of the Socialist International officially protested to the Indian Government against its refusal to grant entry to Socialist International representatives. The protest, which was addressed to the Indian Prime Minister, Indira Gandhi, is as follows:

'I acknowledge receipt of the message from your Government in which the request I made on behalf of the Bureau of the Socialist International for representatives of the Socialist International to visit India in order to meet Mr J. P. Narayan has been turned down as an "Objectionable interference in the internal affairs of the Indian Government".

'The response of the Indian Government to this request of the Socialist International can only increase the very great disquiet felt by democrats at the recent developments in India which have led to the suspension of basic freedoms and the imprisonment on political grounds of thousands of patriotic citizens.

'The violation of human rights wherever it occurs must concern socialists and cannot be regarded as a purely internal affair.

'I therefore protest against the rejection by your Government of our request.'

ANDRE RESAMPA IN LONDON

André Resampa, General Secretary of the Malagasy Socialist Party, arrived in London on 9 July where he was received by the Assistant General Secretary of the Socialist International, Rodney Balcomb, in the absence abroad of the General Secretary. During their talks André Resampa described for the information of the Socialist International the events which took place in Madagascar in February 1975. He reaffirmed the total innocence of the Malagasy Socialist Party with regard to the assassination of Colonel Ratsimandrava, head of government of Madagascar. The General Secretary of the Malagasy Socialist Party also spoke of the destruction of the headquarters of the Party which he described as being without any justification.

It should be noted that the Bureau of the Socialist International in a resolution adopted on 22 March, 1975, had expressed its grave concern at the arrest of André Resampa, General Secretary of the Malagasy Socialist Party, and had called for his release.

CHILEAN SOCIALIST ARRESTED

The General Secretary of the Socialist International issued the following statement on 24 July on learning of the arrest of a prominent member of the Chilean Socialist Party:

'I have been informed by the Socialist International's Chilean affiliate, the Radical Party of Chile, that Exquiel Ponce, a prominent member of the Chilean Socialist Party, has been arrested in Chile and subjected to torture. I protest in the strongest terms at this latest act of political repression and barbarous inhumanity on the part of the Chilean military régime. I call upon the Chilean régime to acknowledge that they have arrested Exquiel Ponce, and I call for his immediate release.'

FINLAND: SEPTEMBER ELECTIONS

Following the resignation in June of the coalition government of Social Democratic Prime Minister Kalevi Sorsa after almost three years in power, Finns will elect a new parliament on 21 and 22 September.

The Social Democratic Party opened its electoral campaign on 20 August and a meeting of the Party's Council accepted a manifesto which recommended the following policy:

— full employment to be secured by economic planning and development of industry. Price control legislation improved.

— employment, housing and services to be evenly directed by public authorities throughout the country and especially to regions with high unemployment.

— tax relief on small and medium-sized incomes. More effective tax on large businesses and income from capital as well as wealth.

— sufficient and reasonably priced housing to be secured by legislation. Land speculation to be prevented. Mortgages to be lowered. Support for young people and low-income groups for housing expenses to be expanded.

— two-week winter holiday to be granted. Health care of employees to be organised by special legislation. The pension age for those in heavy work to be lowered. The position of women and young people in working life improved. The right to paid study leave to be secured. The establishment of industrial democracy.

— welfare and security of families to be improved. Child allowances to be increased and day-care organised where needed.

— those on retirement pensions guaranteed minimum wage-level income. Means test of state pension according to income of spouse or own income from work to be modified. War-time service to be considered in calculating pension from working income.

— all-round medical services provided for everyone in hospitals and health centres. Position and training of employees in the health service to be improved. Dental services to be gradually made free. Distribution of medicines organised in health centres and hospitals.

— basic comprehensive schooling extended to ten years. Trade school to be made equal to high school as an educational alternative, including access to further education and training. Support for students with low incomes increased. Conditions for various cultural activities to be made available for all sections of the population.

— environment protected from pollution by effective legislation. The security and comfort of people to be the first priority in the development of communities.

Printed by Frank Bristow & Co. (T.U.), 124 Churchfield Road, Acton, London W3 6DD

Arbeiderbevegelsens Arkiv Oslo

SOCIALIST AFFAIRS

July/August Socialist International Information Volume XXV Number 4

Shadow Over India

On 15 August 1947, the eve of the fulfilment of India's struggle for independence, the first Prime Minister of India, Jawaharlal Nehru, made an historic speech and his words 'at the stroke of the midnight hour, while the world sleeps, India will wake to life and freedom', filled the heart of every Indian with hope and aspiration. Their dream to see a new India where democracy, individual freedom and social justice would be guaranteed, seemed within reach.

Twenty-eight years later, at the midnight hour of 26 June 1975, when India and the world were asleep, Mrs Indira Gandhi, the daughter of Jawaharlal Nehru and the third Prime Minister of India, sounded the death knell to democracy in India by declaring a state of emergency. She arrested all her major political opponents, imposed a complete censorship on the press and suspended all basic civil liberties enjoyed by Indians since their independence. The police and the security forces have been given wide powers to arrest and detain anyone for up to two years without having to give reasons for the arrest. The imprisoned person will have no right to appeal to any court of law.

What is worse, while calling herself a socialist, Mrs Gandhi has launched the biggest onslaught against the Socialist Party of India. Its Chairman, George Fernandes, who escaped arrest, is now underground and hounded by the police and security forces. He has sent several appeals to the conscience of the world (one of them published in this issue of *Socialist Affairs*). He has also been made the special target of a smear campaign in as much as in a Government publication, he has been accused of surreptitiously accepting large sums of money from abroad during the railway strike, which took place in India in May 1974. However, the facts are that two Japanese railway unions presented the All India Railwaymen's Federation, of which George Fernandes is also the President, with some money for the trade union education of railway workers in India in May 1975, i.e. a year after the strike, which, incidentally, was brutally suppressed by Mrs Gandhi's Government. This gift was made to the All India Railwaymen's Federation in an open conference in India and the transaction took place legally through banks. These accusations were made only when Mrs Gandhi felt sure that George Fernandes would not be in a position to defend himself or refute these unfounded allegations.

Later, she even went a step further and accused the Socialist International of being very active in the 'Hate-India Campaign'. She further said that the Socialist International is 'flush with funds' and added 'one wonders from where these come', presumably implying that the Socialist International received funds from sinister or subversive sources. Mrs Gandhi knows very well that the Socialist International is a responsible international of democratic socialist parties throughout the world, of which 17 are running the Governments of their countries today. The only source of Socialist International funds, which have never been large, are the affiliation fees from member parties.

Mrs Gandhi should also know that criticism of a Government or specific acts of a Government is not tantamount to being against the country itself. The Socialist International is proud of its long association and friendship with the people of India and it continues to maintain the most cordial relationship with the Indian Socialist Party, of which the internationally respected and great Gandhian leader, Jayaprakash Narayan (J.P.), was the founder and who, at the age of 73, has been unjustly imprisoned by Mrs Gandhi's Government. His only crime was that he found widespread support and favour among the Indian people for his campaign against corruption.

The use of such tactics of smear and innuendo against George Fernandes and against the Socialist International, which have no basis in reality, by the Prime Minister of the second largest country in the world, is most unfortunate and, frankly speaking, deplorable. Mrs Gandhi needs no reminding that the Socialist International was in the forefront of support for her Government during the Bangladesh War of Liberation for no other reason than its strong belief in democracy, social justice and human rights. For the same reason, it is now deeply concerned at the recent developments in India. The fact that this has happened at a time when there was neither a threat of external aggression against India, nor from all available evidence, any danger to India's internal security, makes the tragedy even worse. There is no doubt that she decided to demolish the democratic institutions in India, which her father, Nehru, and many of his colleagues including J.P., had created after such great sacrifices, merely to preserve her own position, which was seriously threatened by the non-violent mass movement against corruption, led by J.P. and supported by the Socialist Party of India.

9 329.153 (05) So15

SOCIALIST AFFAIRS
July-August 1975
Volume 25 number 4

Fernandes on India page 58
India's Road to Dictatorship page 60
Justice in Northern Ireland page 63
Cultural Repression in USSR page 65
Portugal's Democratic Alternative page 68
Opposition Unity in Malaysia page 69

Conferences
Canadian New Democrats page 70
European Socialists in Stockholm page 71

Party Documents
Dutch Socialists for World Security page 72
S.I. Research Council page 74

Letters to the Editors page 75

Book Reviews page 77

Socialist Diary page 78

Socialist Affairs covers the policies of democratic socialist parties throughout the world
Published by the Socialist International

Editorial Committee
Gino Bianco Giampiero Rolandi
Carlos Parra Jenny Little Yoram Peri
Vera Matthias

Editor Hans Janitschek
Editorial Assistant Caroline Soper
Indian Correspondent M. S. Hoda

Rates per annum
Ordinary subscription £5
Socialist Party member £3.75
Payment by sterling or dollars
USA & Canada $12 ($8)
Cheque, postal order or International money order payable to Socialist International
88a St Johns Wood High Street
London NW8 S7J
Telephone 01-586 1103
Telex 261735
Cables Intesocon London

Signed Articles in Socialist Affairs do not necessarily represent the views of the editorial committee

AN APPEAL TO THE WORLD'S CONSCIENCE

George Fernandes

The following appeal by George Fernandes, Chairman of the Indian Socialist Party, was received in London on 27 July. George Fernandes, having escaped arrest at the beginning of the Indian crisis on 26 June, has since gone underground.

At the end of their two-day summit in Brussels on 18 July, 1975, the nine-nation European Council is reported to have decided that it would give aid to Portugal only if it preserved 'pluralist democracy'. The British Foreign Minister, Mr James Callaghan, reportedly summed up the common feeling of the European Economic Community by stating: 'We are not in the business of financing dictatorships.'

Even from the isolation and remoteness of the underground, I can say without hesitation that the sentiments expressed by the EEC heads of government cannot but warm up the hearts of millions of people in India who woke up on 26 June, 1975, to find their fundamental freedoms snatched away and a dictatorship clamped on them by a person whose very election to Parliament had been set aside by a court order, and who, therefore, had forfeited the moral right to stay at the head of the government.

Jayaprakash Narayan, the tallest and the noblest Indian alive, is in prison detained under the draconian Maintenance of Internal Security Act (MISA), Mr Morarji Desai, former deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister, is held in solitary confinement under MISA. As of 24 July, more than 60,000 people have been imprisoned all over the country either under MISA or under the draconian Defence of India Act. The entire national committee of the Socialist Party of India which is closely linked with the Socialist International is in prison, except for a handful of persons who have managed to survive underground. A price has been placed on the heads of those who have escaped police arrest and their property and other belongings are sought to be confiscated in the next few days.

The leadership of four other national parties: Congress (organisation), Jana Sangh, Communist Party of India (Marxist) and Bharatiya Lok Dal have been arrested and detained. Many members of Parliament and the state legislatures belonging to these five parties have been imprisoned as have a few outspoken members of the ruling Congress Party. The right to approach the courts has been withdrawn and the fate and fortune of every Indian are now in the hands of the executive entirely, more particularly in the hands of an individual, who though claiming to be the Prime Minister, is a megalomaniac, cast in the mould of Adolf Hitler, Salazar and Ayub Khan and other past and present dictators.

In Parliament, on 22 July, Mrs Gandhi said: 'You have been calling me a dictator when I was not. Now, yes, I am.' This statement was put out on the newspaper teleprinter network by the Press Trust of India but was later killed by the Censor's Order. On 23 July, the Press Trust of India put out a statement in Parliament by Mr Jagjivan Ram to the effect that 'all the arrested political leaders are in excellent health, particularly J.P. and Morarji.' The censor's orders killing this statement five minutes later give rise to serious questions about the health and well-being of the detained leaders. Some of them we fear, are dead.

The Parliament was convened to meet for a week from 21 - 28 July. But it was, for all purposes, a captive Parliament. Over 100 out of 521 members of the Lok Sabha and 80 out of 250 members of the Rajya Sabha were not present. We know that some of them were arrested, but the country does not know of the whereabouts of most of these members. There are reports that some of them, including members of the ruling party, are in self-imposed exile in Nepal, while there are stories that some have been killed by the Secret Service agents.

By suppressing the Free Press and through a vicious campaign of vilification against the arrested and detained leaders including Jayaprakash Narayan, Mrs Gandhi is trying desperately to acquire a legitimacy denied to her the moment the Allahabad High Court convicted her of corrupt election practices, set aside her election to Parliament and debarred her from seeking any electoral office for six years.

The Allahabad verdict should be viewed against the backdrop of the politics of corruption, nepotism, bribery, violence and political thuggery that has been the hallmark of Mrs Gandhi's administration. Not for nothing was she hailed as the fountain-head of corruption in India. The case of Mrs Gandhi and her sycophants is that the lady is above the law, and that no charges can be tolerated against her, and the person of the Prime Minister is above any judicial probe. We reject this heresy against the Constitution and humbly suggest that if there have been any charges made against the person of the Prime Minister involving her in corruption, nepotism or even murder, the courts of law are there to take care of the accuser and the accused. The imposition of a dictatorship is the final admission of guilt by Mrs Gandhi and a public confession that she cannot defend herself in open court.

Across the country the people have been resisting the imposition of dictatorship, though the blanket censorship has prevented the outside world knowing about the extent of protest. During the last few weeks, I have travelled extensively in six states making up more than half of the country and everywhere young people, workers and ordinary people have been fighting with determination against fascist dictatorship.

Besides the 60,000 people detained by the Government, thousands have courted imprisonment in Orissa, West Bengal, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Maharashtra, Delhi, Gujarat, Kerala and elsewhere by protesting against the dictatorship. In Bihar, home state of Jayaprakash Narayan, in the first nine days of the emergency from 26 June to 4 July, 1975, the police lathi-charged or opened fire on seventy-two occasions with an unknown number of casualties. There have been indiscriminate police firings on unarmed people and on students in Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Assam. Gujarat observed a general strike on 26 July.

In Tamil Nadu the people led by the state's ruling party, the DMK, have taken a pledge that they will fight to uphold democracy with all their might, no matter what the cost and consequences.

