

Krivine for President of France



ALAIN KRIVINE: From Sante Prison to Elysee Palace?

**Grigorenko Arrested
at Crimean Tartar Trial**

**May Day
in Britain**

Harvard Strike Report

**New Social Unrest
in Santo Domingo**

Ninth Congress of the Chinese CP

ALAIN KRIVINE FOR PRESIDENT OF FRANCE

The Ligue Communiste* [LC] announced May 5 that it would enter Alain Krivine as its candidate for president of France in the June 1 elections. Krivine was the main leader of the JCR and played a key role in the May-June upheaval. He was imprisoned in July for thirty-nine days and drafted into the army shortly after his release. At present Krivine is stationed at Verdun with the 150th Infantry Regiment.

The announcement of Krivine's candidacy, which was featured on the front page of the widely read Paris daily Le Monde, came only hours after the Communist party designated seventy-two-year-old Jacques Duclos as their standard bearer. The day before, on May 4, the Parti Socialiste [Socialist party -- a new regroupment of right-wing Social Democrats] at its founding conference at Alfortville nominated Gaston Defferre, the mayor of Marseille, as its presidential candidate. The Parti Socialiste Unifié [PSU -- United Socialist party, the left Social Democrats] nominated its national secretary, Michel Rocard.

While the strongest bourgeois candidate is still Georges Pompidou, who has the support of the Gaullists, interim President Alain Poher is being built up by the Parti Radical [Radical party -- the traditional bourgeois liberals] as another potential heir to de Gaulle's throne.

The Ligue Communiste made it clear that its campaign would be conducted as part of the revolutionary struggle of the French youth, and not as part of the traditional parliamentary infighting of the reformist workers parties.

Daniel Bensaid, one of the editors of Rouge, told a press conference May 5:

"We want to put the revolutionary voice of May and June on radio and television. This revolutionary candidacy will help to dissipate the electoralist and parliamentary illusions fostered by the CP. We want to break with this fantasy and build a force to the left of the CP."

* The Ligue Communiste [Communist League] was founded April 5-8 by supporters of the left-Communist action journal Rouge, including former members of the Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire [JCR -- Revolutionary Communist Youth] and of the Parti Communiste Internationaliste [PCI -- Internationalist Communist party, the French section of the Fourth International]. The two last-named organizations were banned by the de Gaulle regime in June 1968.

"This candidacy," Le Monde quoted Bensaid as saying, "does not, therefore, have an electoral objective. Its principal aim is to explain that nothing was solved by the referendum, that nothing will be solved following the 1st or the 15th of June.

"The economic and social problems remain; the financial apprehension, the political instability, will not be healed for long by a victory for Pompidou. The solutions lie elsewhere: in a new mobilization of the working class in the factories and in the neighborhoods."

The army refused to allow Alain Krivine to leave Verdun to attend the press conference, but the young candidate has set in motion legal proceedings to compel the army to recognize his right to campaign. Supporters of the Ligue Communiste have asked the Constitutional Council to rule on the case.

Le Monde said the case was "unprecedented," but indicated that Krivine had the right to be a candidate. At twenty-seven, he fulfills the age requirement for the presidency, which in France is twenty-three. He also satisfies all other constitutional requirements for the presidency. Le Monde commented:

"The first reaction in military circles was that no regulation prohibits running for office. A military candidate in an election is free to write or say what he pleases. He can take advantage of a leave without pay and a special furlough."

French election laws require that a presidential candidate must receive the endorsement of 100 government officeholders in order to appear on the ballot. These 100 signatures must be collected from mayors, members of parliament, senators, etc. The Ligue Communiste has issued an appeal for these signatures on a civil-liberties basis. It is asking for endorsement from individuals who do not necessarily agree with Krivine's program, so that he can exercise the democratic right to appear on the ballot.

The Communist party launched a red-baiting attack on the Krivine campaign in the CP organ l'Humanité.

"If Krivine," l'Humanité said, "despite his sudden respect for the democratic sentiments of elected officials, has trouble finding a hundred sponsors, Marcellin will provide them." Marcellin, of course, is the head of the government police apparatus. The Ligue Communiste replied by asking the Communist party to demonstrate its own willingness to defend

the civil liberties of workers organizations by providing the necessary signatures for Alain Krivine from among the many CP functionaries who hold public office.

Georges Marchais, a member of the Political Bureau of the French CP, in an interview in the May 9 Le Monde, further denounced the young revolutionary and declared that the CP would not provide any signatures.

The same issue of Le Monde reported that the Ligue Communiste had already secured forty of the required endorsements. Charles Michaloux, Henri Weber and Daniel Bensaid told a press conference that the LC had proposed a joint campaign to the PSU, but that the PSU had decided to run its own candidate.

Daniel Cohn-Bendit sent Alain Krivine a telegram May 7 suggesting himself as a candidate for prime minister if Krivine is elected. Speaking for Krivine, who could not be present, Michel Michaloux told the press that in the revolutionary reconstruction that would follow if Krivine were elected there would no longer be such posts as ministers and such, but that Cohn-Bendit could be offered a post as a "people's commissar."

Another requirement of the bour-

"LE MONDE'S" APPRAISAL OF ALAIN KRIVINE

[The leading role which the Trotskyists played in the events of May and June 1968 and their organizational advances since that time have forced the bourgeois press in France to take a different tack in reporting their activities. Before these events, the practice was to denigrate or ignore all forces to the left of the old established parties. Now the far left organizations are receiving more attention.

[Le Monde, a bourgeois Paris daily comparable to the New York or London Times in prestige, on May 7 printed the following relatively objective biographical sketch of Alain Krivine, the candidate of the Ligue Communiste for president of France.

