the basis of the lowest common denominator, without putting forward strategic solutions either to the capitalist crisis or to the policy of the traditional leaderships of the working class. The Fourth International, in an "open letter" to these organizations, expressed the differences we have with their platform, and we are reprinting here the main points of that critique.

* * *

1. Explaining the Crisis

To present a concrete solution to the workers who are being hit by the crisis that all the European countries are going through, it is necessary to start off by seriously explaining the nature and causes of this crisis. However, not only does your platform lack such an explanation, but the partial explanations that are given are very one-sided, and therefore wrong.

For example, as your sole explanation of the imperialists' problems, you write: "The

*Proletarian Democracy (Italy), Communist Workers Organization (France), United Socialist Party (France), Labor Party (Spain), Communist Movement (Spain), For Socialism (Belgium), Communist League (West Germany).—IP/I

crisis of the capitalist system is connected with the growing difficulties it faces in continuing its pillage of the third world in the old ways, as well as to the powerful upsurge of workers struggles in the capitalist countries of Western Europe since the beginning of the 1960s." And you conclude that "the currently accelerating integration of European capitalism is reinforcing the aggressive and exploitative capacities of the European imperialists, particularly aimed against the Third World peoples."

While it is necessary, of course, to explain the crisis affecting the European and world economy, the basic element—which you ignore—consists of the fact that what is involved is a classic crisis of the capitalist economy, resulting from the falling rate of profit, a crisis that is bound up with the very mechanisms of capitalist production (based on the market and on competition). To overcome this crisis, the bourgeoisie's objective is to attack the workers so as to increase the rate of profit.

The intensified concentration and centralization of capital, the reorganization of its productive apparatus on a European scale, are an attempt to respond to this crisis in a way that serves the interests of the big European capitalist trusts, giving them a competitive edge over their American and Japanese competitors, both on the European and the world market. The political institutions that are set up are intended to make it easier to carry out these operations and coordinate anti-working-class policies.

Thus, what is involved is a crisis whose only solution for the workers consists of the establishment of a democratically, internationally planned economy—in other words, the overturn of capitalism and the capitalist state.

By putting the main emphasis on a change in the relationship of forces between the imperialist countries and the "Third World," you fall into a double trap: by doing this, you are careful not to specify which classes profit, in some of the Third World countries, from this change in the relationship of forces (and you will agree, we hope, that it is not a question of the Third World "peoples," but of the capitalists of those countries). Thus your explanation implicitly espouses—or at best does not permit an answer to—the argument given by the Eurocommunists (particularly the Italian CP) to justify their support for austerity (i.e., their attempt to give an ideological cover to sacrifices by the workers by claiming that this is the price

of gains for the "peoples" of the Third World).

You too thereby help create a division within the world working class by falling into the bourgeoisie's trap of explaining the crisis on the basis of the competition from low wages in the Third World (not to mention its previous explanation of the crisis as resulting from increases in the price of oil).

An explanation of the crisis on this basis does not hold up. It should be recalled that the surplus value extracted by the exploiting classes in the few countries that hold a monopoly on oil is by and large redistributed in the form of investments and in purchases of manufactured goods in the capitalist countries. Moreover, a coalition has been formed between the bourgeoisies of those countries and the imperialist bourgeoisies to guarantee the exploitation of Third World peoples.

By failing to give the fundamental cause of the crisis the capitalist economy is going through, your platform therefore makes it impossible to explain to workers the way out of this crisis. To do that it is necessary to go to the very roots of the problem.

2. Role of Class Collaboration

Your platform also remains silent on another essential aspect of the present period—the policy of class collaboration carried out by the organizations that represent a majority of the working class. (Examples of this are the administration of the system and the crisis for the bourgeoisie, as in West Germany and Britain, where Social Democratic governments impose austerity on the workers; the establishment of accords such as the Moncloa Pact or the "historic compromise" in Spain and Italy; and the introduction of divisions and the sabotaging of mobilizations, as in France.)

This policy reflects two basic elements:

1. The fact that the bourgeoisie has faced an unfavorable relationship of social forces since 1968 (despite some limited political gains) and does not have the power to impose austerity without being assured of the collaboration of the traditional workers leaderships (SPs, CPs, and trade unions).
2. The fact that the reformist leaderships, in a period of confrontations that demand a revolutionary solution, are trying to block any development of working-class struggles by diverting the mass movement into the trap of class collaboration, and by binding it in the straitjacket of the national bourgeois state and the supranational European institutions.