In Kerala which is convulsing under a series of state-wide strikes, more than 3,000 people have courted arrest protesting against the dictatorship including former Chief Minister, E. M. S. Namboodiripad, Marxist MP A. K. Gopalan, Socialist MP K. Chandrashekharan and a large number of Socialist, Marxist, Communist and Congress (organisation) legislators. The Bar Associations in Karnataka and Andhra have called for a successful boycott of courts and the students are in the forefront of the action all over Karnataka.

Civil Disobedience

In Bihar one hundred thousand people are being enrolled through underground organisations to defy the police ban and to offer satyagraha which commenced on 9 August, 1975. The Civil Disobedience Movement will be launched in a big way all over the country with the people defying the ban on processions and meetings and also by flouting the other restrictions imposed with the proclamation of emergency.

While the non-cooperation movement has compelled the government to hand over to the Military the power-generating plants in Bihar, there has been widespread sabotage of vital installations such as the railway lines, telegraph and telephone offices and other public institutions. The people who were stunned at the very idea of Mrs Gandhi proclaiming herself a dictator are gradually becoming accustomed to the new modes of struggle that are necessary to rid the country of this dictatorship. The underground press has started proliferating everywhere and even in the remotest parts of the country people are tuning into the BBC, Voice of America, Radio Pakistan and even to Radio Peking to hear the truth of what is happening within the country.

It is my deep conviction that Mrs Gandhi has finally finished herself as a political leader. She never had any claims to intellectual leadership and she had always sounded hollow when she indulged in moral sermonising to a world that was indulgent to her.

I want to believe that Mrs Gandhi is intelligent enough to realise that she has reached the end of the road. She can prolong the agony for herself and in the process plunge the innocent people into great distress. But she cannot retrieve what she has thrown away, and nothing that is said or done by her sycophants will remake her. When she killed Indian democracy on that fateful morning of 26 June, 1975, she destroyed herself with it. Many may fear her wrath now, but none, certainly not Jagjivan Ram and Y. B. Chavan, can have any respect for her.

From her wailings and rantings it is obvious that Mrs Gandhi is aware that the world which once hailed her as the leader of an India which nurtured and cherished democratic values has now only pity and contempt for her. That is what makes her and her Goebbels-style propaganda machine keep looking out for some favourable comments from the world's press to bolster up her sagging morals. And even while she keeps expelling from the country newspapermen long renowned for their objectivity in news reporting as for their love of India, the controlled Indian press is fed with comments from the newspapers of Soviet Russia and some of its satellites and also from those of a few African dictatorships. A meeting in London to demand the restoration of democratic freedoms in India makes Mrs Gandhi mad. The setting up of a committee headed by Nobel Laureate Phillip Noel-Baker to campaign for the release of Mr Jayaprakash Narayan gives her the creeps. An editorial, an objective report on her dictatorship in the press anywhere in the world, rattles her beyond measure. She knows that each of these blows against dictatorship and for democracy will provide tremendous encouragement to those fighting against her fascist rule.

Help for Democracy

On behalf of the people of India who are resisting Mrs Gandhi's fascist dictatorship, may I thank all people everywhere who in their own way have been helping the cause of democracy in India. I would particularly thank the newspapers and newspapermen who have been speaking up for democracy in India and radio networks like the BBC and Voice of America and others for keeping the Indian people informed of the truth while All India Radio has been broadcasting lies. We are grateful to all international organisations, particularly the

Socialist International and Amnesty International for the active interest they have taken in speaking up for democracy and against fascism in India.

While thanking the Indians abroad, in England, in Europe, in the United States, in Canada and in other parts of the world for joining the protest against the fascist rule in India I would especially appeal to them to set up anti-fascist resistance groups and to keep up a sustained campaign through these groups to educate public opinion in their host countries on the Indian situation.

There must be many individuals and institutions all over the world who have been concerned about us or who are speaking up for us. To all of them I express my sincerest gratitude.

The history of mankind is full of instances where the greed for power and the selfishness of a few have paved the way for the denial of freedom to and the slavery of many. History is also full of instances where failure to act at the right time on the part of those who stood for freedom and democracy has not only condemned a people to long periods of slavery, but has also plunged mankind into war and destruction. It is not infrequently that human freedom has been bartered for some favourable trade agreements.

To freedom lovers the world over may I therefore make a fervent appeal. Will you please ask the governments of your countries to initiate steps that will defeat the designs of the fascist rulers and their Russian supporters in India. If the South African government deserves to be ostracised because the whites deny the coloured democratic rights and civil liberties then the government of India, which denies the same democratic rights and civil liberties to its own people, does not deserve any better treatment.

If, as Mr James Callaghan said, the democracies of the world 'are not in the business of financing dictatorships', may I appeal to you in the name of the people of India to stop financing the dictatorship that Mrs Gandhi has clamped on our country.

Social Democracy and India

INDIA'S ROAD TO DICTATORSHIP

Surendra Mohan

The Socialist Party especially, and other Indian democrats too, have warmly welcomed and greatly appreciated the concern shown by the Socialist International and its affiliates regarding the incarceration of Jayaprakash Narayan (J.P.), the eminent leader of the Gandhian movement.

What has happened in India since the night of 25 - 26 June, 1975, when J.P. and other leaders of the opposition were arrested requires detailed explanation. Foreigners, in particular, would find it difficult to appreciate and comprehend the underlying reasons for a leader who had returned to power on the crest of a wave barely four years ago in 1971 to declare an internal emergency, restrict the jurisdiction of the courts of law, deny civil liberties and fundamental rights and impose the strictest possible censorship of the press.

They would also be baffled by the fact that among those arrested should be Mr Chandrasekhar, a prominent member of the National Working Committee of the Party of Mrs Gandhi and Mr Ram Dhan, who has been re-elected Secretary of the Congress Parliamentary Party barely two months before his arrest, in a free poll where the members of the Parliament belonging to the ruling Congress Party were the voters. Mrs Gandhi herself is Prime Minister because of the trust reposed in her by these members.

Those others arrested include five out of seven members of Parliament from the Socialist Party; Mr Raj Narain, MP, whose election petition against Mrs Gandhi's election to Parliament was upheld by a court of law on 12 June, 1975; Mr Morarji Desai, a former Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Jyotirmoy Bosu, Leader of the Parliamentary Group of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) and former Chief Ministers of the States of Punjab, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa and Andhra Pradesh. Not only workers of opposition parties but all those suspected of sympathising with them have either been arrested or are under surveillance, in towns and villages.

Although Indira Gandhi fought a successful battle against some senior leaders of her own party in 1969, and the Praja Socialist Party (PSP), the two Communist parties, the DMK and some others too had given her valuable support in bringing about certain economic reforms in 1969 - 71, (such as the nationalisation of fourteen major banks), a back-sliding became manifest within months of her massive return to power on her 'Remove Poverty' slogan, in April 1971.

Most of the ousted conservative elements from the Congress Party were welcomed back, and as the National Executive of the PSP found in June 1971, Mrs Gandhi's party had again become the same heterogeneous party which the undivided Congress Party before 1969 had been.

Appeasement

The Government followed a policy of appeasing the vested interests who revelled in high profits and black money

accumulations. The currency was vastly expanded and credit supply was liberalised. The credit policy of public sector institutions and nationalised banks exclusively benefitted big entrepreneurs; and mostly seven Big Houses.

As a consequence, all the old ailments of the economy started to become grave. Prices began to rise. Between 1971 - 74, there has been a 30 per cent rise in prices per annum. Unemployment started to become alarming and the economic recession of 1967 - 68 reappeared. Per capita income increased in 1972 by 1 per cent and actually declined in 1973. 40 per cent of the total population were found to be below the poverty line in late 1972. This proportion had increased to 68 per cent at the end of 1974.

Thus, in the elections to the State Assemblies in 1972, Mrs Gandhi, though once again on the high crest of popularity owing to the victory in the December 1971 conflict with Pakistan, and trying to use the war and the influx of refugees from Bangladesh as an alibi, could not secure for her party such a massive victory as in the 1971 Parliamentary election (except in the State of Maharashtra). In the State of Bihar, the ruling Congress Party secured only 51.6 per cent of the seats though a year earlier it had won over 75 per cent of the seats for the House of the People from that State.

The trend of popular disenchantment against Mrs Gandhi and her government became more pronounced as the difficulties of the people grew and her party's collusion with the industrial and landed élite became clearer.

The Congress lost one after another a number of crucial Parliamentary bye-elections in 1972, 1973 and 1974. In early 1974, it all but lost the important State of Uttar Pradesh in elections to the State Assembly, gaining only 215 of 424 contested seats.

In Orissa, where State assembly elections were held at the same time, the party lost its majority and has been forced to depend on the CPI (Pro-Moscow); and in Manipur, a non-Congress Government took over.

The Railwaymen's strike of May 1974 was a dramatic manifestation of the grievances of workingmen whose salaries were being gradually eroded by rising prices. The entire industrial working class supported the strikers. However, the Government resorted to the blackest repression in dealing with the strike. This brought home to the workers everywhere the true character of the ruling party and its class alignment.

In September 1974, a very typical case of high level corruption known as the licence scandal rocked Parliament. Not only was a ruling Congress MP found to be involved in it, but a powerful central Minister, L. N. Mishra, and his bureaucrats were also suspected of involvement. The case brought out the mechanism of the close collusion between Government leaders, bureaucrats, MPs and big business in conspiring to amass huge amounts of black money which, according to a Government Committee totalled up to 14,000 million rupees.

It was also patent to the people that black money formed an important weapon of the ruling party in winning elections by huge, illegal, expenditure. Therefore, on the one hand, there was pressure to eliminate it and on the other to reform electoral law. The suggested reforms of electoral law also included the enshrinement of the right of recall in the Constitution; for it was felt that representatives or legislatures refusing to carry out the mandates given them could be recalled by the electors.

Disintegration

Internal bickerings in the Congress Party had also surfaced, in spite of the great authority and prestige of the Prime Minister. Leaderships in several States had to be reshuffled. In UP, Mrs Gandhi's home State, and Andhra, the President's rule had to be imposed to help the party (and its Government) to smooth inner tensions.

In fact, Mrs Gandhi's own style of politics hastened the process of disintegration of inner party cohesion; for she was keen to impose men of her choice as Chief Ministers instead of allowing the legislature Congress parties to elect them democratically. It became a general practice that the State Congress legislature parties held their meetings in New Delhi to 'elect' their leaders.

The two States which later emerged as the trouble spots in 1974 - 75 — Gujarat and Bihar — experienced their first problems owing to this attitude of the Prime Minister. In both cases, she nominated as the leaders of the Legislature Congress parties persons who did not have strong internal support.

In Gujarat, as her nominee Chief Minister lost all moral authority in the Party, Mrs Gandhi was compelled later to allow a free election to be held for the leadership of the State Assembly Congress Party. Her own candidate lost narrowly and the new Chief Minister, Chiman Patel, started with hostility from Mrs Gandhi and her protégés. Prominent sections from his own party organised popular disaffection against him while owing to his own mismanagement and various headaches created for him by Mrs Gandhi's government at the Centre, a big student agitation started against him. It gained popular support and inept handling by the government led to its intensification.

Although Mrs Gandhi and her apologists are now busy putting all the responsibility for disturbances and disorders on the students and the opposition parties, the fact remains that the powers that be in the ruling party were in no way uninvolved for they wanted the ouster of Mr Chiman Patel. However, the popular agitation was not content with his dismissal. What was desired was a new assembly which could adequately reflect the democratic will.

Thus, after unleashing untold violence and suppression, and on Mr Morarji Desai's threat that he would back the people's agitation by undertaking a fast, the Prime Minister decided to dissolve the assembly in April 1974.

Then, after great procrastination, the central Government decided to hold fresh elections — again under the compulsion of mass agitation and threat by Desai — in June 1975, in which Mrs Gandhi's party was defeated and a non-Congress Government installed. This portened danger to the ruling Party even at the Centre as elections to Parliament were barely nine months away.

Unrest in Bihar

In Bihar, internal factionalism in the ruling Congress Party was further complicated by the support the factions received from the prominent central congress leaders. At one time, over 35 per cent of the legislators of the ruling party publicly expressed dissatisfaction against the Chief Minister. Conditions of utter maladministration, corruption and the Government's total identification with landed aristocracy had created massive unrest.

This unrest first manifested itself through violent activities organised by CPI (Marxist - Leninist) popularly called Naxalites in some areas in 1972-73. J.P. then intervened and offered peaceful and non-violent solutions. Then, in March 1974, a student demonstration was fired at by the police,

and untold repression was let loose on the students in various towns. In the Buddhist town of Gaya alone, police firing on 12 April 1974 killed twelve people. There was a state of terror, of stupefaction, and it was obvious that the Naxalite groups would find a most congenial climate. J.P. had not only trailed a peaceful path for popular action, he had earlier enabled the anti-social dacoits of the dacoit-infested Chambal valley on the UP-Madhya Pradesh border to surrender to the Government peacefully.

With his unmatched record, he, when approached by the student leaders, sought their complete identification for a non-violent struggle and also insisted that the objective of the struggle would have to be a total social revolution based on equality, justice and freedom.

J.P. launched his movement with a demonstration in Patna in April 1974 in which only those strongly committed to non-violence and selected by J.P. participated and their slogan was that they would not raise their hands to strike, however severe and violent the attack on them would be.

J.P's. movement received mass support for the people had become thoroughly disillusioned with Mrs Gandhi's rule by June 1974. In several months that year, prices were rising by 30 per cent per month; availability of food and other essential commodities was difficult and corruption was rising. Over-spending by the rich and ostentatious celebrations by Ministers, amidst poverty and hunger, were hurting the people.

J.P's. personality, the fact that he had renounced power politics when an important leader in 1956, had spurned Nehru's offer of the Deputy Prime Ministership in 1953, and had symbolised the young generation's revolt against imperialism in 1942 - 46, was no less a factor.

For the last few years J.P. had been feeling his way out of the morass in which he found the nation stuck. He had been campaigning for understanding and reconciliation with the Naga Hostiles, with Sheikh Abdullah and with Pakistan and China. He also helped in the drafting of an alternate economic plan based on appropriate technology, decentralised planning, primacy to rural areas and restriction of ostentatious consumption, in 1971. And, he had successfully intervened to stamp out the menace of dacoity, and robbery from the UP - Madhya Pradesh border.