[The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

* * *

With abundant but not overly long hair, careful dress, a natural elegance in his expression and bearing, and a ready sense of irony, M. Alain Krivine is eloquent but discreet. At 27, he is an "old man" of the student movement. The

geois election code is the posting of 10,000 francs [US\$2,000] with the government to put a presidential candidate on the ballot. This is in addition to the expenses of campaigning. The Ligue Communiste has issued an appeal for contributions for the campaign, to be sent to Dominique Mehl, CCP: 24 786 41, Paris, France.

In issuing their appeal, the Ligue Communiste further outlined the projected campaign:

"In face of such a carnival of thieves, who seek to disorient revolutionary workers and militants, the Ligue Communiste considers it important to offer a revolutionary candidate. We are not interested in running for the post of president but in spreading revolutionary ideas and propaganda among the workers through this campaign. At a time when all groups are digging into the mythology of May to come up with attention-getting trappings for one or another of their heroes, we must present clearly and before all, one of the vanguard organizations which bourgeois propaganda branded as a 'splinter group.'"

Krivine's campaign is scheduled to wind up with a mass rally at the Palais des Sports in Paris May 28.

son-in-law of the former assistant general secretary of the PSU [Parti Socialiste Unifié -- United Socialist party -- a centrist formation] M. Gilles Martinet, he was a history student. He had to abandon his preparation for his doctorate, however, to devote himself to politics.

Involvement in politics is de rigueur in the Krivine family. While his father, a dentist, has never been active in a political organization, his five brothers all joined the Communist party. At present, two are still in the Communist party. One has left politics. The two youngest -- Alain and his twin brother Hubert -- moved toward Trotskyism under the influence especially of Ernest Mandel, a Belgian economist and the author of Marxist Economic Theory, and one of the main figures in the Fourth International.

Alain Krivine got his first experience in politics during the Algerian war. He helped to found the Front Universitaire Antifasciste [Student Antifascist Front]. Accusing the Communist party of softness in the struggle for Algerian independence and against the OAS [Organisation de l'Armée Secrète -- Secret Army Organiza-

tion -- a colonialist terrorist outfit], he was already trying to outflank the CP to the left.

He was in the opposition in the Union des Etudiants Communistes [UEC -- Union of Communist Students]. He conducted a noisy campaign against the Communist party line and violently criticized the party's decision to support M. Mitterrand's presidential candidacy. This position got him expelled from the UEC at its 1966 congress along with the rest of the "liberal arts section" of the Sorbonne, of which he was one of the principal leaders.

Upon being expelled, he did not give up the fight. He immediately announced the formation of the Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire, which joined the leftist "splinter groups" already proliferating in the Latin Quarter. The aim of this organization was to rally the various strata of the youth (high-school and university students, apprentices) to "genuinely revolutionary" positions, to train militants, and to promote ideological discussion. The JCR sought to be receptive to the new Marxist currents and

especially those shaking the "third world" (Castroism, Guevarism...) and the youth. It established numerous contacts with the revolutionary youth movements in foreign countries, especially Germany and Belgium.

If Alain Krivine was not one of those on whom the spotlight played the most in May 1968, he was nonetheless quite active. He appeared at the Sorbonne, on the barricades, in the first rank of the marches. He was often the one who inspired the tactics of the demonstrators or who dealt with the police.

This exuberant activity got him arrested in July, after the dissolution of the JCR, for holding a "clandestine" press conference. He went directly from prison to the barracks.

Combining tactical skill with revolutionary conviction, he symbolizes the new extreme-left political generation quite well. In this generation, we find a combination of a taste for intellectual debate, a quest for direct action, and a certain romanticism.

WEST IRIAN REVOLT PLAGUES INDONESIAN DICTATORSHIP

Despite earlier assurances by the Suharto dictatorship that the current rebellion in West Irian had been suppressed, an Indonesian government official announced May 8 that an "anti-Government terror campaign" had begun in West Irian. The Djakarta government banned journalists from the Indonesian-administered area. Some 500 Indonesian paratroops were sent into the territory to quell an uprising of Papuan tribesmen armed only with farm tools and primitive weapons.

West Irian, formerly Dutch New Guinea, was ceded to Indonesia by the Netherlands in 1962, on the condition that a plebiscite or "act of free choice" be conducted among the 800,000 inhabitants prior to 1969.

The current revolt, which began April 29, was sparked by the Suharto regime's announcement that the "act of free choice" would not be a vote of the West Irian population but a "consensus" of 1,000 tribal chiefs. This method would guarantee continuation of Indonesian rule.

The rebels, said to belong to a loose confederation called the Free Papua Movement, used farm implements to plow holes in grass airstrips that provide the only access to the Indonesian-controlled portion of the island. Several Irianese policemen went over to the rebels with their rifles. In one clash on Biak Is-

land an Indonesian marine and six Irianese policemen were said to have been killed.

At the West Irian capital of Jayapura, workers and peasants held a large anti-Indonesian demonstration.

At Enaratoli, rebels fired on a reconnaissance plane carrying the military commander of West Irian, General Sarwo Edhie. The area was reportedly strafed and rocketed by Indonesian bombers in retaliation.

As of May 10 the Indonesian government claimed to hold all major towns and airfields. Small rebel groups were said to have retreated into the countryside.

Since it achieved control of West Irian, Indonesian investment in the area has ranged between \$2 million and \$5 million a year. Much of this tiny sum has been drained off in corruption. Large quantities of produce and even equipment were simply shipped to Djakarta without payment, and maintenance of equipment has declined. The Dutch, for their own imperialist reasons, have encouraged the development of an independence movement in their former colony, but undeniably real social forces are in motion against the Indonesian government's dictatorial rule over the darker-skinned people of West Irian.

