

Defend The National Sovereignty of Pakistan

In March of this year, disorder broke out in East Pakistan. Supported mainly by China, President Yahya Khan and the Pakistani Government took effective measures to put an end to the disturbances. The disorder or the so-called "revolt" was instigated by the Indian Government in close collaboration with the U.S. Imperialists and the Soviet Union social-imperialists. This was done in total disregard of the repeated protests of the Pakistani Government against interference by India or any other countries, in their internal affairs.

In order to clearly understand the recent disturbances in Pakistan and all the confusions that have developed around it, we must ask ourselves some very relevant and revealing questions on the subject.

First of all, where is Pakistan and what political importance does its location have? Pakistan is an Islamic country located in south Asia. Hostile India divides it into two parts, East and West Pakistan. India is a Hindu country located at the southern most tip of Asia. Both countries have been traditional, religious rivals for a long time. Ever since the British imperialists partitioned the two countries in August 1947, there have been many bloody battles.

Both Pakistan and India form a large frontier along the southwest boundary of China and are seen by the U.S. Imperialists as of strategic military importance. The imperialists have been attempting to get military bases along China's border for years. This was the primary reason for the Korean conflict, the war in Southeast Asia and now the bloodshed in Pakistan. To get these military bases is one of the main reasons why they have financially supported both governments. In return, both governments have catered to the U.S. Imperialists. It is worth noting that Pakistan was at one time a member of SEATO (Southeast Asia Treaty Organization) and CENTO (Central Treaty Organization), two anti-communist alliances formed and controlled by the U.S. Imperialists.

Then, why is it that Pakistan's main support is now Communist China and why have the U.S. Imperialists shifted most of their support to India? In early September 1965, an 18 year old boundary dispute between Pakistan and India over the states of Jammu and Kashmir, turned into war, which lasted three weeks. The U.S. Imperialists found themselves in a dilemma when the weaker Pakistan govern-



ment turned to them for continued financial support and for the use of U.S. supplied tanks against India. Because of their many investments in India and India's much longer border frontier on China, the U.S. Imperialists refused and asked the two alliances, SEATO and CENTO to do the same. So the Pakistani Government had no one else to turn to except China. China, of course, responded with support. Although the Pakistani Government has maintained a "friends, not master" relationship with the U.S., it has also adopted a policy of neutrality and friendship to China.

Now, what were the social conditions that gave rise to the recent disturbances in East Pakistan and why did the U.S. imperialists, through India, try to take advantage of this? Under the leadership of former President Ayub Kahn, Pakistan grew economically but this wealth never reached the majority of Pakistan's ever-increasing population. The living conditions were very poor and still are. Because East Pakistan is much smaller in area (land) and much larger in population than West Pakistan, the conditions there are even worse. Because of the increasing social problems, in 1969, the aged Ayub Kahn resigned from the presidency in favor of General Yahya Khan, but conditions still remained the same.

Instead of allowing the Pakistani people to deal with their own internal affairs, now the Indian Interventionists backed by the U.S. Imperialists, have interfered in an attempt to take advantage of the situation and thereby regain control of Pakistan.

Exactly what position did the Soviet Revisionists or Social-Imperialists take during the disturbances? The social-imperialists of the Soviet Union worked in close coordination with both the U.S. Imperialists and the Indian Interventionists against

Pakistan. In Peking Review #16, 1971, it was pointed out that, "The U.S. State Department issued a statement in an effort to poke its nose into Pakistan's internal affairs, while the Soviet Government acted more blatantly. In his message to President Yahya Khan, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., Podgorny, makes no mention of the Indian reactionaries' threat to Pakistan but on the contrary, impudently criticized the Pakistani Government. They posed themselves as 'friends' and hypocritically expressed concern for 'the interest of the ...people of Pakistan.' As known to all, if the independence, sovereignty, unification and territorial integrity of a country are encroached upon, then what is left of the interests of the people?! Judging by what had been done by the Soviet Union in Czechoslovakia, it is not hard to see what the Soviet leadership supports, what it opposes, and on whose side after all it stands."

What position did China take? The Chinese Government and people supported and stated that they will as always, resolutely support the Pakistan Government and people in their just struggle for safeguarding national independence and state sovereignty and against foreign aggression and interference. The Chinese people always take a clear anti-imperialist position.

Finally, what is the position of the "Left" and what is the position of the Communist League? Most of the so-called "Left", including the Trotskyites and the revisionists (Communist Party U.S.A.) have sided with imperialism. How? By supporting a reactionary and imperialist instigated "national movement". Not all national movements are progressive. As Comrade Stalin points out in The National Question, "This of course does not mean that the proletariat must support every national movement, everywhere and always, in every single, concrete instance. The point is that support must be given to those national movements which tend to weaken imperialism and bring about the overthrow of imperialism, and not to strengthen and preserve it. Cases occur when the national movements in certain oppressed countries come into conflict with the interests of the development of the proletarian movement. In such cases, of course, support of entirely out of the question. The rights of nations are not an isolated and self-contained question, but part of the general question of the proletar-

(cont. on p.11)

Pakistan (from p.9)

ian revolution, a part which is subordinate to the whole and which must be dealt with from the point of view of the whole."

In this case the imperialists are clearly attempting to break up Pakistan so they can control it and establish bases along the border of the People's Republic of China. It is clearly an attack against socialism to aid imperialism.

The Communist League strongly supports the correct position put forth so well by Comrade Stalin. We fully support the position that China has taken on Pakistan. That is to say, we will always resolutely support any movement that serves to weaken imperialism and bring about its overthrow and resolutely oppose any movement that serves to strengthen and preserve it!