J.P's. leadership was hailed by the people and by most opposition parties barring the pro-Moscow CPI. Large sections in the ruling Congress Party which did not like Mrs Gandhi's personal politicking and her support for pro-Moscow elements in her own party also welcomed it.

Although J.P. failed to persuade or force the Central Government to dissolve the Bihar Assembly and order new elections — as in the popular view, the assembly had proved irrelevant to the people's problems and they had a right to recall it — his movement gained nationwide appeal, and in November 1974, a National Coordination Committee was set up to launch a countrywide agitation for the reconstruction of the Indian polity on the Gandhian framework.

J.P's. Charter

Such was J.P's. influence, and his popular appeal, that even those parties which were committed to *laissez-faire* or had denigrated Gandhi, came forward to accept ideas akin to Gandhian Socialism.

Thus, in a charter presented to Parliament on 6 March 1975, on behalf of half a million demonstrators, J.P. and the National Coordination Committee asked for the reduction of income disparities to 1 : 10, egalitarian redistribution of land and the provision of essential commodities particularly to the weaker sections of the population at fair prices.

The Charter also made concrete proposals for the elimination of corruption, electoral reform in order to render money and state power ineffective in influencing poll outcome, and the reconstruction of education. It advocated certain democratic reforms to strengthen civil liberties, trade union rights, rational distribtution of power to elected lower tiers and a lifting of the Emergency.

Mrs Gandhi, instead of holding discussions with J.P. and the opposition on the Charter, sensed a danger to her Party's power and to the grossly inequitous system that her Party and Government were upholding.

Growing consensus among the opposition, consolidation of public opinion behind a new set of programmes and the failure of the political and socio-economic options which she had been following must have made her party and its monopolist and landed patrons apprehensive and nervous.

At this time, dissident voices were heard within the ruling party pressing for a dialogue with J.P. A pamphlet circulated by a Congress MP in February 1975, advocated it persausively. The CPI and its fellow-travellers in the ruling party who were itching for confrontation with J.P. also became vociferous.

However, in the election of office-bearers of the Congress Party in Parliament held in April 1975 — that is, the same period—the advocate's of a dialogue with J.P. scored a resounding victory and further unnerved the bosses.

The Gujarat assembly elections were over by the second week of June 1975. The Kerala Assembly elections were scheduled to be held even earlier where a CPI-Congress coalition, ruling with a precarious majority, was heading for defeat in September 1975.

Then came the Judgement of the Allahabad High Court on 12 June, 1975, accepting the election petition filed by her defeated rival Mr Raj Narain and invalidating Mrs Gandhi's election to Parliament. Leaders in the opposition, but some in her party too, advised her to give up her office.

When the Supreme Court, on 24 June, 1975, refused to give Absolute Stay to that Judgement, further pressures built up that she resign. Within less than forty hours, however, she had imprisoned opposition and dissident Congress leaders — the Proclamation of Emergency and Censorship followed within hours.

Having deprived the Indian people of their civil liberties and after jailing tens of thousands (the actual figure on 5 August was reported to be 56,000), the Prime Minister on the same day sought Parliament's approval of certain amendments in the electoral law and ordinary civil law all of which directly relate to her election case appeal to be heard by the Supreme Court. These amendments leave no option for that court except that her appeal be upheld; for all the amendments are to operate with retrospective effect.

Government Propaganda

The Prime Minister has also sought to win back people's support by high-powered, and of course one-sided, propaganda dubbing the opposition as anti-national. Those accused have no opportunity to explain or contradict. Nor are they to be prosecuted before a court of law. And, in order to bolster up the socio-economic system that her government safeguards and promotes, the Prime Minister has announced a 20-point economic programme. While some old slogans

which have been mouthed for two decades to beguile the landless workers but have ever remained only on paper have been included in it, no machinery is to be fashioned to implement them.

The capitalists, on the other hand, have been assured that there will be no further nationalisation — a high powered committee having recently advocated nationalisation of drug multinational companies, controls will be drastically reduced and all concessions will be given them to maximise production.

Some police measures have been taken at the same time to cleanse the cities and towns, improve the efficiency of the offices and to check smuggling, in order to justify the promulgation of Emergency among the middle classes who too have got some tax relief. Yet, there is no pronouncement as to the generation of employment, bridging disparities and eliminating black money. The trend is towards a Rightist economic policy.

The Emergency vests enormous powers in the Central Executive and Legislature and drastically reduces the powers of the States. To that extent, it is anti-federal and centralistic in content. The fact is being made use of by the Government of Mrs Gandhi in its relationship with the two States not run by her party i.e. Tamilnadu and Gujarat. Partisan interests of the ruling party reign supreme. There is a probability that these governments will be dismissed. The picture of an authoritarian, centralised rule will have been completed.

The reasons for the current Emergency can be summarised in the following:

The ruling party, as the custodian of the system and the ally of the ruling class, found that

a) the system was losing credibility and popular support as prices were rising and poverty increasing;

b) the ruling party itself, plagued by dissensions and disliked by the people, was being confronted by a united opposition whose credibility was increasing;

c) the leader of the ruling party on whose popularity earlier elections had been won had lost her charisma and her power as Prime Minister was dependent on the judgement of the Supreme Court which was more likely than not to go against her;

d) a popular leader, capable of mobilising the people, uniting the Opposition and creating a national consensus on the basis of a new programme had emerged; and

e) the people were growing restive against the corrupt electoral system and the administrative corruption and were preparing to fight against it.

Finally, with regard to J.P's. call to the Armed Forces and to the Police: J.P. had only advocated that since the Armed Forces were pledged to defending the Constitution, they should not obey orders which were subversive of the Parliamentary democratic system. He had also called upon the police not to follow orders which asked them to fire upon peaceful and unarmed citizens.

We, in this country, are faced with an authoritarian, anti-democratic rule. We expect from fellow socialists and fellow democrats that they extend all moral support to our struggle. We trust that this will be forthcoming. Socialists, the world over, have an unparalleled record of fighting against dictatorships, and Indian Socialists will most certainly aspire to keeping that glorious tradition alive.

**Surendra Mohan, General Secretary of the Indian Socialist Party, escaped arrest in India following the crisis and has remained underground since.*

Social Democracy and Northern Ireland

TOWARDS JUSTICE IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Denis Haughey

The Historical Background

The popular press often represents the Northern Ireland problem as an unresolved religious struggle left over from the seventeenth century. According to this version Protestants and Catholics fight a complex, vicious and never-ending battle over ancient theological quarrels while the British Government and the British Army try to keep the sides apart and force them to live in peace. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Northern Ireland problem is, in fact, a pretty straight-forward post-colonial problem, and the issues which divide the community are political, not religious.

For centuries before 1921, Britain ruled Ireland through a substantial population of British settlers. Although Ireland was, in theory, an 'integral part of the United Kingdom' she was, in fact, a colony, with an administration largely separate from the rest of the United Kingdom. The vast majority of Irish people were opposed to British rule, and in the second half of the nineteenth century Ireland regularly returned over 80 Nationalists to the British Parliament out of a total of 105. By 1914 the British Parliament had agreed to a measure of 'home rule' for Ireland but it was suspended for the duration of the war. Meanwhile, the 'Loyalists' of British descent, who by historical accident happened to be Protestant, began to arm themselves. In an Irish Parliament they would find themselves in a minority and the administration of Irish affairs would be taken out of their hands. Leaders of the 'Loyalists' formed a Provisional Government in the North-East of Ireland where the 'Loyalist' population is concentrated around the city of Belfast, and prepared to resist the British Government's decision to give Ireland Home Rule. In response to the setting up of the Loyalist army (the Ulster Volunteer Force) Nationalist leaders set up a volunteer army of their own. The stage was set for a civil war when the first world war intervened.

In April 1916 militant nationalists made a desperate bid to seize control

and untold repression was let loose on the students in various towns. In the Buddhist town of Gaya alone, police firing on 12 April 1974 killed twelve people. There was a state of terror, of stupefaction, and it was obvious that the Naxalite groups would find a most congenial climate. J.P. had not only trailed a peaceful path for popular action, he had earlier enabled the anti-social dacoits of the dacoit-infested Chambal valley on the UP-Madhya Pradesh border to surrender to the Government peacefully.

With his unmatched record, he, when approached by the student leaders, sought their complete identification for a non-violent struggle and also insisted that the objective of the struggle would have to be a total social revolution based on equality, justice and freedom.

J.P. launched his movement with a demonstration in Patna in April 1974 in which only those strongly committed to non-violence and selected by J.P. participated and their slogan was that they would not raise their hands to strike, however severe and violent the attack on them would be.

J.P's. movement received mass support for the people had become thoroughly disillusioned with Mrs Gandhi's rule by June 1974. In several months that year, prices were rising by 30 per cent per month; availability of food and other essential commodities was difficult and corruption was rising. Over-spending by the rich and ostentatious celebrations by Ministers, amidst poverty and hunger, were hurting the people.

J.P's. personality, the fact that he had renounced power politics when an important leader in 1956, had spurned Nehru's offer of the Deputy Prime Ministership in 1953, and had symbolised the young generation's revolt against imperialism in 1942 - 46, was no less a factor.

For the last few years J.P. had been feeling his way out of the morass in which he found the nation stuck. He had been campaigning for understanding and reconciliation with the Naga Hostiles, with Sheikh Abdullah and with Pakistan and China. He also helped in the drafting of an alternate economic plan based on appropriate technology, decentralised planning, primacy to rural areas and restriction of ostentatious consumption, in 1971. And, he had successfully intervened to stamp out the menace of dacoity, and robbery from the UP - Madhya Pradesh border.

J.P's. leadership was hailed by the people and by most opposition parties barring the pro-Moscow CPI. Large sections in the ruling Congress Party which did not like Mrs Gandhi's personal politicking and her support for pro-Moscow elements in her own party also welcomed it.

Although J.P. failed to persuade or force the Central Government to dissolve the Bihar Assembly and order new elections — as in the popular view, the assembly had proved irrelevant to the people's problems and they had a right to recall it — his movement gained nationwide appeal, and in November 1974, a National Coordination Committee was set up to launch a countrywide agitation for the reconstruction of the Indian polity on the Gandhian framework.

J.P's. Charter

Such was J.P's. influence, and his popular appeal, that even those parties which were committed to *laissez-faire* or had denigrated Gandhi, came forward to accept ideas akin to Gandhian Socialism.

Thus, in a charter presented to Parliament on 6 March 1975, on behalf of half a million demonstrators, J.P. and the National Coordination Committee asked for the reduction of income disparities to 1 : 10, egalitarian redistribution of land and the provision of essential commodities particularly to the weaker sections of the population at fair prices.

The Charter also made concrete proposals for the elimination of corruption, electoral reform in order to render money and state power ineffective in influencing poll outcome, and the reconstruction of education. It advocated certain democratic reforms to strengthen civil liberties, trade union rights, rational distribtution of power to elected lower tiers and a lifting of the Emergency.

Mrs Gandhi, instead of holding discussions with J.P. and the opposition on the Charter, sensed a danger to her Party's power and to the grossly inequitous system that her Party and Government were upholding.

Growing consensus among the opposition, consolidation of public opinion behind a new set of programmes and the failure of the political and socio-economic options which she had been following must have made her party and its monopolist and landed patrons apprehensive and nervous.

At this time, dissident voices were heard within the ruling party pressing for a dialogue with J.P. A pamphlet circulated by a Congress MP in February 1975, advocated it persausively. The CPI and its fellow-travellers in the ruling party who were itching for confrontation with J.P. also became vociferous.

However, in the election of office-bearers of the Congress Party in Parliament held in April 1975 — that is, the same period—the advocate's of a dialogue with J.P. scored a resounding victory and further unnerved the bosses.

The Gujarat assembly elections were over by the second week of June 1975. The Kerala Assembly elections were scheduled to be held even earlier where a CPI-Congress coalition, ruling with a precarious majority, was heading for defeat in September 1975.

Then came the Judgement of the Allahabad High Court on 12 June, 1975, accepting the election petition filed by her defeated rival Mr Raj Narain and invalidating Mrs Gandhi's election to Parliament. Leaders in the opposition, but some in her party too, advised her to give up her office.

When the Supreme Court, on 24 June, 1975, refused to give Absolute Stay to that Judgement, further pressures built up that she resign. Within less than forty hours, however, she had imprisoned opposition and dissident Congress leaders — the Proclamation of Emergency and Censorship followed within hours.

Having deprived the Indian people of their civil liberties and after jailing tens of thousands (the actual figure on 5 August was reported to be 56,000), the Prime Minister on the same day sought Parliament's approval of certain amendments in the electoral law and ordinary civil law all of which directly relate to her election case appeal to be heard by the Supreme Court. These amendments leave no option for that court except that her appeal be upheld; for all the amendments are to operate with retrospective effect.

Government Propaganda

The Prime Minister has also sought to win back people's support by high-powered, and of course one-sided, propaganda dubbing the opposition as anti-national. Those accused have no opportunity to explain or contradict. Nor are they to be prosecuted before a court of law. And, in order to bolster up the socio-economic system that her government safeguards and promotes, the Prime Minister has announced a 20-point economic programme. While some old slogans which have been mouthed for two decades to beguile the landless workers but have ever remained only on paper have been included in it, no machinery is to be fashioned to implement them.

The capitalists, on the other hand, have been assured that there will be no further nationalisation — a high powered committee having recently advocated nationalisation of drug multinational companies, controls will be drastically reduced and all concessions will be given them to maximise production.

Some police measures have been taken at the same time to cleanse the cities and towns, improve the efficiency of the offices and to check smuggling, in order to justify the promulgation of Emergency among the middle classes who too have got some tax relief. Yet, there is no pronouncement as to the generation of employment, bridging disparities and eliminating black money. The trend is towards a Rightist economic policy.