THE NINTH CONGRESS OF THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY

By Pierre Gousset

The New China News Agency has just published the full text of the report that Lin Piao gave to the Ninth Congress of the Chinese Communist party on April 1 and that was adopted by the congress on April 14. The NCNA also published the official text of the new statutes adopted at the congress and listed the members of the newly elected Central Committee. These reports are far from complete. We still know nothing about the fifteen days of discussion! Nonetheless the published material enables us to get a clearer idea of the meaning of the congress.

The Ninth Congress confirmed the correctness of the opinions generally held for a long time as to the political meaning of the "great cultural revolution." Mao, whose faction found itself in a minority in the Central Committee elected by the Eighth Congress, reversed the relationship of forces in the Chinese Communist party [CCP] through a gigantic mass mobilization. He now holds a solid majority in the new Central Committee. More than two-thirds of the members of the old Central Committee have not been reelected. It can safely be wagered that most of them were not even allowed to participate in the congress or to defend their point of view there.

In this regard, a flagrant contradiction must be noted between the text of the new statutes and the practice of the Maoist tendency during the factional struggle that has raged in the CCP for three years.

Contrary to the reports published in the bourgeois press before the Ninth Congress of the CCP, the new statutes do more than assert that party members must obey the leadership and that minorities must bend to the majority. They add an important qualification:

"If a Party member holds different views with regard to the decisions or directives of the Party organizations, he is allowed to reserve his views and has the right to bypass the immediate leadership and report directly to higher levels, up to and including the Central Committee and the Chairman of the Central Committee. It is essential to create a political situation in which there are both centralism and democracy, both discipline and freedom, both unity of will and personal ease of mind and liveliness."

This formulation is no ideal codification of the proletarian democracy that ought to prevail in any communist or revolutionary party. It does not recognize the right of tendencies. And without

this right proletarian democracy is reduced to a fraud, since the central apparatus holds all the advantages of centralization against an atomized membership.

This article does not repeat the formulation in the famous resolution of the Eleventh Plenum of the Central Committee (August 1966) which maintained that a minority could be right against a majority of the Central Committee or even against a majority in the party (it is true that at the time, Mao was often in a minority...). But it nonetheless constitutes an advance over the norm which the Stalin faction introduced into the Communist International in October 1927 that minorities had a duty not only to carry out the decisions of the majority (which is the rule of democratic centralism) but to renounce their ideas and confess to having erred ideologically.

It was through such procedures, which transformed democratic centralism into bureaucratic centralism, that Stalin expelled the Left Opposition and most of the old Bolsheviks from the CPSU. All the Communist parties, including the Chinese CP, have engaged in these anti-Leninist practices for more than thirty years. The fact that the Chinese CP now disavows them in theory is not without importance.

But does the practice match the theory? Clearly not. As long as the Maoist faction was in a minority, it invoked the right of free mass discussion and was able to compel discussion in which tens of millions of Chinese -- students, intellectuals, workers, technicians, and peasants -- participated. As soon as it felt it had regained control of the apparatus, it sought to stifle freedom to discuss.

The rule just cited was not applied to Liu Shao-chi and his friends. They were required to renounce their errors in order to be able to continue to function in the Chinese CP. Since they did not do this, or at least did not do so in a way entirely satisfactory to the Mao-Lin Piao faction, they were expelled. The Chinese people and the Chinese Communists are still uninformed as to their real points of view, platforms, proposals, and the real extent of the present differences. All that they have been offered are excerpts from documents ten, twenty, or thirty years old -- that is, of a period when there was no question of the "cultural revolution" or even an open factional struggle between Liu and Mao.

In order to bypass their own legality, which they had just proclaimed so solemnly, the Mao-Lin Piao faction resorted to a procedure which cannot fail to arouse the greatest distrust among all critically minded Communists and revolutionists throughout the world. This procedure was to set up two categories -- "Communists in error" and "renegades, secret agents, officials stubbornly embarked on the capitalist road, degenerated elements, and elements alien to our class ranks." In his report Lin Piao blithely proclaimed:

"Now it has been proved through investigation that as far back as the First Revolutionary Civil War period Liu Shao-chi betrayed the Party, capitulated to the enemy and became a hidden traitor and scab, that he was a crime-steeped lackey of the imperialists, modern revisionists, and Kuomintang reactionaries and that he was the arch-representative of the persons in power taking the capitalist road. He had a political line by which he vainly attempted to restore capitalism in China and turn her into an imperialist and revisionist colony."

And further on he said: "He [Liu] and his gang were working against time to restore capitalism."

When you consider that this "gang" included the majority of the Central Committee that directed the overthrow of capitalist power in China, the majority of the leaders of the People's Liberation Army that won the civil war in 1949, and the majority of the cadres responsible for the proclamation of the People's Republic of China in October 1949, it is clear how odious and slanderous this formulation is.

Liu Shao-chi and his friends unquestionably committed many opportunist errors. Not a few of these errors were committed collectively by the entire leadership of the CCP, including Mao. To cite just two such collective errors: there was the abandonment of propaganda for the dictatorship of the proletariat in the period 1937-1948 and the support for Aidit's opportunist line in Indonesia which led to the catastrophic defeat in October 1965. In these cases, Liu and his friends are today being used as scapegoats.

In other cases, it is possible that Liu maintained erroneous views against more correct concepts held by Mao (although Lin Piao's formulation that after 1964 Liu's views were "apparently leftist but in reality rightist" counsels caution here also).

But it is clear that what was involved were differences among Communists and not plotting by enemy agents. In



MAO TSETUNG

these circumstances, the expulsion from the CCP of two-thirds of the members of the Central Committee without their being able to defend their positions before the congress was a violation of the elementary rules of proletarian democracy, and a violation of the very statutes which the CCP has just adopted.

Here we come to a second contradiction -- a contradiction involving the social meaning of the Ninth Congress of the Chinese CP.