Is it necessary to recall the most glaring forms in which this collaboration appears? National unity in Italy, with the CP's call for a strict policy of austerity and repression against the workers; the wage freeze and massive growth of unemployment in Britain initiated by the Labour government; the sabotage by the French CP, CGT

union federation, and other organizations of the mobilization by the entire population of the Lorraine region in defense of the steelworkers who were laid off; the Social Democratic government's opposition to the demand for a thirty-five-hour week raised by West German workers in the course of their struggle, while at the same time Schmidt claims to defend this demand in his European platform—the list could go on.

Accordingly, the basic characteristics of the political context in which the European elections are taking place are the following—a profound economic crisis, a general austerity policy, and class collaboration by the workers organizations, which goes to the point of open support for the bourgeois austerity policy.

A revolutionary alternative to capitalist policies and to the European capitalist institutions, as well as to the "democratization" of these institutions proposed by the reformists and Stalinists, must be expressed in relation to these two elements. As a matter of fact, the crisis faced by the European workers movement today is fundamentally a crisis of strategy (made evident by the failure of the Union of the Left in France, the "historic compromise" in Italy, etc.), and it is on the strategic level that a revolutionary response must be made.

By failing to do this, your platform provides no solution to the workers who look to and follow the lead of the Communist and Socialist parties, to the trade-union activists who in increasing numbers today are questioning the policy of their leaderships and have lost their illusions in them. (Look at the crisis that is festering in nearly all the traditional organizations in the European countries; also the strike waves led by the British and West German workers in opposition to the policy of their leaderships.)

Moreover, your refusal to place yourselves on this ground from the beginning is leading you to put forward increasingly ambiguous positions on a number of points that we will take up shortly.

3. No Alternative Strategy

In the present crisis situation, we cannot confine ourselves to stating the need for international gatherings and solidarity among the workers—although this must be done. The reformist leaderships themselves speak—demagogically, of course—of the need for gatherings, not only among the top leadership, but between unions in a given industry or around particular issues (see, for example, Séguin's proposal at the beginning of February for a Europe-wide trade-union conference on the thirty-five-hour week). But, as in each country, such proposals fall within the logic of exerting trade-union pressure on the bosses and European institutions, and not within a strategy of anticapitalist struggle.

For us, the aim is to pave the way for a

struggle by workers across Europe, for a mobilization against big business and its state, with a perspective of the workers taking power.

This means being able to combine demands that correspond to the workers' most immediate needs and make it possible to unite broad layers of the exploited (the demand for a thirty-five-hour week is exemplary in this regard); struggles around these demands (right now, for example, a Europe-wide strike by steelworkers is imperative) and a European working-class program to fight the crisis by all of the working-class organizations without exception; struggles within the trade unions by workers against their reformist leaderships and to replace them with class-struggle leaderships; and struggles for the unity and independence of the working class, and the united front of its organizations, against all class-collaborationist solutions and for a workers government.

Only a plan of this type can actually make it possible to meet the burning need today for a struggle against the immediate effects of the crisis, while placing this fight in the context of a struggle to establish workers power.

4. No Mention of Struggle Against State Apparatus

Your lack of a strategic solution has grave consequences, in our opinion, on the different points that you raise in your platform. Nowhere do you stress the necessity of fighting against the bourgeois state with the prospect of overturning it. This gives some of your statements a gradualist, "self-management" tone—even if the term "self-management" is not used.

For example, you write: "We also intend to carry out the production decisions imposed by the workers that correspond to collective needs." Or, further on, "In face of this situation, we need to develop an authentic working-class and popular culture, the memory and enjoyment of the people, the companion of its struggles and demands."

How do you propose to carry out such plans without tying them to the struggle to nationalize key sectors of the economy, for workers control, and for the overturn of the bourgeois state? Or do you think that it is possible to develop socialist islands of popular culture or alternative production within capitalist society?

5. Ambiguous Silence on Policy of CPs

Another startling aspect of your platform is the silence, bordering on opportunism, in regard to the policies of the European Communist parties. You stress "the ambitious attempt by the Social Democratic parties of the Second International, spurred on by the West German SPD" and that "the forces of the Second International aim to constitute the axis of a European edifice, brushing aside the West-

ern Communist parties and the anticapitalist and anti-imperialist revolutionary forces." But you do not say one word about the policy of the Communist parties!

We note with surprise that you place the Communist parties and the "revolutionary forces"—victims of the Social Democratic onslaught—on the same plane, which can only indicate an inclination for a special pact with the Communist parties. However, revolutionists need not choose among the reformist forces; the latter, whether they call themselves Social Democrats or Communists, offer nothing but a dead end to the workers. Your judgment leads you to gloss over the policy and strategy of the Communist parties, which is just as counterrevolutionary as that of the Social Democratic parties, whatever the differences in the form in which they may be expressed.