The Emergency vests enormous powers in the Central Executive and Legislature and drastically reduces the powers of the States. To that extent, it is anti-federal and centralistic in content. The fact is being made use of by the Government of Mrs Gandhi in its relationship with the two States not run by her party i.e. Tamilnadu and Gujarat. Partisan interests of the ruling party reign supreme. There is a probability that these governments will be dismissed. The picture of an authoritarian, centralised rule will have been completed.

The reasons for the current Emergency can be summarised in the following:

The ruling party, as the custodian of the system and the ally of the ruling class, found that

a) the system was losing credibility and popular support as prices were rising and poverty increasing;

b) the ruling party itself, plagued by dissensions and disliked by the people, was being confronted by a united opposition whose credibility was increasing;

c) the leader of the ruling party on whose popularity earlier elections had been won had lost her charisma and her power as Prime Minister was dependent on the judgement of the Supreme Court which was more likely than not to go against her;

d) a popular leader, capable of mobilising the people, uniting the Opposition and creating a national consensus on the basis of a new programme had emerged; and

e) the people were growing restive against the corrupt electoral system and the administrative corruption and were preparing to fight against it.

Finally, with regard to J.P's. call to the Armed Forces and to the Police: J.P. had only advocated that since the Armed Forces were pledged to defending the Constitution, they should not obey orders which were subversive of the Parliamentary democratic system. He had also called upon the police not to follow orders which asked them to fire upon peaceful and unarmed citizens.

We, in this country, are faced with an authoritarian, anti-democratic rule. We expect from fellow socialists and fellow democrats that they extend all moral support to our struggle. We trust that this will be forthcoming. Socialists, the world over, have an unparalleled record of fighting against dictatorships, and Indian Socialists will most certainly aspire to keeping that glorious tradition alive.

**Surendra Mohan, General Secretary of the Indian Socialist Party, escaped arrest in India following the crisis and has remained underground since.*

Social Democracy and Northern Ireland

TOWARDS JUSTICE IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Denis Haughey

The Historical Background

The popular press often represents the Northern Ireland problem as an unresolved religious struggle left over from the seventeenth century. According to this version Protestants and Catholics fight a complex, vicious and never-ending battle over ancient theological quarrels while the British Government and the British Army try to keep the sides apart and force them to live in peace. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Northern Ireland problem is, in fact, a pretty straight-forward post-colonial problem, and the issues which divide the community are political, not religious.

For centuries before 1921, Britain ruled Ireland through a substantial population of British settlers. Although Ireland was, in theory, an 'integral part of the United Kingdom' she was, in fact, a colony, with an administration largely separate from the rest of the United Kingdom. The vast majority of Irish people were opposed to British rule, and in the second half of the nineteenth century Ireland regularly returned over 80 Nationalists to the British Parliament out of a total of 105. By 1914 the British Parliament had agreed to a measure of 'home rule' for Ireland but it was suspended for the duration of the war. Meanwhile, the 'Loyalists' of British descent, who by historical accident happened to be Protestant, began to arm themselves. In an Irish Parliament they would find themselves in a minority and the administration of Irish affairs would be taken out of their hands. Leaders of the 'Loyalists' formed a Provisional Government in the North-East of Ireland where the 'Loyalist' population is concentrated around the city of Belfast, and prepared to resist the British Government's decision to give Ireland Home Rule. In response to the setting up of the Loyalist army (the Ulster Volunteer Force) Nationalist leaders set up a volunteer army of their own. The stage was set for a civil war when the first world war intervened.

In April 1916 militant nationalists made a desperate bid to seize control

of the capital, Dublin, and establish a Republic. The rebellion was crushed and the repression which followed hardened nationalist opinion. In 1918, the old Nationalist Party was swept aside by a more militant party — Sinn Féin — who took 73 of Ireland's 105 seats in the general election of that year. The Sinn Féin representatives refused to take seats at Westminster; many were still in jail since the rebellion of 1916, but the remainder met in Dublin and proclaimed themselves the parliament of the Irish Republic. For the next three years British troops struggled to suppress the new Republic and arrest its leaders, while the republicans carried on a guerilla war against the British. By 1921 both sides were weary of the struggle and agreed to talks.

After lengthy negotiations Ireland was partitioned. A large area of North-East Ireland was made into a separate state with a Loyalist majority and was given a parliament and government of its own inside the United Kingdom. The rest of Ireland became a Free State outside the United Kingdom. However, the partition settlement gave the Loyalists the largest possible area in which they could command a majority, including two counties with Nationalist majorities. The mainly Catholic Nationalists who were included within the borders of the new Northern state were resentful and rebellious and looked upon the 'Loyalist' government as illegal and immoral. The mainly Protestant 'Loyalists' were fearful of the South and insecure, and adopted a siege mentality towards the new Irish state and towards the Nationalist population within their own borders. Consequently there was a widespread system of discrimination against Catholics in every sphere of life. This sustained the resentment of Nationalists and the Northern Ireland state settled into a pattern of chronic instability. In each decade since 1921 there has been resistance and rebellion from the Nationalist population countered by repression from the Loyalist government.

The Civil Rights Campaign

The present crisis began in 1968 when Nationalists began a militant campaign against the political and economic discrimination which deprived them of houses, jobs and votes. For fifty years British governments of all parties had turned a blind eye to the system of anti-Catholic discrimination which existed within the United Kingdom.

The Civil Rights Campaign attracted intense interest from the world's press and widespread television coverage especially in Britain itself. It became impossible to ignore Northern Ireland any longer. Civil Rights demonstrations were attacked by Loyalist mobs and the police were unable to contain the disturbances — especially since they were noticeably sympathetic to the Loyalist mobs rather than to the Civil Rights marchers. Militant Nationalist groups such as the Provisional IRA began to attack the police and the British troops who were, from 1969 onwards, sent to Northern Ireland in increasing numbers. Militant Loyalist groups began to shoot Catholics in retaliation for attacks on the police and the army and the macabre game of 'tit for tat' began. In 1972 the British government suspended the Belfast Parliament and took direct control of Northern Ireland. The search began for a new and fairer system of government which would enable both sides to live in peace. That search has gone on for the last three years against a background of violence from small extremist groups on both sides of the community.

The Formation of the SDLP

In 1970 a small group of six members of the Belfast Parliament began to meet regularly to discuss the developing crisis. They had a great deal in common — they were socialists and democrats, and they believed in the reunification of Ireland by persuasion rather than force. In September of that year they formed a new Party — the Social Democratic and Labour Party. Since then our Party has grown enormously and in successive elections has increased its share of the vote to almost one quarter. In a series of policy statements made in 1971 and in 1972 we in the SDLP have set out our analysis of the problem and our proposals for dealing with it. Our policies have not changed in any way since then.

It is clear that the partition of Ireland was a mistake, both as a concept and in the way in which it was carried out. However we must live with that mistake; Ireland cannot be reunited overnight, and it cannot be reunited at all without substantial consent from the citizens of Northern Ireland. Therefore the people of Northern Ireland must find a way of living together, for the immediate future. We believe that this can only be done through 'partnership'.

The fundamental principle of our policy of partnership is that both sections of the community have equal rights to their traditions and aspirations. The 'Protestant' majority have a right to seek to retain their links with Britain. The 'Catholic' minority have an equal right to regard themselves as Irish and to seek to maintain and strengthen their links with the rest of Ireland. The two sections of the community are entitled to their separate identities and cultures and neither must seek to impose its identity or its culture upon the other. However each section of the community must also be entitled to participate fully in government. In a society where a permanently defined majority holds power permanently, and a permanently defined minority is permanently excluded from power, democracy does not exist.

The British Government eventually accepted the substance of our policy, and in June 1973 a new elective body was set up, the Northern Ireland Assembly. The British Government announced that it would try to establish a new Northern Ireland government on the basis that Assembly representatives of both sections of the community could participate. The subsequent negotiations were successful and on 1st January, 1974, a new 'powersharing' government took office. For six months the powersharing executive tackled the social and economic problems of Northern Ireland with remarkable success. In May, 1974, however, extreme right-wing Loyalists called for a general strike to bring down the powersharing government. The strike had little support in the beginning but when the Loyalist strikers paralysed the power-stations the British government, who still had control of security, refused to move against them. The inertia of the British government created the impression that the strikers could do as they pleased and eventually the majority of Loyalists began to support the strike in the hope of recovering their ascendancy. The Loyalist representatives left the powersharing government and it collapsed. The search for new institutions of government began again. Eventually the British Government announced the setting up of a Constitutional Convention in Northern Ireland to discuss possible forms of future government and to make recommendations to the British Government. The Constitutional Convention was elected in May 1975: predictably the right wing Loyalist parties won an

overall majority of the seats in the Convention and completely dominated its proceedings.

The Present Situation

The policy of the British Labour Government since July, 1974, has given us great cause for concern. In the first place the policy of interning suspects continues in contradiction of all socialist principles; and it is now directed exclusively at the Nationalist community even though the IRA is observing a ceasefire and the bulk of violence now comes from extreme Loyalist organisations. This creates a violent and emotional reaction in nationalist areas and makes it possible for the Provisional IRA to find sympathy and support. In the second place the British Government is beginning to show signs of a desire to disengage entirely from Northern Ireland. For instance the British have made it clear that they will take no part in deliberations of the Constitutional Convention and this attitude has made the Loyalist majority all the more determined to regain complete power.

The present situation is therefore extremely dangerous. If the British Government disengages from Northern Ireland the Provisional IRA may see it as a suitable opportunity to provoke the final confrontation between Nationalists and Loyalists. This in their opinion, would lead either to the abject submission of the Loyalists, or to a civil war, in which the Republic of Ireland would intervene on behalf of the Nationalist minority and crush the Loyalists. The difficulty with this analysis is that the Loyalists will not submit abjectly — there is nothing in the history of the last hundred years in Ireland to support such a conclusion. That leaves us with a civil war. It is clear to most people that the Republic would not willingly take part in a war against the Loyalist section of the Northern community. Civil war would lead to either a disastrous repartition of Ireland on a more permanent basis after substantial movement of population, or to years of inconclusive violence. There is, however, no sign that the IRA have grasped these facts or indeed that they are capable of a rational analysis of the present situation. On the other hand the Loyalist groups may see the withdrawal of the British as an opportunity to reimpose a Loyalist ascendancy. The difference between 1921 and 1975, however, is that they would have to impose their will on a rebellious minority without the aid of the British Army, and support an ailing economy without British money. At best Northern Ireland would be an insecure impoverished state; at worst rebellion would breed over-reaction and plunge the whole of Ireland into bloodshed. There are signs that some of the Loyalist leaders in the Convention are beginning to recognise the fact that Northern Ireland cannot be governed without substantial consent from the Nationalist minority.

When the Convention meets again it will be impossible to avoid the contentious issues for very long. In that situation it is vital that the British Government makes it clear that it will not tolerate anything short of full democracy and social justice in Northern Ireland. The British Government must insist that the conditions it laid down in the 1974 White Paper on the Northern Ireland Constitution regarding power-sharing and the Irish Dimension be adhered to. Only in the situation where the two sections of our community can work together in partnership will we be able to tackle the enormous social and economic problems which should be our sole concern. We, in the SDLP, have taken minority opinion a long way from the traditional Nationalist position of demanding the submission of the Loyalists to an immediate United Ireland. It remains to be seen whether Loyalists leaders can convince their followers of the futility of the traditional Loyalist policy of ascendancy.

Social Democracy and Communism

CULTURAL REPRESSION IN THE USSR

ONE MAN'S STORY

Sheldon Williams

The most notorious example of official detestation of new ideas in culture used to be Hitler's Third Reich. Today too much evidence is amassing to suggest that Russia, with only a slightly different accent, is proceeding along parallel lines. For those who remember the poet Mayakovsky's death, the self-imposed cultural retirement of the Constructivist Vladimir Tatlin[1], and the philosophical U-turn taken by writer Ilya Ehrenburg when he swapped his rôle of new-thought pundit to become puppet to his new masters, this accusation may not read like news. The difference now is that official Russian assault upon modern art, whilst losing none of its erstwhile vehemence, has in a peculiar way become horribly reminiscent of Nazi times. It has now acquired an Hitlerian imprint because of its concentration upon Jews.

In 1933/34 when the entire fabric of German modern art was being destroyed this was excused as an attack upon enemies of the State. Kultur-Bolschewismus was supposed, by the Nazis, to be allied to International Jewry[2]. Paul Klee could be blamed just as much for his Jewish dealer Alfred Flechteheim as for his 'modernism'. Having once labelled Klee as unhealthy (one day his pictures hung in Berlin's Kronprinz Palais, the next they were gone), it was a simple matter to empty a whole floor of Königsberg's National Gallery which had hitherto been full of Lovis Corinth's finest paintings. Foul and senseless as this Entarte-Kunst campaign was, it might still have been relegated to history books were it not for a repeat performance in modern day Soviet Russia.

Hitler's sneer was directed at Inter-

national Jewry. Russia decries Zionism. To be a Zionist is to be anti-State. Worse. Unless hard evidence is produced to the contrary, every Jew is a Zionist. To be Jewish with any cultural pretensions is a double fault. It needs emphasising that this is not just a return to the time when apparatchiks suddenly banned Suprematism, Neo-Objectivity and Constructivism because they could not inject them into their straitlaced manifesto (although one wonders if Marc Chagall's Jewish origins helped speed his abrupt dismissal from the Vitebsk art academy). This is the autopsy of a Nazi archaism.

How far away from the 1970s is the USSR? What information leaks through implies the West (let alone the Third World) knows all too little of what are regarded as domestic issues.

Unjustly, only those with some international connections or with more than local reputations (Solzhenitsyn!) can expect their difficulties to reach ears more than a few versts away. So the persecuted and anonymous stand no chance of alleviation from State harassment (or worse) unless they risk making a row in public loud enough to be heard and understood outside their own country. A dangerous gamble.

Cynically, it is necessary to know the rules of the game, rules capable of being twisted or replaced by new ones. The case of the writer Anatoly Marchenko (now jailed in Chuna, near Irkutsk) italicises uncertainties to which the persecuted may be subjected. The KGB would like Marcheko and his family outside Russia, but only if he emigrates to Israel. So now anyone who can be referred to as a dissident is being lumped together with Zionists. The old fashioned pogrom has been simultaneously updated and expanded. Marchenko wanted the USA. Instead, he has Siberia.