According to Lin Piao's report, which repeats the formulas used thousands of times over by the official Chinese publications during the past three years, the central objective of the "great cultural revolution" was struggle against "the restoration of capitalism in China," struggle between "the proletarian line and the bourgeois line."

In our view, China, like the Soviet Union and the East European countries, is in a stage of transition from capitalism to socialism (that, moreover, is how Marx and Lenin defined the epoch of the dictatorship of the proletariat). In this sense, a restoration of capitalism in these countries obviously is still possible. But such a counterrevolution would be bound up not only with political struggles and their results but also with economic and social transformations, that is, with the appearance of social forces of a capitalist or semicapitalist nature.

The definition of capitalism is well known to any Marxist. Capitalism is the exploitation of wage labor by means of capital accumulated by a social class separated off from the rest of society. We must, therefore, search for the economic and social phenomena promoting primitive capitalist accumulation and capitalist exploitation of labor in China.

Lin Piao imprudently quoted Lenin on this question in his report. But what does Lenin say in the quotation chosen by Lin?

"...the bourgeoisie, whose resistance is increased tenfold by its overthrow (even if only in one country), and whose power lies not only in the strength of international capital, in the strength and durability of the international connections of the bourgeoisie, but also in the force of habit, in the strength of small production. For, unfortunately, small production is still very, very widespread in the world, and small production engenders capitalism and the bourgeoisie continuously, daily, hourly, spontaneously, and on a mass scale."

What can be concluded from this quotation except that, according to the method of Lenin (and Marx), in order to evaluate the dangers of capitalist restoration in China, the extent of capitalist production would have to be determined (capitalist production survives in China because of the subsistence of a private industrial sector) as well as the extent of small-commodity production (which still predominates in the countryside)? The developmental tendencies of these sectors would have to be analyzed, that is, whether they are expanding or contracting. And a political, economic, social, and international line of the Chinese revolution would have to be determined that

could reduce the weight of these sectors and shift the relationship of forces in favor of the anticapitalist and proletarian sectors.

But such an analysis is completely lacking in Lin Piao's report. We learn nothing in this report about the class forces in China, nothing about the dynamic of these forces in the countryside, nothing about small-commodity production, nothing about the spontaneous reproduction of the bourgeoisie by the mechanisms which Lenin, and Marx before him, pointed to.

Instead of this, we are offered a violent factional polemic against Liu, who is presented as the incarnation of evil and of capital, a polemic strictly limited to superstructural phenomena, offering not an iota of objective analysis. The height of absurdity is reached when it is not even explained what motives and what forces impelled Liu into wanting to "restore capitalism" in the People's Republic of China, in which he still held power.

Let us not forget that elsewhere in his report Lin Piao uses the formulation "seize back that portion of power usurped by the bourgeoisie..." Then, when the CCP denounced Khrushchevite revisionism, was it the bourgeoisie that was denouncing revisionism? The party did this, we must remember, under the leadership of a Central Committee in which Liu's followers had a majority.

One would have to conclude that Liu tried to restore capitalism out of pure malice. This is all very far from Marxism.

It is clear that these formulations conceal the real problems rather than clarify them. And there are three real problems.

The People's Republic of China, besieged by imperialism, was stabbed in the back by the Soviet bureaucracy, which denied it the nuclear weapons needed in face of the standing threat of an American atom bomb attack. In this situation, with the Soviet bureaucracy putting on an economic stranglehold, China needs an international extension of the revolution. Is the tactic advocated by Mao sufficient to achieve this? The least that can be said is that the results of the last seven years -- with those in Indonesia and Pakistan heading the list -- have scarcely provided a conclusive corroboration of the Mao line. And Lin Piao's report (which already erred grossly by relegating the possibility of revolutions in the imperialist countries to a remote future) gives no answer to, nor any analysis of, this question.

The People's Republic of China,

which is an underdeveloped agricultural country, requires an accelerated tempo of industrialization and a general mobilization of all available manpower to raise itself out of its age-long poverty. This demands a well-thought-out social and economic policy based on the mobilization and enthusiastic involvement of the masses, and based also on using the agricultural surplus product in a systematic and carefully considered way without destroying the psychological motivations of the peasant masses' productive effort.

On this question also, no analysis or answers were contained in Lin Piao's report. The Chinese people as well as the workers of the rest of the world still do not know what social and economic policy the Mao-Lin Piao group intends to apply in the years to come.

The People's Republic of China has been governed for twenty years by a bureaucratic team which, by Mao's own admission, was remote from the people, enjoyed exorbitant material privileges, and stifled the masses' will to act and to discuss. Therefore, the necessary institutional guarantees should be established to prevent such a pernicious bureaucracy from regaining power.

But Lin Piao's report offered on

this score nothing but moralizing appeals and pledges of fidelity to Mao Tsetung's* thought (which are even written into the statutes). When it is recalled that Liu also swore by Mao Tsetung's thought, it will be understood that such guarantees are insufficient -- that is the least that can be said. We would have preferred organs of power elected by the workers and poor peasants, organs like those of the Paris Commune. But there is no question of that with Lin Piao.

The gigantic mass mobilization of the last three years has unquestionably weakened the Chinese bureaucracy. The violent intrabureaucratic struggle has had the same effect. But the contradictions mentioned above and the questions which the Ninth Congress left unanswered show that there is a danger now that this process will end. The Red Guards have been dissolved. An attempt is being made to rebuild the bureaucratic apparatus. That is also part of the meaning of the Ninth Congress.

* One of the achievements of the "cultural revolution" was to remove the hyphen from the transliteration of Mao's name, thus streamlining the formula, "Marxism-Leninism-Mao Tsetung's Thought." -- I.P.

DICTATORSHIP IN HAITI DECREES DEATH FOR "COMMUNISTS"

The rubber-stamp legislature of Haitian dictator François Duvalier voted unanimously April 28 to make "communist activities" a "crime against the security of the state" punishable by the death penalty. This "crime" is to include the "promotion of Marxist or anarchist doctrines."