You neglect to mention, for example, the fact that the Italian and Spanish CPs fully subscribe to the European "self-management" projects of the Social Democracy (the Italian CP even signed an agreement with the European Socialist parties), while lining up with the European projects of their respective bourgeoisies. You ignore as well—which is the last straw for a platform that claims to be internationalist—the national chauvinist policy of the French CP, which is beating the drums with the tricolor flying. Such a silence, coupled with a failure to condemn the policy of class collaboration, can only make us uneasy.

6. No Clear Position on Expansion of Common Market

You correctly point out that widening the EEC to include Spain, Portugal, and Greece is going to hurt the workers and peasants of those countries by subjecting them to the needs of capitalist rationalization in Europe. But you do not put forward any position on this question, even though several organizations in countries that are applying for membership in the Common Market are signers of your platform.

We think that in those countries revolutionists must clearly say "no" to entry into the Common Market, which represents above all a reinforcement of the capitalists in those countries to exploit the workers. There can be no ambiguity on this question. A clear position of rejecting membership is the only position that makes it possible to wage a really internationalist campaign against divisions among workers in the different EEC countries, resulting from the increased exploitation within the framework of the EEC.

7. The National Minorities

Several ambiguities seem to us to pose serious dangers of deviations. The first paragraph of this point in your platform is not at all clear. You state: "In each country, the fight against the European institutions is also the fight for national identity. It is the right of each nationality, in

keeping with the right of nations to self-determination, to put forward its own demands."

The fact is that by talking about "national identity" in general, you do not make any distinction between an oppressed nationality (such as the Irish, the Basques, the Catalans), and imperialist nations (the majority of European countries). While the workers must unconditionally defend the right to self-determination of the former, they are entering slippery ground if they begin to defend the "national identity" of the latter. Behind this defense of "national identity" lies defense of the institutions of the bourgeois state, and of its national defense. As you see, the dangers in your position are superficial, and clarification of this point is indispensable.

Our concern seems to us all the more justified when we learn that one of the organizations that signed your platform, the VS of Denmark, has signed an agreement—which it describes as "technical"—with the "People's Movement," a bourgeois anti-Common Market organization. The agreement is to vote for each other's candidates (with the VS's votes going to the People's Movement in the event that the VS does not get enough to have someone elected). Any accord—which is, of course, basically political, under the cover of a technical arrangement—between forces that defend antagonistic class interests is impossible.

As for the right to self-determination of Europe's oppressed nationalities, which we also fight for, it seems important to us to point out the necessary link between the struggle for self-determination and the struggle for socialism. Not only can a real emancipation of these regions come about only in the framework of a European socialist federation, given the stage of development of the productive forces, but emphasizing this link is also the only way to warn against the collaborationist danger inherent in the nationalist ideologies. This seems all the more important to us inasmuch as major nationalist currents are under great pressure to accept reformist projects, as was shown most recently by the French CP's offensive in Béziers toward the leaders of the Occitanian movement (which consisted of offering to run one of their main representatives on its slate, toward the top of the list).

8. Women's Liberation

This section of your platform seems to us to be particularly confused. It does not point out either the necessity of building an independent women's movement to fight their specific oppression, or the need for the mass organizations of the workers movement to take up women's demands and struggles. Thus, we find the formulation of support to the "right of women to self-determination." This allows you to avoid having to take a clear position on

these two issues, but does not offer any strategy to women (as for what it means exactly, that's anyone's guess).

Finally, Sinn Féin's reservation on the abortion question merits a fuller explanation. How, in fact, is it possible to contend that a demand aimed at advancing the liberation of women could weaken an anti-imperialist liberation movement?

9. On Democratic Rights

You bring in confusion with grave implications in this section by putting all the repressive measures carried out by the European bourgeoisie and its regimes on the same plane with the "practice of expulsions from trade unions." This puts the struggle for democratic rights, aimed at the bourgeois state, on the same plane with the struggle for workers democracy within the trade-union organizations. It leads to the assumption that the latter are institutions of the bourgeois state like any other.

Are you going to ask the bourgeois state to guarantee the right of revolutionists to remain in the trade unions? Are you going to fight for the destruction of the trade unions as institutions like other institutions of the bourgeois state? With such a position, how are you going to bring the masses of workers to consciousness of the need to fight against the reformist leaderships of their organizations—who are weakening these organizations with their antidemocratic methods?

To do this, it is necessary to clearly tie the struggle against the undemocratic practices of the leaderships to defense of the mass organizations of the workers against any and all attacks by the bourgeois state. This, of course, would make it impossible to construct the kind of amalgam you make in the section on democratic rights. This is all the more important in a period when attacks on the trade unions or attempts to co-opt the trade unions are part of the bourgeoisie's offensive against the working class.