Alexander Glezer

Solzhenitsyn's exile, Marchenko's detension — modern times. But the latest, in its way most extraordinary, Culture/Jewish persecution story is that of a 41-year-old Alexander Glezer.

As a cultured Jew, Glezer was constantly in the sights of official snipers. To make matters that much more complicated he has often been the focal point of policy uncertainties. Very clearly his career in Russia demonstrates that all too often those in control are not always themselves sure of what the official line should be. A permit from one man or even from one department can be withdrawn to be replaced by a ban from another. It has taken more than 20 years for a man like Glezer to appreciate the problems such a quicksand situation presents.

Free thought, audacious views about cultural matters and, above all, the combination of both of these with Jewishness, make life for 'glezers' in the Soviet Union intolerable and eventually impossible. Existence in a dirigist State is difficult enough; when the officers in that State interpret the party line in different ways, all personal decisions become a Russian roulette.

Alexander Glezer's family was deported from Baku at the outbreak of war because they were Jewish ('undesirables'). He grew up in Bashkiri where he acquired fluency in Georgian, but he was refused entry into the local literary institute. Another act of anti-Semitism. Contrariwise, he was accepted by Moscow's Petro-Chemical Institute to train as an engineer.

The USSR does not like the word: anti-Semitism. Reasons still have to be found before a Jew can be persecuted. High on the list of such excuses are so-called 'dissident' intellectualism and — of course — Zionism.

Growth to Dissidence

What follows is an encapsulated programme of Glezer's activities which promoted him from Jew to Dissident.

1958: produces wall newspaper at the Institute. Despite support from Komsomol (Soviet Youth organisation), banned after publication of Picasso[3] number with appraisal by Ehrenburg (reprint from the days before Ehrenburg switched horses in midstream and turned his back upon modern art).
Organises cultural social evenings at the local Friendship Club. Nieszvestny sculpture, Voznesensky poetry, Ehrenburg readings. Local district committee wants to ban the Modigliani evening. Local agent persuaded to let it take place.

1962: Social cultural evenings at Friendship Club prohibited because of proposed discussion of Ehrenburg's memoirs from the 1920s.
No longer an engineer, now a full-time writer. Fired by his editor for refusing to write condemnation of Ehrenburg's early works.

1967: Invited by Friendship Club to produce exhibition of Non-Union[4] art with painter Oskar Rabin.
January 22: exhibition closed after first two hours (and 2,000 visitors) by district party. Accused by KGB of working for the CIA. Poet Slutsky pleads that Glezer should at least be able to hold discussion on 'modern art'. Decision deferred for two days — then negative.
Glezer described by Soviet Minister of Culture Furtseva as 'an enemy of the people'.
Starts making private collection of unofficial art.
On invitation from the President of the local Artists' Union, he lent works from his collection to an open exhibition in Georgia (so that his pictures hung next to those of local Georgian artists). The show lasted three days. An Army colonel complained to the KGB and the President of the local Artists' Union took them down.

1969: Organises art exhibition at Moscow's Institute of International Economics and Politics. Lasted 45 minutes.

1970: Holds a house-warming party for 200 people at his new flat so that they can see his art collection.
February: Vicious attack upon Glezer by the Moscow Evening News.
As secretary of the translation section of the Publishing House trade union, ordered to write an apology for his deviationist cultural activities. His refusal leads to his expulsion from the union.

1970-72: Because of his expulsion, not permitted to write for anyone. Helped by two artist friends. Denounced by the People's Militia as a sponger.
After 12 years employment by the Publishing House, Anna[5] Glezer is sacked for refusing to divorce Alexander.
Glezer complains to the Central Committee — protest rejected. The beginning of two years of interviews with the Committee and with the KGB — all fruitless.

1974: September — He and Rabin granted permission by the City Council to hold a street 'show' of non-Union art in Moscow.
September 15: 24 pictures by 12 artists went on street display. Almost immediately battle commenced. An official named Yagodkin[6] ordered bulldozers to break up the Show. Police, disguised as 'workers', set about burning all they could lay hands upon. Many pieces which escaped the bonfire were badly damaged. One of Glezer's Rabin paintings was completely destroyed. 300 people watched the carnage. Reaction both abroad and in Moscow was one of horror. International press and radio were full of accounts of the attack.
September 22: Glezer set upon by thugs (KGB he thinks), gagged and tied to a tree. Beaten about the face until his assailants grew weary. Then they spat upon him and made off into the night.
September 23: Protests to KGB. Only response: 'It must have been Members of the Artists' Union taking their revenge'.
Glezer says he will call press conference. KGB warn him that if he does he will be prosecuted.
September 29: New permission from City Council for another street show. This time 70 artists participate, displaying 300 works. No interruptions. Lasts a full day.
Intention to hold two more shows in Leningrad and Moscow — both to be indoors.
November 12: KGB warn him again.
December: Leningrad show is put on. Glezer jailed for 10 days on charge of being a public nuisance.
December 15: Summoned again by secret police. They would like to charge him with anti-Soviet behaviour, but authority had told them to drop the case and just ensure that he was thrown out of Russia.
Glezer lays down conditions: He would not leave without his wife, his son Alexei — and all his collection.
Glezer organises invitation from phoney relatives asking him to visit Israel.

1975: February 16 — KGB accede to his request. The wife, yes; the son, yes; but only 80 pictures.
Glezer leaves Russia with his wife, his son, his entire collection, having made arrangements for a further 300 non-Union works of art to reach him in Vienna (his privately chosen destination).

Strategy has to be employed to withstand the discomforts of bureaucratic pressure, but at least in most countries this is a normal life hazard experienced by the majority of citizens. The pattern of Glezer's tangle of friends, supporters, apparent allies and implacable foes illumines in detail not only how terrible such pressures can be upon people with independence of mind in the Soviet Union, but also that the enemy, in this case the State, can permanently distort a person's life, perhaps liquidate him, over a matter or attitude which in a free society would be written off as trivial or no more than personal eccentricity.

Today Alexander Glezer wants to settle in Britain. He would like a Centre set up for the 600 pictures. Not an anti-Russian Centre, but a Centre against the Destroyers. In return he would give everything to the UK and hope that he might be appointed curator.

---

[1] Glezer says how in 1943 when Tatlin, describing himself as a 'visionary engineer', died of heart failure, 'he crawled through the door to nothing and to no-one'.

[2] Neo-Nazis will recall Emil Nolde being rejected when he wanted to join the Nazi Party, but this is wholly irrelevant. Nolde was a mystic racist.

[3] The late Spaniard has embarrassed the Soviets ever since he made the obituary portrait of Stalin which sparked off the quarrel with Louis Aragon. But at least Picasso was a card-carrying Party member.

[4] Any artist failing to be elected to the official Artists' Union, although he is allowed to paint or sculpt, is forbidden to hold exhibitions and does not have access to state-subsidised artists' materials and travel. In theory, he has to depend upon sales to 'eccentrics' like Glezer (who are rare) or to occasional diplomats and foreign visitors (if Intourist allows such contacts). To live, he has to work at other jobs. Culturally speaking, he is reduced to a non-person.

[5] Soviet name 'Maia' in honour of Workers' Day.

[6] Yagodkin escaped serious rebuke for the bulldozer scandal. By far the greater share of blame was accorded to his opposite number on the local Party Council. In Britain we would say this man was kicked upstairs; Glezer prefers the Russian phrase: 'He was moved sideways'. Relieved of his post, he was appointed the new Soviet Ambassador to Vietnam.

PORTUGAL'S DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE

Rudolfo Crespo

In leaving the government, the Socialist Party (PS) was discharging its responsibilities to the two and a half million Portuguese (38 per cent of the electorate) who placed their trust in it. Indeed, in view of the latest developments in the Portuguese situation, which can only lead to a deterioration in the political and social climate and even to an economic crisis which would open the way for the Right, the Socialist Party could not allow itself to remain indifferent.

We think that the Portuguese process can only be consolidated by respect for the will of the people. But the Armed Forces Movement, after elections which gave a comfortable majority to the socialist forces, continued to govern with the support of an extremist minority, particularly the Communist Party, scorning the majority of the Portuguese people, riding the crest of a wave of theoretical 'revolution' learned in haste from manuals and failing to take account of the real problems of the Portuguese people. The social base of support for the revolution has thus been dangerously reduced, and popular discontent grows apace. The warnings of socialist ministers have been ignored and the biggest of the Portuguese parties has seen its status reduced to that of 'also present' at the meetings of the Council of Ministers, which was an intolerable position for it to be in.

The contraction of the social base of support for the revolution goes hand in hand with the marginalisation of the major political parties, of which the PS is one, for it is through these parties that the voice of this popular base is heard by the decision-making bodies. Clearly, it is not possible to marginalise the most representative parties without severe encroachment on democratic freedoms, and this is why we have been witnessing the manipulation of organs of the press, for example the affair of the newspaper 'Republica' which, with the complicity of the military authorities and in violation of the law governing the press, had its socialist editorial line suppressed and was made to take its place among the press of communist bias.

Crisis of Authority

We have always said that the Republica affair was for us a test case concerning the reality of the pluralist orientation of the Portuguese Revolution. The solution imposed was a reflection of the rise of what we call 'anarcho-populism', and of the crisis of authority which Portugal's political institutions are at present undergoing, for successive decisions of the Council of the Revolution have remained ineffective, owing to the clamorous intervention of minority groups under the pressure of which the bodies of government have always given way. This is an extremely serious situation: a régime of transition towards socialism requires a central power which is strong and respected and which is the guarantor of the implementation of the plan.

No such plan exists, moreover, and in the economic sector we are witnessing a slow but sure deterioration in the situation. In the absence of a plan, discretionary measures have been pursued which have had their effect on the mechanisms of the Portuguese economy without at the same time creating new structures, and this has led to progressive paralysis of the productive apparatus (production will fall by 6 per cent in 1975, according to official figures). The chain of nationalisations has in effect been 'flight in a forward direction', and they have not brought about the democratisation of management. The PS is not opposed to the policy of nationalisation and it envisages in its programme state control of the key sectors of the economy, but it demands that nationalisation should be set within the framework of a plan for the restructuring of the economy, without which such measures become pointless and demagogic.

But in fact, all these vicissitudes of Portuguese politics have their origin in the absence of a coherent political design which accords with the state and balance of Portuguese social and political forces. This is why the Socialist Party will not return to the government except on the basis of a clearly defined political agreement and programme of government. This common programme must establish clearly the type of society we wish to build and the stages for which the course will be marked out, in the conformity with the will of the people. This government must have the means to implement its policy and there must be an end to the superimposition of bodies of civilian and military power.

The socialist party embraces the historic mission of thwarting, on the one hand, the anti-democratic offensive of the totalitarian 'socialist' forces and, on the other hand, the counter-offensive of the reactionary forces, who find their surest ally in the adventurist tactics of the former. The PS is thus presenting a solution for a democratic alternative to the policy currently being applied, for it knows that only democratic socialism can provide a harmonious solution for the Portuguese people and it knows too that it has the majority of that people behind it.

OPPOSITION UNITY IN MALAYSIA

Fan Yew Teng

The five opposition parties in Malaysia started negotiations at the beginning of 1975 to bring about a united opposition Front. Past attempts at opposition unity had been either short-lived or limited.

In the late 50's and early 60's the Labour Party of Malaya and the Partai Rakyat (People's Party) succeeded in forming the Socialist Front. A split ultimately came about as a result of differences over language and education issues. The LPM had been defunct for the past few years after most of its leaders and activitists were arrested and detained without trial by the right-wing Alliance (non National Front) government. The Partai Rakyat is now known as the Partai Sosialis Rakyat Malaya (PSRM) or People's Socialist Party of Malaya.

An electoral pact was reached by the Democratic Action Party (DAP), the Gerakan (Malaysian People's Movement) and the PPP (People's Progressive Party) in time for the May 1969 general election. This electoral understanding achieved its limited purpose of increasing the combined opposition strength in both Parliament and some of the State Assemblies. The combined opposition obtained more than 50 per cent of the total votes cast and, more importantly, succeeded for the first time in denying the ruling group its two-thirds majority in Parliament and therefore its power to amend the country's constitution.

However, the successful 1969 electoral pact which was devoid of any long term political or ideological basis proved useful for the short-term electoral aims it was brought about to serve. In 1971 and 1972 the Gerakan and the PPP succumbed to the cajolery and blandishments of the right-wing ruling régime to enter into coalition government at the centre as well as the States of Penang and Perak.

About a year before the 1974 General Election was due opposition parties were coming together once again to talk about unity. The talks broke down just before the General Election in August 1974 largely over the different aims of the DAP and the other parties — the Pekemas (Social Justice Party), the SNAP (Sarawak National Party) and KITA (Country's Awareness Association). The Partai Rakyat Sosialis Malaya had earlier decided against taking part in the talks. The DAP had insisted on a long term political arrangement and ideological alignment in addition to a short-term electoral pact, while the other parties had argued for merely the latter.

Committee on Human Rights

In January 1975 the five parties (DAP, Pekemas, SNAP, PSRM and KITA) managed to agree on the formation of a Committee on Human Rights headed by well-known Malaysian poet Osman Awang to fight for the release of political detainees held under the highly repressive and obnoxious Internal Security Act.

The climate for opposition understanding was further strengthened in June when the parties agreed to have only one of the parties to contest a parliamentary by-election.

In mid-July a committee, comprising two representatives from each of the five parties, was formed to explore the possibility of drawing up a minimum common political programme. This committee is headed by Kassim Ahmad (PSRM) as chairman, Ahmad Boestamam (Jekemas) as Vice- Chairman, and Fan Yew Teng (DAP) as secretary. No specific target dates have been set, but the committee expects to be able to reach some conclusions within a year.

CONTRIBUTORS

George Fernandes is Chairman of the Socialist Party of India.

Surendra Mohan is General Secretary of the Socialist Party of India

Denis Haughey is Chairman of the Northern Ireland Social Democratic and Labour Party

Rudolfo Crespo is Secretary to Mario Soares, General Secretary of the Portuguese Socialist Party.