Anyone accused of spreading Marxist ideas, or of aiding or harboring anyone so accused, is liable to be tried by a military tribunal and executed.

Only a few days after this head-hunting warrant had been issued, the Du-

valier regime gave a demonstration of the enforcement of its new policy. Dispensing with the part about a military trial, it proceeded directly to the executions. The May 3 issue of le Nouveau Monde, a semi-official government organ published in Port-au-Prince, reported that police had surrounded a house in the Haitian capital and killed thirty-five "communists."

Police opened fire on the house, then demolished it when the occupants would not surrender. The people inside were buried in the rubble. Four survivors were taken prisoner.

STUDENTS BOYCOTT CLASSES IN BRAZIL

Thousands of students boycotted classes at the University of São Paulo, Brazil, May 8, to protest a government order forcing the retirement of twenty-three professors.

Groups of students from several universities also met during the day to protest a decree ordering the suspension of students and professors who take part

in strikes or demonstrations. Under this law, students would be suspended for three years and professors for five.

Students at São Paulo University adopted a resolution asking President Arthur da Costa e Silva to withdraw the order purging the professors. The government had given no explanation of the order.

THE MAY DAY STRIKE IN BRITAIN

By Alan Harris

London

A sharp jolt was dealt Tory and Labour party leaders alike when over 200,000 workers throughout Britain went on strike May 1 to show their hostility to the Labour government and its proposed anti-trade-union legislation.

The government's White Paper, "In Place of Strife," seeks to put the trade-union movement into a legal straitjacket by such means as a twenty-eight day "cooling off" period and by fines and imprisonment for those who refuse to return to work when ordered by the government to do so.

Demonstrations and rallies took place in London, Liverpool, Manchester, Glasgow, Hull, Sheffield, Birmingham, and other industrial centres.

Industries most seriously affected, if not completely shut down, were the docks, building sites, engineering and car factories.

Members of the Society of Graphical and Allied Trades [SOGAT], a union which has a high proportion of youth and women in its membership, stopped all daily



HAROLD WILSON

papers from being printed in London and Scotland.

The SOGAT contingent in the London demonstration included members from Her Majesty's Stationery Office at Harrow, where the White Paper and other government documents are printed.

Between 15,000 and 20,000 singing and slogan-chanting London workers marched through the City (British capitalism's financial centre) to Lincoln's Inn Fields by way of the Trades Union Congress [TUC] headquarters in Great Russell Street.

A petition was handed in to Congress House demanding that the TUC take decisive action against the government's bill and call for a twenty-four hour general strike on June 5 -- the day the TUC recall conference meets.

The official policy of the TUC is not to oppose the White Paper in its entirety but to criticise only the most crude and objectionable parts of the bill. The top echelons of the TUC hope that by patiently explaining to Barbara Castle, the secretary of state for employment and productivity, the antilabour content of the bill, she will prevent the worst aspects from becoming law.

Although the demonstrations and rallies were initiated by the Liaison Committee for the Defence of Trade Unions -- a body influenced to a great extent by the Communist party of Great Britain -- there was a wide response for strike action among the more militant workers. The turnout was much broader than the CP or its periphery, with almost all sections of the labour movement being represented.

Students from the London School of Economics and the Revolutionary Socialist Students Federation participated in the London march but the composition was overwhelmingly trade unionist.

All the left-wing socialist organisations were there with banners, leaflets, and journals.* The banner of the International Marxist Group, the British affiliate of the Fourth International, called for "Workers Control in Place of Strife."

Three or four left-wing Members of

* There was one exception. Despite their concentration on trade-union issues, the leaders of the sectarian Socialist Labour League did not have a contingent under their own banner in the demonstration.

Parliament were in the front of the march, the most notable being Bernadette Devlin, the twenty-two-year-old civil-rights fighter and member of People's Democracy -- the driving force behind Northern Ireland's civil-rights movement. Earlier in the week she had toured the building sites, where large numbers of Irish workers are employed, to encourage them to participate in the May Day activities.

In speeches at the conclusion of the demonstration, spokesmen for the Liaison Committee urged everyone to spend the afternoon in lobbying their MPs to put pressure on them to vote against the bill when it comes for final reading in a few weeks time.

Not many workers did so, as this type of cap-in-hand protest has taken place many times before with unencouraging results.

It is clear that the British labour movement is now at a decisive turning point. The Labour government was elected some four and a half years ago on the basis that reforms, no matter how small, would be implemented by the Wilson leadership. The record is just the opposite. Far from getting the reforms they anticipated, the British working class is learning from concrete experience that the present government, while making concession after concession to the bankers and businessmen, while allowing prices and profits to escalate, is not giving anything to the workers, but, on the contrary, is taking

away workers' rights (like the right to strike) that have been won through many years of struggle against the Tories and their big-business friends in industry.

In other words, the limitations of a Social Democratic Labour government are becoming much clearer to large layers of workers if not to the class as a whole.

Alongside this development, the policies of trade-union officials are coming under closer scrutiny by the rank and file. Almost every trade union in the country has been forced to take a stand one way or the other on the White Paper. Not surprisingly, most unions are opposed to it either in its entirety or in part.

To pass critical resolutions and to be in verbal opposition, however, is one thing. To have to take a position on mobilising workers in strike action to defeat the bill is yet another.

According to the April 29 Guardian, the fifty-two rank-and-file members of the National Committee of the Amalgamated Engineering Union, Britain's second largest union, decided after a "bitter 6 hour debate" to oppose the entire White Paper. They also decided, according to the same report, to reject the call for the "unofficial" May Day strike. On the latter question, the right wing won the vote by 38 to 13 with one abstention. President Hugh Scanlon, who has a record of being a left-winger, used his influence to gain support for the right-wing resolution.