For all the reasons we have just outlined, we think that your platform does not make it possible to carry out an anticapitalist and internationalist campaign against the Europe of the multinationals and their institutions. This seems to us to be confirmed by the fact that a number of the signers (this is officially already true of the VS of Denmark and the PLS of Belgium) have already announced that they would run campaigns in their countries based on a national platform. □

Intercontinental Press/Inprecor
will give you a week by week
analysis of the most important
world events.
Subscribe now!

Indonesian Students on Trial for 'Insulting' Suharto

By Dan Dickeson

A series of trials against student leaders in Indonesia have become a focal point of opposition to the Suharto dictatorship.

The students now on trial are among the estimated 600 persons arrested by the regime in January and February 1978 following a wave of campus protests against government corruption, and against the fraudulent elections in which General Suharto ran unopposed for a third term as president.¹ Trials are occurring in Jakarta, Bandung, and at least four other Indonesian cities.

Lukman Hakim, chairman of the Student Council of the University of Indonesia, Jakarta, appeared in court February 21. In a statement to the court he declared that the current trials are "unique in Indonesia's history. . . . Together with me, my comrades-in-arms are being tried simultaneously in various parts of the country, each in their capacity as student leaders in their campuses. The actions they took were varied but the charges are uniform, insulting the Head of State."²

The students are being tried under Indonesia's "lese majesty" laws, a holdover from the colonial period when criminal penalties were imposed for insulting the Dutch king or governor general.

The accused are being defended by prominent attorneys of the Indonesian Legal Aid Association. The trials offer a rare opportunity to publicly challenge the violation of democratic rights by the Suharto regime.

Courtroom testimony has revealed the use of torture against the defendants. Lukman Hakim stated that "almost all students detained together with me were subjected to beatings, electric torture and confinement to cells."

Some of those appearing in court show visible signs of mistreatment in prison. Several trials have had to be postponed because of the poor state of health of the defendants. Student leader Lala Mustafa, on trial in Bandung, reportedly had to request permission to remain seated while his indictment was being read because he was too weak to stand.

The students have sought to use their trials to reach out to the Indonesian people, explaining why they mobilized against the dictatorship.

Indonesian law stipulates that court hearings are to be open to the public, but the regime has nevertheless taken various measures to prevent the students' appeal from reaching a wider audience. Courtroom galleries are often packed with plainclothes police, and riot troops are mobilized to intimidate the crowds which gather around the courthouses to listen to the proceedings over loudspeakers.

These practices were denounced by student leader Sukmaji Indro Tjahjono in a statement before the Bandung District Court February 22:

There are indeed some loudspeakers in this courtroom, but what is the significance of Bandung for the one hundred and thirty million Indonesian people? . . . Is it possible to say that because of a few loudspeakers in front of the courtroom, we can tell the world that this is an open trial? Can we say that because the courtroom doors are open 60 centimeters, this is an open hearing? Can we be proud and satisfied if all who attend are searched and have to go through formalities as if they were entering a royal palace? I feel a deep sense of shame when I see all these devious methods. The authorities are, it is true, allowing voices from this courtroom to be heard outside a little; but more insidious is the fact that while our voices are not

being stifled, the ears of virtually the entire Indonesian people have been plugged.

During the 1977-78 protests many Indonesian newspapers, although prohibited from criticizing Suharto directly, gave extensive coverage to the students' demands. To prevent the same thing happening during the trials, the regime in February ordered all newspapers and periodicals to reaffirm the "Journalists' Code of Ethics." The code stipulates that journalists will not write stories "of a destructive nature, which harm the state and the people, create trouble or hurt moral ethics, religion or belief." Offending publications face withdrawal of their publishing permit by the government.

The result has been that newspapers publish extensive coverage of the trials, but avoid mentioning students' statements about why they oppose Suharto. In order to break through the press blackout, the Joint Indonesian Students Defence Coalition has been formed to publish uncensored reports and documents from the trials.

Statements in support of the defendants, and protesting the violations of their democratic rights, can be sent to the Joint Indonesian Students Defence Coalition, Student Centre UI, Salemba 4, Jakarta Pusat, Indonesia. □

Your First Issue?

Why Not Subscribe?

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Country _____

- \$24 enclosed for a one-year subscription.
- \$12 enclosed for a six-month subscription.
- \$6 enclosed for a three-month subscription.
- Send information about first-class and airmail rates.

Intercontinental Press/Inprecor, P.O. Box 116, Village Sta., New York, N.Y. 10014

1. See *Intercontinental Press/Inprecor*, January 30, 1978, p. 103.

2. Quoted in the April issue of *Tapol*, bimonthly bulletin of the British Campaign for the Release of Indonesian Political Prisoners. To subscribe, send £4.00 (£3.00 for U.K. and Europe) to *Tapol*, 8a Treport Street, London SW18 2BD, England.