Sheldon Williams is a freelance visual arts writer in London

Fan Yew Teng, MP, is International Secretary of the Democratic Action Party of Malaysia

Gordon Rothney is Professor of History at the University of Manitoba in Canada

Wim van Gelder is a member of the Wiardi Beckman Stichting, Netherlands

Vilem Bernard is Chairman of the Czechoslovak Social Democratic Party in exile

Paul Fauvet is a member of the Executive of the London-based Committee for Freedom in Mozambique, Angola and Guiné

SOCIALIST AFFAIRS

Bound volumes for 1973 and 1974 available

Price: £6 each

Orders to:

88A St. John's Wood

High Street, London NW8 7SJ

CANADA:

BROADBENT FOR NEW DEMOCRATS

Gordon O. Rothney

On 7 July 1975 a convention of the federal New Democratic Party, meeting in Winnipeg, elected John Edward Broadbent as its new leader. In so doing it repeated the decision of the Parliamentary Party, of which Ed Broadbent has been leader since the defeat of David Lewis in the general election of 1974.

Like his predecessor, Ed Broadbent is from Ontario, Canada's most populous Province. He was born in Oshawa in 1936, where his father was an office clerk at the General Motors' Canadian plant. At the University of Toronto he graduated first in his class, proceeded to an M.A. in the Philosophy of Law, and took a Ph.D. in Political Science. This was followed by a year at the London School of Economics.

From 1965 to 1968 he was a Professor of Political Science at York University, Toronto. In 1968 he raised the NDP from third to first place in Oshawa-Whitby, in spite of the 'Trudeaumania' which swept most of Ontario at that time. He increased his majority in 1972 and again in 1974.

Ed Broadbent was a candidate for the leadership in 1971, when he sought to reconcile the left-wing 'Waffle' position with the moderate 'establishment', rather than beat it into the ground. He came fourth on that occasion, however, and a polarisation occurred which rent the Ontario party and resulted in its expulsion of the 'Waffle' organisation.

This year, as Parliamentary leader, it was Ed Broadbent himself who had the support of the so-called 'establishment'. He was nominated by T. C. Douglas, former Premier of Saskatchewan and former federal leader. But this time there was no ideological division such as that of 1971.

In his speech before the voting, Ed Broadbent said, 'Corporate power must be broken. This is the socialist issue of our time.' He talked about the need for the party to develop a new economic plan for Canada as 'the major weapon in our fight against corporate power', to be debated at the 1977 convention, and taken into the federal election of 1978. 'We can build a nation with a sense of compassion, a sense of community, and above all a sense of equality.'

Although there was no division of the proportion of that which faced the party in 1971, an 'anti-establishment' coalition did again emerge in the runner-up position, this time behind the candidature of Mrs Rosemary Brown, a member of the British Columbia legislature who came to Canada in 1949 from Jamaica. In 1972 she was awarded the UN Human Rights Fellowship, and in 1973 she won the National Black Award of Canada. Among her supporters across the country was a well-organised and determined 'women's caucus' within the NDP.

At the end, the balance in the voting was held by the supporters of Lorne Nystrom, MP, from Saskatchewan, the Province in which the forerunners of the NDP first achieved power. The result of the semi-final ballot was Broadbent 694, Brown 494, Nystrom 413. The final result was Broadbent 948, Brown 658.

On the motion of Rosemary Brown, the result was immediately made unanimous. Ed Broadbent was at his very best in a rousing acceptance speech which brought the delegates cheering to their feet. 'This afternoon,' he declared, 'the fight begins against one of our country's most reactionary governments in modern times . . . The battle for the formation of a socialist government at the federal level in 1978 begins today . . . We will make the socialist party the governing party in Canada.'

A pleasant incident during the convention was the presentation, on behalf of the Socialist International, to the retiring leader, David Lewis, and his wife, of return Air Canada tickets to Geneva where Mr Lewis will receive the Silver Plate of Honour next January. The presentation was made by Donald C. MacDonald, retiring President of the NDP, who represents the same constituency in the Ontario Legislature as that previously represented by Mr Lewis at Ottawa. In adding a set of luggage for the trip, as a gift from the NDP, Mr MacDonald mentioned that of the five people so far to receive the Silver Plate of Honour of the Socialist International, two were from Canada, Mr Douglas and Mr Lewis.

A month before the federal convention, a provincial NDP congress in Quebec dropped the policy in that Province of confining NDP activity to federal politics. This means that the party will be entering candidates in the next Quebec elections in some constituencies against the Parti québécois. This important social democratic party abstains from federal politics, but its supporters conspicuously failed to give their votes to NDP candidates in the 1974 federal election.

Mr Broadbent has declared himself delighted with this decision, on the ground that a local organisation dealing with provincial issues is needed as a base upon which a federal organisation can be built. NDP prospects in Quebec, however, do not look good at present at any level. Even in the key Province of Ontario, there is a very long way to go. But Ed Broadbent has demonstrated in his own constituency that it is quite possible to make impressive headway against the Liberals in Ontario. After the many setbacks which the federal party has received since 1948, his election as leader symbolises a determination and confidence on the part of NDP members right across Canada that their party can yet rise to new heights in the Parliament at Ottawa.

EUROPEAN SOCIALISTS IN STOCKHOLM

At the invitation of the Swedish Social Democratic Party representatives of 13 European member parties of the Socialist International met in Stockholm from 13 - 15 June to discuss coordinated policies for full employment and economic growth without inflation. The socialist and social democratic parties from the following countries were represented: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Israel, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland. The International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, the International Union of Socialist Youth as well as the Socialist International Research Council, were also represented.

The meeting, opened by Prime Minister Olof Palme of Sweden, Chairman of the Swedish Social Democratic Party, was convened because all those parties which were represented are deeply concerned by present international economic conditions.

The discussions on items on the agenda were introduced by Johan Aberg, of the Swedish Finance Department, Oscar Debunne, Director of the Emile Vandervelde Institute, Belgium, Dr Herbert Ehrenberg, Deputy Chairman of the German Bundestag, Edmund Dell, Paymaster-General of the Treasury, Great Britain, and Dr Philipp Rieger, Director of the Austrian National Bank.

After discussion, the following conclusions were drawn in the form of a resolution to be presented by Olof Palme to the next Party Leaders' Conference of the Socialist International:

'Although there are some signs of recovery, the world today is experiencing the deepest recession since the Second World War. There are 15 million unemployed in the OECD area alone. Production is declining. We have very high rates of inflation and severe disequilibria in the balance of payments. This situation further aggravates the already precarious situation in the poor countries. The differences between the rich and the poor countries in the world will increase further.

'The participants agreed on the importance of greater price stability. Unemployment, however, is no tool for achieving this aim. In view of this fact the participants stressed the need for rapidly reducing unemployment and restoring growth in a balanced way. The opinion is often held that there is a choice between inflation and unemployment. The conference held the view that fighting these evils simultaneously by combining properly applied measures is both desirable and possible. In fact where unused production capacity is available government actions toward increasing employment could permit production at lower per unit cost.

'The conference expressed its agreement with actions already taken by countries to stimulate the general level of demand. Where total demand is still depressed governments should take prompt action to move towards a satisfactory level of general demand. A particular responsibility in this respect lies on those countries which, because of the state of their external balance and their cost performances, can most easily do so.

'The participants stressed the need to achieve and maintain full employment without creating new inflationary pressures. With these objectives in mind economic policy should be reconsidered and additional instruments should be devised. In particular the participants stressed the need to combine more general demand management policies with selective and flexible measures that have an immediate employment effect.

'Among such measures the conference wants to draw attention to the following:

— improved training and retraining opportunities to help unemployed and low paid workers to take new jobs in industries with good prospects, thereby facilitating structural changes and resolving bottlenecks in the labour market.

— financial assistance to support employment within individual firms and local government, e.g. in the form of supplementary training.

— measures designed to counteract instability of employment due to variations in private investment and stock building, bearing in mind also the rôle and activities of the multinational companies.

— the use of public sector activities in counter-cyclical policies.

— measures designed to assist the economic development of deprived regions; where workers wish and need to move, government measures to assist them must be carried out under socially responsible conditions, e.g. through an efficient public labour exchange service.

— measures designed to increase job opportunities for disadvantaged groups.

'Given the urgency to reduce unemployment, the conference expressed the need for governments to reinforce their economic policy by the forceful use of such methods. The participants agreed that mutual information and actions of Governments and Central Banks based on coordination will significantly increase the chances for dealing effectively with world economic problems.

'The participants underlined the value of this exchange of views on economic policy between the represented parties. The conference advised the parties represented to strengthen their cooperation in this field.'

DUTCH SOCIALISTS FOR WORLD SECURITY

The Dutch Labour Party at its Congress held from 10 - 12 April 1975 in Amsterdam, adopted the following resolution on Peace and Security:

The Congress,

1. **considering,** that an active peace policy must be based on worldwide solidarity, an international legal order and the following additional **principles:**
2. —a just distribution throughout the world of prosperity, power, knowledge and labour;
3. —protection of fundamental human rights;
4. —protection of the natural environment;
5. —peace and security for all peoples;
6. observing that democratic socialism as an international movement cannot accept division of the world into power blocs within and outside which superpowers impose or seek to impose their will politically, economically, culturally and sometimes even militarily on other peoples;
7. that democratic socialism aims to provide an alternative both to the capitalist power structures of the West and to the authoritarian state-bureaucratic systems of the East-bloc countries;

7a. that the existing 'security system' is unstable and unsafe since it maintains in existence an increasingly intensified armaments race, which leads to the use of increasingly refined and lethal weapons systems;

8. **taking the view** that an active peace policy must aim at the achievements of the following objectives:
9. —establishment of a stable situation of peace and security by replacing the precarious 'equilibrium' of mutual deterrence that a system in which all states work together on an equal basis so that war and other forms of violence can be eliminated and disarmament achieved. The resources and the knowledge thus released must be used to benefit the Third World by raising their level of development, and to prevent wars between the rich and poor countries;
10. —abolition of power blocs such as NATO and the Warsaw Pact by the creation of a new, collective security system in Europe in which the neutral countries will also be able to participate and which will guarantee national freedom to the countries concerned; this new system must represent a step in the direction of a world security system within the framework of the United Nations;
11. —strengthening and extension of the powers, the organisation and the activities of the United Nations as a world organisation;
12. —elimination of all forms of discrimination and exploitation;
13. —the ending of colonialism and imperialism in the economic, political and cultural senses, in part by the creation of a new international economic system based on the elimination of the differences between the economically strong and weak;
14. —solution of the problems connected with the world food and raw materials shortage and with pollution of the environment so that the poorer population groups in the Third World benefit first and foremost and are not harmed;
15. —**convinced** moreover that a major objective of international socialist policy lies in the formation of united alliances, cutting across the power blocs, of all exploited and oppressed classes, races and peoples;
16. —that this objective is more important than conformity with the official line of international treaty organisations such as NATO and the EEC and calls for commitment to tthe role of a critical ally within these organisations, which may mean renunciation of membership on the grounds of unacceptable incompatibility with the central objective;
    (a) that NATO membership must be seen against the background that NATO is an important element in interlocking military and industrial interests which cannot easily be subjected to public supervision and that it may be used as an instrument of American power policy, although there is a risk that NATO's dissolution would lead to even greater instability if it were not replaced by a new collective European security system;
17. also **convinced** that a constant check should be kept on the following measures which are to be created and implemented, in order to ensure that they continue to be useful and suitable for the achievement of the objectives of an active peace policy.

Congress Reserves:

To employ, through the party and the government, the following measures as a means of achieving the above objectives;

I. At Party level:

18. —Strengthening and activation of the Socialist International, for example, by pursuing a policy geared to the participation of parties and movements from the Third World striving to attain Socialist societies, and the encouragement of discussions on an active peace policy;
19. —Direct support for these parties and movements and for social democratic parties in countries in which major political changes are taking place or are to be expected, for example in southern Europe;
20. —Support for the creation of Socialist parties at European level;
21. —Support for the European and international trade union movement in its efforts to counteract forces, such as multinational undertakings, opposed to the principle of fair shares, and support for independent trade unions in countries where they are forbidden or not recognised;
22. —Contacts and exchanges with parties and organisations in Eastern Europe, as regards information on the policy to be adopted in respect of East-West relations, on individual social structures and on relations with the Third World as also to set on foot mutual criticism and discussions on such subjects as the further humanisation of the various systems;