Photo by Dick Roberts

MAY DAY IN LONDON. Marchers were part of nationwide strike protesting antiunion laws.

Throughout the country the issue of the May Day strike drove a wedge between militant rank-and-file unionists and the conservative union officials, as a wide sector of the labour movement was forced to take a position on the strike.

Despite the fact that the union officialdom did not support the strike, the action must be regarded as a success. In view of the mass turnout, the opposition of the top brass of the TUC was particularly specious -- they argued that the strike was "unofficial" because only two relatively small unions had endorsed it.

For decades in Britain May Day has

been celebrated mainly by the socialist movement and generally on a weekend.

This year was quite different. We saw a political strike directed against the Labour government which is bound to have a radicalising effect on many heretofore apolitical or conservatively inclined workers. The response gained so far in the campaign against "In Place of Strife," if properly utilised, should make it possible for the June 5 lobby of the TUC emergency conference to involve even larger numbers of workers and demonstrate in no uncertain terms to the trade-union leadership that the workers are not prepared to accept any cutbacks of their traditional trade-union rights.

STUDENTS AT LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS PRESS DEMANDS

The London School of Economics administration retreated a step April 29 in its campaign to crush student dissidence. The standing committee of the LSE's Court of Governors recommended that two ousted lecturers, considered sympathetic to the rebellious students, be heard by a special appeals tribunal.

The standing committee's decision was made after a student strike against victimization by the administration, a successful one-day strike by the Association of Scientific, Technical and Managerial Staffs, and a recommendation by the LSE branch of the Association of University Teachers that the dismissals be suspended pending an independent inquiry. The two dismissed lecturers -- Robin Blackburn, a well-known collaborator of the New Left Review; and Nicholas Bateson -- agreed to study the appeal proposal.

If Bateson and Blackburn accept the appeal machinery, the London Times of April 30 reported, "The dismissals will be suspended and they will be given leave of absence on full pay pending the finding of the tribunal, comprising 'one eminent legal member and two nonlegal members.'"

Life at the LSE has been embittered over the past months by attempts of the administration and reactionary professors, backed by the government, to purge student militants from the school. They have been the target of police spying and informing since a student action on January 24.

At that time, the students voted to remove iron gates that had been installed to divide up the campus into small sections in order to prevent student mass actions. About five hours after the gates were torn down, police called in by the university heads surrounded a

building where a student social was being held, raided the gathering and arrested known student militants. In a statement issued the next day, the students described what happened: "...students present at the Friday night social were forced to march single file through the cordon to be personally fingering by their own senior professors."

Since the January arrests, some professors have had difficulty in keeping order in their classes. Dr. Alan Day, a professor of economics and vice-chairman of the Academic Board, has been singled out in particular as "an academic spy." Indignant students have prevented him from giving a number of lectures.

A parliamentary committee trying to investigate campus unrest has found the students very "uncooperative." This may be because numerous MPs have made violent verbal attacks on the student movement which have been played up by the press. The students have objected to individuals being questioned by the committee at its own convenience and have demanded that hearings be held in front of mass meetings.

The students' anger over academic informers and investigating MPs has led the British press to call for blood. Even the liberal Observer wrote May 4 that the students' action "in preventing professor Alan Day from delivering his lecture and in breaking up the hearing of a parliamentary committee hearing evidence about university affairs showed clearly enough that the aim of this hard core is not so much to bring about reforms as to make it impossible for the LSE to function."

Little discussion has appeared in the press on professors serving as police informers. Perhaps that is considered part of the normal functioning of the LSE.

GENERAL GRIGORENKO ARRESTED AT TRIAL OF CRIMEAN TARTARS

Former Major General Pyotr G. Grigorenko, one of the best known left-Communist critics of the Soviet bureaucracy, was arrested in Tashkent May 7. The for-

the army and held high command positions in World War II, during which he was twice wounded. After the war he taught cybernetics at the Frunze Military Academy in Moscow.



PYOTR G. GRIGORENKO

In 1961 Major General Grigorenko was removed from his post for a speech at a party meeting accusing Khrushchev of following in the footsteps of Stalin. In 1964 he was arrested and held for fifteen months, eight of them in a mental institution -- a common expedient of the Soviet bureaucracy for silencing opposition. In 1965 Grigorenko was certified sane and released without having been brought to trial. He was expelled from the party.

For a period he worked as a construction foreman, while outspokenly demanding a return to the norms of proletarian democracy of the days of Lenin.

In February 1968 Grigorenko joined a number of dissident Communists in sending a telegram to the Budapest conference of pro-Moscow Communist parties, protesting against political repression in the Soviet Union. Other signers included Pavel Litvinov and Larisa Daniel [both of whom are now in exile in remote regions of the USSR for demonstrating in Red Square against the invasion of Czechoslovakia], a Crimean Tartar leader, the writer Alexei Kosterin, and others. Kosterin had long been a champion of the Tartars' cause, and was instrumental in linking dissident Communist circles in Moscow with the Tartar spokesmen.

mer Soviet officer had flown to the Central Asian city at the request of eleven imprisoned Crimean Tartar leaders, who had asked him to act as a nonprofessional defense council on their behalf at their trial on charges of "anti-Soviet" activities.

The Crimean Tartars were one of seven national minorities in the Soviet Union whom Stalin forcibly deported to Central Asia during World War II because individuals had allegedly collaborated with the Nazis. In 1967 they were "rehabilitated" but were not permitted to return to their homeland in the Crimea. Since 1959 more than 200 Tartars have been imprisoned for writing protest letters, circulating petitions, and holding peaceful demonstrations.

Soviet officials had threatened Grigorenko with arrest if he attended the trial. The outspoken former general refused to be intimidated, and when he received a petition signed by 2,000 Tartars asking him to come to the aid of the defendants, he left his home in Moscow and went to Tashkent. The trial of the Tartar leaders was postponed indefinitely after Grigorenko's arrest.