II. At national level:

23. —The creation of new models for consultation and cooperation, both within and outside the traditional framework of NATO and the EEC, with all countries, including those of the Third World, which are guided in their policies by one or more of the above objectives, so as in this way to exert influence at international level as an 'action group of like-minded nations';
24. —Measures to be taken or, where appropriate, to recommend:
    (a) a declaration from NATO that it will not be the first to use nuclear weapons and a corresponding adjustment of strategy aimed at détente by means of a more defensive armament structure in the conventional field;
    (b) establishment of NBC weapon-free zones in Europe;
    (c) considerable reduction in the number of tactical nuclear weapons with a view to total nuclear disarmament in Europe;
    (d) no cooperation under any circumstances in an extension (by replacement or otherwise) of NATO's military potential or in the introduction of new offensive weapons systems; partly for the same reasons, if the Netherlands or any other country decides on a (limited) replacement of Starfighters, they should choose an aircraft which is not so technically and qualitatively advanced that it will give new stimulus to the arms race;
    (e) introduction of an advance period of notice for troop manoeuvres;
    (f) inclusion by NATO of tactical nuclear weapons, tactical air forces and their limitation in the MBFR disarmament talks; if NATO does not do this by 1978, the Netherlands must remove the nuclear weapons from its territory;
    (g) definitive measures for the mutual limitation of conventional and nuclear weapons via the SALT and MBFR talks; if these steps are not taken in the MBFR talks, and no agreement on limitation can be reached with the allies, the Netherlands must go ahead with the planned limitations in 1976;
    (h) reduction by the end of 1978 of Dutch defence expenditure to a maximum of 3 per cent of the national income at market prices;
    (i) no new military exercise areas to be laid out in the Netherlands;
    (j) no further nuclear functions to be assumed by units of the Dutch armed forces;
    (k) finally, at national level, steps must be taken to counteract the complete dependence of certain industries on military contracts;
25. —Rejection of and refusal to participate in the establishment of a European nuclear power, *inter alia* by opposing any integration of the French and British nuclear powers and any multilateral military research projects, and by creating guarantees, for example in the framework of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, precluding the emergence of such a nuclear power; rejection also of the development of an unwieldy and unstable network of bilateral security relationships;
26. —The use of NATO membership to encourage an active policy of détente in the above sense and to reject all attempts to confer on NATO any tasks not connected purely with military policy or to extend the treaty area; NATO membership should be open only to states with a democratic system of government, which must also respect human rights outside their national borders; NATO membership must not stand in the way of other policy objectives; at the same time the alliance and the relevant Dutch policy should be subject to close parliamentary and public supervision;
27. —Continued Dutch membership of NATO on condition that within three years a significant contribution is made to détente within the meaning of paragraphs 24, 28 and 30; the continuation of conditional membership should be reconsidered by the Congress for each new legislative period; unconditional termination of membership if French nuclear weapons (in cooperation with the Federal Republic of Germany) are assigned a role in Central Europe;
28. —Intensification of the East-West dialogue and of the dialogue with the Third World at both multinational and bilateral level; in the East-West dialogue disarmament measures must take priority over such issues as the free exchange of information, persons and ideas;
29. —Strengthening of economic, technological and cultural relations between East and West and with the Third World on a basis of equality;
30. —Creation of a permanent organ for consultation and cooperation between East and West with provision for procedures for the peaceful solution of disputes and the preparation and support of the new collective European security system, which should not take the form of a new bloc in opposition to the Third World;
31. —The increasing cooperation between East and West in the form of agreements and conventions must help to bring an end to the exploitation of the Third World and interference in its affairs.
    One of the means to this end is the implementation of joint East-West projects for the encouragement of independence, which should in particular benefit the poor population groups in the Third World;
32. —Strengthening of international cooperation both within and outside the framework of the United Nations. Encouragement of binding agreements aimed at preventing existing groups of rich and/or industrialised countries (e.g. the EEC, NATO, the Group of Ten, etc.) from taking any decisions affecting the interests of the Third World without negotiations with

the countries concerned. Action to counteract the increasing tendency of rich and/or industrialised countries to form groups, which are an obstacle to decision-making at world level. Greater supervision by the United Nations of the activities of international monetary and financial institutions such as the World Bank and the IMF;

32a. Dutch development policy must be aimed primarily at the poorest population groups in the Third World; this means that social criteria must govern the distribution of funds to support the Third World;

33. Implementation of the UN charter on the economic rights and duties of states and national and international political supervision of multinational undertakings;

34. Subordination of the instrument of European unification to the realisation of a policy of progress and the democraticisation of the European institutions;

35. Action to combat and, by legal measures, to ban international trade in weapons, and to forbid the manufacture of weapons for and supply of weapons to countries which violate human rights. Investigation, exposure and as far as possible banning of combined military and industrial interests, which represent an obstacle to an active peace policy. Nationalisation of the armaments industry;

36. Closer study of non-violent forms of defence such as social defence;

37. Extension of contributions for humanitarian and education projects to liberation movements in countries where the latter promote the emancipation of the population;

38. Practical rejection of the principle of apartheid by ending all state involvement in investments in South Africa.

SOCIALIST AFFAIRS

1975 Advertising Rate

Full page	£60	½ column	£18
⅔ page	£48	Column inch	£15
½ page	£36	Insertion of	
Column	£24	leaflets	£12

We publish below the first in a series of reports on the current work of research institutes associated with member parties of the Socialist International which belong to the Socialist International Research Council.

NETHERLANDS:

WIARDI BECKMAN STICHTING

Wim van Gelder

The Wiardi Beckman Stichting (WBS) is the research institute of the Dutch Labour Party. It was founded in 1946, in the same year as the Partij van de Arbeid (the Dutch Labour Party) was established through a combination of several political parties. From the beginning there have been strong links between the party and the WBS. Formally it was a rather independent research institute, but in fact there are so many relations between the WBS and the party that it could be said that the WBS belongs to the party.

Like the party office the WBS is seated in Amsterdam and not in the Hague, the centre of government. That is one of the reasons why the relations between the WBS and the politicians are not very close. Because of the fact that the WBS is rather independent from the party it is not a staff department for the party leaders too. The work-programmes of the WBS are primarily long-term study projects. That is to say the WBS tries to build up a framework for a long-term view of the development of socialism in the Netherlands. The seven researchers of the WBS have their own subjects and work in cooperation with a lot of party members from the unions, universities, etc. on programmes for building, industrial democracy, education etc. All these reports from the WBS can form the basis of decision making in the party on the subjects concerned.

During the last few years the WBS has published reports on industrial policy, insurance companies, industrial democracy, education, sports. In 1970 a paper was written by the WBS staff called 'Gelijkheid' (Equality) which formed the 'common denominator' for all the projects of the WBS.

A very important report of last year was that on self-management in enterprises. The WBS book 'Op weg naar arbeiderszelfbestuur' (On the Way to Workers' Self-management) tried to build up a strategy for self-management in Dutch enterprises. After the war we in the Netherlands had a long period of harmonious and peaceful relations between the unions and the employers. These two groups worked together with government representatives in the Social Economic Council, which had to advise the government on a wide range of social questions. Because we had a wages policy which was centrally directed, the influence of the unions and employers at national level, together with the government was considerable. After the years of centrally directed wages policy interest in relation to the wages policy was widened, and the struggle for higher wages in several branches of industry restarted. The struggle for industrial democracy also became more and more important. During the last years it became more clear that the party needed a new policy for industrial democracy.

The results of the study on this subject will be worked out as a discussion paper and will be used as discussion material within the party. Based on the results of that discussion the party will draw up its new strategy.

The discussion will be centred on the position of the unions in the enterprises. Because of the increasing divergence of interests between the employers and the unions the unions will advise the government directly on social matters and no longer through the Social Economic Council. They take a strong position in order to achieve their own wishes. The unions will do that not only at national level but also within the enterprises. That is why it is necessary for a socialist party to see how it can promote the strengthening of the position of the unions within the enterprise. Besides this we have to look again at the law on works councils and we have to look for a way of achieving more influence for the workers on the boards of firms.

The reports on sports and education were also directed by the common denominator of equality, which is the basic principle of the present government in The Netherlands. Just after the government came to power in 1972 the Prime Minister, Joop den Uyl, said that the government should strive for equality of income, knowledge and power. This will, however, be rather difficult because the Labour Party has to work together with the so-called Christian Democratic parties. The WBS report on education aimed at building up an education policy which would give equal opportunities to all children, and special attention to children with specific problems. On sport the WBS will look at the kind of popular sport we now see in our society and in the other capitalist societies.

At the moment the WBS is busy on projects on women's liberation, building and employment policy. The first and the last subjects were considered by the WBS because of Party resolutions on these subjects. The results of these study projects are expected to form the basis for the party's policy in the future.

INDONESIA

Dear Sir,

May I be allowed a brief comment upon the two letters (referring to a recent article of mine) which appeared in *Socialist Affairs* (Vol. XXV, No. 3, May/June, 1975)?

In the first place, Otto Kersten, as General Secretary of the ICFTU, must be aware that the Suharto régime has systematically and deliberately dismantled the trade union structure of Indonesia, replacing it with an hierarchical military-controlled and military-dominated apparatus dedicated to ensuring that 'for the foreseeable future, Indonesian wage rates will remain considerably below those in most other Asian countries'. Sic! Hardly traditional union aims, whether social democratic or communist!

Professor Tinbergen is entitled to know that I am a member of the British Labour Party, and have been — with a short break at the height of the Vietnam war — for almost a quarter of a century. However, as a student of South East Asia, with some personal experience of the region, I long ago concluded that the progress of the workers and peasants there would clearly take a different course from that pioneered by the workers here in Western Europe. After all, the latter were the gainers from imperialism, the former the victims, and while the European ruling classes could afford concessions to their own working classes at the expense of the colonial peoples, today a mighty coalition of forces — all with vested interests of one kind and degree or another — block the way forward of the 'last poor'. Forbidden effective trade unions (see above) or access to electoral advance, what options have they but humiliating resignation or heroic revolt?

Malcolm Caldwell
Lecturer in the History of South-East Asia,
London School of Oriental and African Studies.

Dear Editor,

My attention was drawn only recently to the article on 'Indonesia and its Rulers' written by Malcolm Caldwell in the January-February issue of *Socialist Affairs*. Mr Caldwell has presented a political theory of the rôle of Indonesia after the fall of Vietnam. I will not attempt to argue the merits of his theory as a whole, but what I do object to is the fact that he bases his theories on data and facts which are not substantiated. For example:

a) The writer refers to an abortive coup in 1958 and 'their exiled leaders who went to the United States and took the chance to undertake postgraduate studies'. The abortive coup of 1958 was not a rebellion of pro-western elements in Indonesia, against Sukarno's leftward drift. It was an insurgence of the people outside Java who resented the too central-dominated administration of Sukarno's government. The leaders of the local rebellions in Sumatra and Celebes did not go abroad into exile. They were hunted down after their retreat to the jungles. They were arrested and kept imprisoned in various camps together with other political leaders who opposed Sukarno (among others Sutan Syahrir, the founder and first President of the Indonesian Socialist Party). They were released only after General Suharto came into power in early 1966.

b) These leaders were identified by Mr Caldwell as the present economic leaders of Suharto, known as the 'Berkeley Mafia'. This is absolutely wrong. The economists who graduated from Berkeley (University of California) were too young at the time of the 1958 rebellion to be interested in politics; they were studying in Indonesia and later were sent under a United States grant provided to the government of Sukarno for postgraduate studies.

c) The allegation that General Suharto was playing a 'double rôle' in Untung's abortive coup has recently come up among certain left-wing political writers in Europe and has never been substantiated by documentary proof. Colonel Untung acted against senior officers, members of Indonesia's supreme high command. These officers were known to be in favour of eliminating communist influence inside the army. Some of them may have been corrupt, but some definitely were not. General Suharto was at that time not a member of the staff, and therefore not important enough to the Untung group to be eliminated. He may or

may not have been aware of certain 'things going on', as was the case with many other senior officers, but he was not interested. At that time many rumours were circulating, but the real professional soldiers kept themselves outside these political manoeuvrings. Suharto was later obliged to take over the command in the army because he was the most senior in rank among the remaining living senior officers with the exception of General Nasution who was physically incapacitated as a consequence of Untung's attack on his life.

d) Only those trade union leaders who were members of the Indonesian Communist Party or of its affiliated organisations were killed or arrested.

e) The so-called 'Berkeley Mafia' have no connection whatsoever with the Indonesian Socialist Party. They were not even due-paying members, let alone party leaders.

f) Mr Caldwell's bold statement about writers, artists and musicians 'rotting away in gaols' ignores the fact that never before has there been such a rise in cultural activities in Indonesia as now. It is true that some of Indonesia's good writers and painters are imprisoned because of their communist inclinations. Their number is negligible.

These are only some of my comments on the factual distortions presented by Mr Caldwell. I will refrain from more, as it would take too much space.

Gadis Rasid
Journalist,
Jakarta, Indonesia.

Dear Sir,
The surprise and dismay expressed by Otto Kersten and Professor Jan Tinbergen over Malcolm Caldwell's article on Indonesia (*Socialist Affairs,* January-February 1975) indeed astonished me.

Malcolm Caldwell's article was, I found, cogently argued, accurately presented and indeed timely and urgent in terms of historical significance and current as well as continuing relevance. It also showed Caldwell's keenly intimate knowledge of Indonesia in particular and South East Asia in general.

What happens in Indonesia today must be viewed in the global perspective — indeed any narrower and smaller perspective would only be shortsighted, inadequate and perhaps even deceptive — of American-Japanese capitalist imperialism and Western European neo-colonialism. These are the phenomena well-meaning democratic socialists in Western Europe can ill-afford to remain ignorant or naïve about.

The military and economic tentacles of the imperialists throughout the length and breadth of the main Indonesian islands are too obvious and ostentatious to escape the notice of any ordinarily observant visitor. As the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute has pointed out in its report 'The Arms Trade with the Third World' (Pelican 1975), although only a minor military-assistance agreement was signed by the Suharto régime with the United States in April 1967, after 1970 military aid from the US increased considerably, leading to the culmination of Indonesia-US rapprochement during Nixon's visit to Indonesia in July 1970.

We know of course that Indonesia is today one of the few 'success stories' according to the dubious and cynical categorisation of the International Monetary Fund. We must remember, however, that the military coup against Allende in Chile in September 1973 merely followed an inexorable pattern of earlier fascist 'achievements' in Indonesia, Cambodia, Brazil and Argentina. To be able and willing to recognise the present fascist rulers of Chile for what they truly are and at the same time reluctant and equivocal in condemning fascist repression and imperialist exploitation in places like Indonesia can only make us guilty of political duplicity.

Indonesia's so-called 'success' today is a 'success' of American, Japanese and Western European capital; it is the 'success' of the multi-nationals; it is also the personal financial 'success' of the generals. The sad case of Pertamina and the curious story of the multi-million-dollar 'Indonesia in Miniature' project initiated by none other than Mrs Ibu Tien Suharto are but only two examples of numerous instances of corruption and gross mismanagement.

Caldwell's statement of facts with regard to the far greater revolutionary militancy and political potential of the PKI over the — unfortunately, admittedly — ineffectual and somewhat tarnished PSI did not make the dialectics and demands of the situation any less true or any more irrelevant or unworthy of mention.

Needless to say, as advocates and practitioners of constitutionalism we would have preferred our friends in the PSI to be in a better position, but that need not mean that we must pour scorn on the advocates of armed struggle. We may not necessarily agree with the methods of the PKI, but that does not mean that we should not try to understand the reasons behind them.

For Otto Kersten, at a time of détente in Europe in particular and the world in general, to be so myopic about the PKI's rôle against blatant fascism is somewhat difficult to comprehend. Or, is it really? The hope and attempt — though temporarily shelved for the moment, I understand — of certain Western European trade union circles and the ICFTU itself to eventually institutionalise relations with the Moscow-based WFTU provoke at least two interesting questions: (1) Is détente a luxury only Europeans — not Asians nor other peoples in the Third World — can afford?; (2) Is the PKI so abhorred because it was, and still is, more Peking-oriented rather than pro-Moscow?