In Moscow, agents of the secret police, armed with warrants naming Grigorenko as a defendant, searched the apartments of six persons known to be sympathetic to his views. Letters and other written materials were confiscated.

The secret police also raided the former general's apartment and seized copies of a number of petitions on behalf of the Tartars, letters, manuscripts, and other materials.

Pyotr Grigorenko joined the Communist party in 1927, at the age of twenty. He earned degrees in both military science and engineering. In 1930 he joined

In March 1968 Tartars in Moscow held a meeting to celebrate Alexei Kosterin's seventy-second birthday. Kosterin was ill and could not attend, so he sent Grigorenko in his place. Grigorenko urged the Crimean Tartars to fight for their legal rights and to seek links with radical members of other nationalities in the USSR.

Grigorenko, along with Ivan Yakimovich, former chairman of a collective farm in Latvia who is now under arrest, has played a prominent role in opposing the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. An open letter to the Soviet people by the

two men is said to be circulating widely in typewritten form in Moscow.

Grigorenko was fired from his job a year ago in reprisal for his criticism of the Brezhnev-Kosygin regime. His pension was taken away when he was cashiered from the army. Despite his age and a bad leg injury received during the war, he

has had to work as a laborer to support himself and his wife Zinaida Mikhailovna, who is also a long-time party member.

Friends of the general fear that the regime will railroad him to an asylum again to avoid having to bring his case to trial.

PALESTINE SOLIDARITY CAMPAIGN FORMED IN BRITAIN

[The following is the text of the initial declaration of the Palestine Solidarity Campaign, recently founded in Britain. This founding statement of the united front committee was endorsed by a broad spectrum of organizations and publications, including:

[International Socialism; General Union of Arab Students; General Union of Palestinian Students; International Marxist Group, affiliated to the Fourth International; Black Dwarf; New Left Review; Arab Revolution; Free Palestine; Friends of Palestine; Committees for Solidarity with the Palestine Revolution; Revolutionary Students Federation; Revolutionary Socialist Students' Federation; British Vietnam Solidarity Front. Further information can be obtained by writing to the Palestine Solidarity Campaign, % Free Palestine, BCM Box 3275, London, WCL.]

* * *

A permanent Palestine Solidarity Campaign (PSC) has been established to organise all solidarity activities in Britain with the struggle of the Palestinian people for national liberation against Zionism and imperialism.

The Zionist state of Israel is, historically, the product of a European problem, anti-Semitism. Zionism and anti-Semitism are, in fact, two sides of the same medal. The latter shouts 'out with the Jews', the former is only too glad to remove the Jews from Europe. But the removal of the Jews from where they are unwanted will never abolish minority persecution. Unable to solve the Jewish problem by striking at its very roots in the capitalist structure of European society, Zionism created, furthermore, a new problem of national persecution -- Zionist persecution against the Palestinian Arabs. Zionism is a colonialist movement in its own right, bent on the occupation of land and the displacement of its original inhabitants -- the Palestinian people. It is at the same time part of the world imperialist camp, through which the various imperialist powers (and notably the U.S.) have waged their aggressions by proxy, against the national liberation struggle of the Arab masses.

The present struggle of the Palestinian people is a struggle to reclaim their rights and overthrow the Zionist, racist and expansionist state of Israel. The PSC will struggle in support of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, under Israeli occupation and in exile, along the lines of the following political platform:

1. PSC supports the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and national liberation in a de-Zionized, democratic Palestine where Jews and Arabs enjoy equal rights. A de-Zionized, democratic Palestine will put an end to: (i) Palestine as the state of all Jews in the world; (ii) Jewish majority rule; (iii) the sequestration of Arab land and property; (iv) racial discrimination against Arabs and Oriental Jews; (v) subservience to imperialism.

2. PSC considers that the armed struggle waged by the vanguards of the Palestinian people is the decisive means to force recognition of this people's rights to self-determination and national liberation. It, consequently, supports the activities of the Palestinian liberation fighters and the heroic civilian resistance in the occupied territories.

3. PSC rejects the UN resolution of November 22, 1967, because it disregards the political existence of the Palestinian people and their legitimate national rights. PSC is firmly opposed to the attempts made by the four Big Powers to impose on the Palestinian people and the Arab masses their so-called 'peaceful solution'. The fate of the Arab peoples should be determined by the Arab peoples themselves.

4. PSC opposes the attempts made by any Arab government to liquidate, muzzle, control, or in any way interfere with the Palestinian people and its armed vanguards -- the liberation fighters -- and supports all resistance to such repressive measures.

5. PSC opposes all forms of racism. It will actively struggle against Zionism and anti-Jewish racism as rigorously as it will fight against anti-Arab racism, a legacy of imperialism fostered by Zionist propaganda. PSC joins the Palestinian lib-

eration fighters in declaring its solidarity with all Jews inside and outside Israel who are fighting against the Zionist, racist and expansionist state of Israel. It calls upon all progressive anti-Zionist Jews in Britain to organise themselves for the defeat of Zionist propaganda and the liberation of the Jews from that aberration that has transformed many of them into unabashed racists, subservient to imperialism.

6. The armed struggle of the Palestinian people forms an integral part of the Arab revolution -- the combined anti-Zionist and anti-imperialist struggles of the Arab peoples. Anti-imperialism in the Arab world is presently waged against direct colonialist rule (in Zafar, Muscat

and Oman), against foreign military bases, and neoimperialist exploitation. PSC supports this struggle and its ultimate aim: the control by the peoples of the Arab world over their wealth and natural resources (especially oil).

7. The struggle of the Palestinian people and the Arab masses, like that of the Vietnamese people and all the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, forms part of the historical process of liberating the oppressed peoples from under the yoke of imperialism.