As for Professor Jan Tinbergen, we hope he would succeed in persuading democratic socialists in the Dutch government to take a hard second look at its rôle in the IGGI and ask itself whether it should continue with its misplaced generosity towards the forces of reaction and repression in Indonesia today.

Lastly, but not least, it is perhaps high time we had a Study Group on Indonesia? If not for anything else, Indonesia has a population of about 130 million.

Yours sincerely,
Fan Yew Teng, MP
International Secretary,
Democratic Action Party,
Malaysia (member party of the Socialist International).

RADIO SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

Dear Sir,
I am writing to ask that the Socialist International puts Sicco Mansholt's excellent idea into practice. In the May/June edition he suggested, in an article on Chile, that . . . 'In the Socialist International we have to consider ways and means of establishing a strong world-wide radio network. Through this we could spread information on Chile to all parts of the world, where it is needed, and more especially to the Latin American countries, etc.' That is a superb idea and I don't understand why we haven't thought of it before! After all, our propaganda opponents do it. 'Voice of America', Radio South Africa, Radio Moscow, the CIA backed Radio Monte Carlo, to name but a few broadcast their ideas around the world, so why shouldn't we?

Our new Radio Socialist International should do this as well — programmes all over the world.

Yours comradely
Steven Topol
11 Brook House
London Road
Twickenham
Middx. U.K.

Book Reviews

MISSIONARY IN MOZAMBIQUE

Paul Fauvet

Mozambique, Memoirs of a Revolution by John Paul, Penguin, London, May 1975, 80p, pp 232.

Most white visitors to Mozambique, Angola and Guinea-Bissau during the wars of liberation in those territories — journalists, members of Parliament, industrialists etc. — acted as shabby apologists for Portuguese colonianism. Their reports consisted mainly of eulogies for the fraudulent 'multi-racialism' of the Caetano régime and of assertions of imminent Portuguese victory over the African liberation movements. History has rapidly discredited the authors of such reports.

However, one category of white visitors frequently produced a very different response. Christian missionaries were often instrumental in exposing the atrocious realities of Portuguese rule in Africa. Protestant missionaries in Angola were strident enough in denouncing Portuguese brutalities for the régime to lump 'communists' and 'Protestants' together as the 'fomenters' of the 1961 uprising. The order of White Fathers voluntarily withdrew from Mozambique in 1971, accusing the colonial authorities of creating a situation where it was impossible for honest priests to continue their work. And in 1973 it was missionaries who revealed to the world the massacre committed by Portuguese troops at the village of Wiriamu in Mozambique's Tete province.

John Paul worked as an Anglican missionary in northern Mozambique from 1957 to 1969, and his book is an autobiographical account of his life at the Messumba mission in Nyasa during those years. Messumba lay in an area of intense FRELIMO activity almost from the very start of the war, and so Fr. Paul found his mission caught up in the conflict. Many of his catechists were arrested and tortured by agents of PIDE, the secret police, while Portuguese troops destroyed most of the villages in the vicinity of the mission. FRELIMO, having no quarrel with the mission, treated Fr. Paul courteously, would warn him of the roads they had mined, and respected the neutrality of Messumba.

At the level of one small community, Fr. Paul's book explains much about the rise of FRELIMO and the collapse of Portuguese rule, in terms of the lives of individuals subjected to the unbridled terrorism of PIDE and of the Portuguese army, and easily turning to a movement that proved capable not only of waging successful armed struggle against colonialism, but also of significantly improving the material standards of the population.

The book has its defects. The first few chapters are far too long for the little material they contain, and there is at times a certain patronising tone to the writing which, I suspect, is a common failing of clergymen, missionary or otherwise. But all in all Fr. Paul's book is a useful addition to the literature on 'Portuguese' Africa. The story that he tells puts to shame all those in the West who spoke in favour of the Caetano régime, and all those governments in the NATO alliance who continued to supply weaponry and political assistance to Portuguese colonialism right up to its collapse in mid-1974.

FORERUNNERS OF THE MULTINATIONALS

Vilem Bernard

An Economic Background to Munich. International Business and Czechoslovakia 1918-1938 by Alice Teichova, Cambridge University Press, London, July 1975, £9.50, pp 382.

This is a scholarly book written not only with superb knowledge of the subject matter but also with untiring dedication which helped the authoress overcome enormous obstacles, mainly the lack of available sources. After extensive research undertaken over a number of years in Czechoslovakia, the two Germanies, France and Britain she has completed a factual study on foreign investment in Czechoslovak industry, on the clash of competing interests — French, British, German and domestic — and on the close ties between international cartels and Czechoslovak industry.

The position of Czechoslovakia was twofold in the European industrial scene. While under strong influence from giants such as Schneider-Creusot, Imperial Chemical Industries and Unilever, the young Czechoslovak state was something more than their junior partner, expanding at the same time its links with the other countries of Eastern Europe. When all is said about the growing foreign share in Czechoslovak industry, the fact remains that Czechoslovakia greatly benefited from her incorporation into the European industrial community, sharing in its technological progress, and thus reaching an industrial level which would hardly have been attained otherwise: the book gives instances of modernisation of the most important production lines carried out successfully in conjunction with the West European combines.

The title of the book is somewhat misleading in as far as the factors that led to Munich were predominantly political — nazi expansionist designs combined with the appeasement policies of France and Britain — with economic factors much less pronounced. The study itself shows that the German ambition to secure a domineering position in Czechoslovak industry at the expense of France and Britain could materialise only after

Munich and the subsequent incorporation of Czechoslovakia into the Reich. While the comparatively cheap labour available in Czechoslovakia is rightly cited among the motives that attracted foreign capital to Czechoslovakia, no attempt is made to assess whether foreign ties led to greater exploitation of the Czechoslovak workers nor is the impact assessed of the international affiliation of the Czechoslovak economy on providing employment or, on the contrary, of reinforcing in Czechoslovakia, the effects of the Depression of the 1930s.

The study ends with the year 1938 but a reader familiar with the subsequent Czechoslovak developments — and with the Czechoslovak tragedy — cannot avoid comparisons with the new brand of foreign economic relations established in 1948 and characterised not by merely growing Soviet influence on but complete Soviet domination over the Czechoslovak economy, resulting even in the imposition on the country of the Soviet economic and political system. Moreover — and this is an ironic twist of history — at the end of the road the demands for the restoration of economic links with the western countries in order to obtain badly needed Western industrial know-how, have become the official policy of the Soviet-dominated countries, with the Soviet Union taking the lead and Czechoslovakia sadly lagging behind in this as in other areas.

SOCIALIST DIARY

CHILE COMMITTEE IN ROTTERDAM

The Socialist International's Standing Committee on Chile met in Rotterdam from 3 - 4 July under the chairmanship of the Mayor of Rotterdam, André van der Louw, a former Chairman of the Dutch Labour Party, to discuss the Socialist International's financial and political support to the Chilean resistance movement.

The Committee heard a report on the situation inside Chile from Carlos Parra, International Secretary of the Radical Party of Chile, a member party of the Socialist International. Carlos Parra said that the resistance movement was active in all parts of the country, clandestine radio stations were in operation and underground newspapers were being published. The economic situation in Chile was, however, worsening with the rate of inflation having passed 600 per cent. Carlos Parra said that the political base of the resistance movement was being widened and that the opposition to the junta was growing even among conservative forces in Chile. Dissent, he said, was also building up among the armed forces, the working class and certain sections of the middle classes.

The Committee expressed its full support for the strategy and policies of the Radical Party in its struggle against the military junta both inside and outside Chile. The establishment of Radical Party headquarters in Caracas, Venezuela, was also endorsed by the Committee.

The Committee discussed at length the problem of the Chilean Government's debts to other countries which amounts to 800 million US dollars. The Committee agreed that consultation between social democratic governments on this matter should be continued to ensure joint action.

EEC SOCIALISTS: CHILE PROTEST

Following the recent declarations of the Chilean Head of State, General Pinochet, Ludwig Fellermaier, Chairman of the Socialist Group of the European Parliament, sent the following cable, on 24 June, to Mr Ortoli, President of the Commission of the European Communities:

'It was with great indignation that I learned of the declaration of the Chilean Head of State, General Pinochet, according to which Chilean political parties must be completely eradicated.

'In stating that neither under his régime nor under that of his successor must there ever again be free elections in Chile, the Dictator Pinochet has at last revealed himself in his true light.

'In the name of the Socialist Group of the European Parliament, I urge you to close, without delay, the office of the Commission of the European Communities in Santiago.

'Any other behaviour on the part of the European Community could be misinterpreted as support for the oppressive régime of Chile.'

DEFENDING DEMOCRACY IN INDIA

The Chairman and General Secretary of the Socialist International issued the following statement on 27 June:

'The Socialist International expresses its alarm and deep concern at the measures of the Indian Government which have led to the suspension of fundamental civil liberties and the imprisonment of leading democrats, including the founder of the Indian Socialist Movement, Jayaprakash Narayan, and the Chairman of the Indian Socialist Party, George Fernandes.

'The Socialist International deplores these developments which are leading India away from the path of democracy and urges the Indian Government to restore fully all basic human rights in India.

'The Socialist International calls for the immediate release of all political prisoners in India and an end to the state of emergency.'

* The Socialist International later learned that George Fernandes had, in fact, escaped arrest.

BUREAU MEETS IN IRELAND

The Irish Labour Party were hosts to a meeting of the Bureau of the Socialist International held in Dun Laoghaire, near Dublin, from 12 - 13 July. Representatives from member parties in the following countries attended the meeting: Austria, Belgium, Chile, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Ireland, Israel, Italy (Social Democratic Party) and Sweden. The International Council of Social Democratic Women and the International Union of Socialist Youth were also represented and representatives of the Indian Socialist Party, the Portuguese Socialist Party, the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party, the Vietnamese Socialist Party and the Social Democratic and Labour Party of Northern Ireland attended as guests. The Socialist International was represented by the General Secretary, Hans Janitschek, and the Assistant General Secretary, Rodney Balcomb. The Bureau meeting was chaired by Karl Czernetz of Austria, owing to the absence due to illness of the Chairman of the Socialist International, Bruno Pittermann.

Statement on Chile

The Bureau unanimously adopted the following statement on Chile:

'The Socialist International strongly condemns and draws the attention of the world to the refusal of the Chilean Military Junta, to admit the delegation sent by the Commission of Human Rights of the United Nations, to investigate the state of human rights in Chile.

'The Junta has failed to honour its commitment to give facilities to this commission so that they might carry out their task.

'The attitude of the Junta is tantamount to a declaration that human rights do not exist in Chile and that no progress is being made to restore them. Only full respect of human rights can be accepted by the Socialist International and the democratic world.

'The Socialist International strongly urges its member parties, particularly those in Government, to study the full implications of the Junta's attitude within the context of the United Nations Charter and to denounce the action of the Chilean Military Junta at the next General Assembly.'

Statement on Malagasy Republic

The Bureau unanimously adopted the following statement on the Malagasy Republic:

'The Bureau of the Socialist International, meeting in Dublin on 12 - 13 July, 1975, calls upon the Government of the Malagasy Republic, now that martial law has been lifted, to permit the political parties to function freely and normally and to ensure that full human rights and democratic freedoms are restored to the Malagasy people.

'The Bureau affirms its full support for the Malagasy Socialist Party.'

Statement on Portugal

The Bureau unanimously adopted the following statement on Portugal:

'The resignation of the Socialist Party from the Government of Portugal expresses the profound political crisis in that country. The present developments threaten the evolution of democracy there. The reason for the resignation is the violation of the agreement signed in April 1975 regarding the democratic process.

'We reaffirm our solidarity with the Socialist Party of Portugal and our full support for the democratic revolution. Only through democratic socialism can Portugal avoid the three dangers of a right wing coup, a Communist dictatorship or a military dictatorship.

'The Socialist International appeals to all member parties and especially parties in Government to support the Socialist Party of Portugal and to give financial assistance to the Portuguese Government to help solve their grave economic crisis, and further, to contribute to development schemes and to try to improve the trade position of Portugal. We consider it absolutely necessary for Socialist Governments to provide this kind of assistance in order to help Portugal remain on the path of democracy.

'The situation in Portugal has implications for the whole of Europe. A deterioration of conditions for democratic political life in Portugal is thus an impediment towards détente and dialogue in Europe.'

Telegram to Mrs Gandhi

It was unanimously agreed by the Bureau that the following telegram, on behalf of the Bureau, should be sent to Mrs Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India:

'The Bureau of the Socialist International meeting today in Dublin, motivated by friendship for the people of India, deeply deplores the abrogation of civil rights in your country, and earnestly appeals for the release of political prisoners, especially Jayaprakash Narayan, who carries the respect of socialists and men of peace throughout the world.'

Delegation to India

The Bureau also decided to send two representatives to India to meet the founder of the Indian socialist movement, Jayaprakash Narayan, who has been detained by the Indian Government and who is in poor health.

Vietnam Committee

The Bureau decided to convene an ad hoc Committee on Vietnam to consider urgently requests by the Vietnamese Socialist Party for political and material support for the Vietnamese people and political and financial support for the Vietnamese Socialist Party in its endeavour to cooperate with other patriotic forces in Vietnam.

The Cyprus Situation

The Bureau authorised the General Secretary of the Socialist International to express the concern of the Socialist International at the human aspects of the recent expulsion of Greek Cypriots from the Turkish-occupied part of the island.

INTERNATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES TO INDIA

The Socialist International on 15 July made a formal request to the Indian Government for Socialist International representatives to visit India to meet Jayaprakash Narayan, the detained socialist leader.

The request was made by the General Secretary, Hans Janitschek, to the Indian High Commission in London.

However, on 17 July the General Secretary received a message from the Indian High Commissioner in London who said that the visit of Socialist International representatives to India would be an objectionable interference in the internal affairs of the Indian Government and therefore the request to the Indian government by the International had been turned down.

On 18 July the General Secretary