From Palestine to Vietnam: One enemy, one fight! Victory to the national liberation struggle of the Palestinian people!

"ODD THINGS" IN THE SINO-SOVIET RIFT

The ever widening Sino-Soviet rift, which reached the point of bloodshed in the clash on the Ussuri River, continues to be of absorbing interest to the buzzards roosting in Washington. They watch every move of the contestants to see how the conflict might be turned to the advantage of imperialism.

Their approach is illustrated by the comments made by C.L. Sulzberger, the conservative foreign expert of the New York Times. In his column of May 9, he commented on the "odd things" that have been taking place. "On the one hand," he said, "Russia has begun an extraordinary flirtation with Chiang Kai-shek and on the other hand, Communist China has started making googoo eyes at Marshal Tito, for long considered by Mao Tse-tung the greatest heretic of them all." The "cautious development of friendship between Chiang's Nationalist Chinese Government on Taiwan and the Soviet Union is a fantastic ideological reversion from the viewpoint of both Taipei and Moscow" in Sulzberger's opinion. As evidence of what is cooking, he cites the following:

"This year...a Soviet journalist suspected of connections with Moscow's intelligence apparatus was admitted to Taiwan and received by Chiang Ching-kuo [the son of Kai-shek]. Since then there have been hints that contacts are slowly warming up. If Taiwan and the Soviet Union were first touching fingers they are now gingerly commencing to rub knees under the table. Direct anti-Soviet propaganda has almost ceased in Taiwan."

Brezhnev's game, says Sulzberger, is to give "Peking something extra to worry about on its rear while Mao beats war drums along the Siberian frontier."

But Mao is engaging in a counter-maneuver. He made a "sudden decision to

ogle Yugoslavia after years of outright hostility." The switch this signifies for Peking can be gathered from the fact that "one of the greatest criticisms of Khrushchev -- seen by Mao as the worst Soviet leader of the lot -- was the fact that he made up with Tito and promptly denounced Stalin." Mao thereupon elevated Stalin to the highest pinnacle and gave full support to Albania in its enmity with Yugoslavia. "But now China has decided to forget all this in the name of convenience. Because Tito is No. 1 champion of Czechoslovakia among Communist leaders, Mao has decided to wipe the slate clean. A trade agreement was signed with Belgrade and Tito's name has disappeared from Maoism's hate list."

In conclusion, Sulzberger hints at what is of greatest interest to Washington -- how far will Mao go in seeking new allies in the conflict with Moscow? "The Chinese, who continue their proclaimed hostility to the United States, have notwithstanding become used to the idea that we are not going to blow them up. America is the known enemy; Russia is the unknown enemy. And today both are abandoning previously fixed doctrinal positions as they edge toward the brink."

The truth is, of course, that in both instances the two bureaucracies have long discounted ideology and put their own national interests above everything else. This is one of the characteristics of the Stalinist school in which they were trained. In the case of the Kremlin this can hardly be considered to be news. In the case of Peking, however, many illusions persist.

Naturally, it remains to be seen how far Mao will ultimately go in this direction, but a film produced in China, relating to the Sino-Soviet conflict, is hardly reassuring. Called the "Antichinese

Crimes of the New Czars," it is being shown throughout China. It opened recently in Hong Kong.

Harrison E. Salisbury, the correspondent who gained a reputation for his objective reporting of the North Vietnamese cause after visiting Hanoi in 1966, described the film as follows in the New York Times May 11:

"The clear propaganda objective of

the film is to arouse the most intense national and chauvinistic emotions of the Chinese against the present Russian regime. The picture is presented in primitive colors of black and white. But no one watching and hearing the reaction of the Hong Kong Communist Chinese could doubt its powerful impact in arousing precisely those moods which Peking hoped to evolve -- anger, resentment and violent hatred coupled with a mood of national revenge."

NEW SOCIAL UNREST IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Santo Domingo

Popular opposition is mounting here against the Balaguer government which rules under the protection of American imperialism. The detonator of this opposition was the student movement which went onto the streets February 14 to demand an increase in the appropriation for the national university. The movement later spread to the primary- and secondary-school students.

In addition, the Catholic clergy has begun to express opposition to the regime. They recently issued a statement, one in a series of accusing documents, denouncing poverty, oppression, and "institutionalized violence." The declaration said that an immense popular explosion is in the offing throughout Latin America. This was shown, the priests said, by the sharp social convulsions, political upsets, and signs of mass desperation appearing in various Latin-American countries. "We cannot continue," they said, "to appease our consciences by pretending to respect the law or continuing to give priority to the property rights of those who live in overabundance, disregarding the elementary rights of those who live in poverty because they are bereft of all property."

On April 15, in protest against the government forces' recent murder of seven persons, the parliamentary opposition made up of the deputies of the Partido Revolucionario Dominicano [PRD -- Dominican Revolutionary party -- the party of ex-President Juan Bosch] withdrew from both houses of the legislature. They announced that they would not return "until Dr. Balaguer's government adopts a different position in regard to the crimes that have been committed recently." The opposition deputies accused the police of doing nothing to halt "the wave of crimes in the nation's capital."

By the fourth anniversary of the revolution of April 1965 the list of oppositionists murdered by the García Godoy and Balaguer governments went over the



JOAQUIN BALAGUER

500 mark. On May 1 the leaders of the PRD parliamentary fraction reaffirmed their stand of boycotting the legislature. They declared that they felt the circumstances were still not ripe for them to return because such an action "could be interpreted as a lack of feeling for the suffering of the people."

On April 24 and 28, the anniversaries respectively of the revolution of 1965 and the new American occupation, lightning meetings were held throughout the country. American flags were burned. There were bomb attacks on American companies. The revolutionary organizations denounced American imperialism in the press and over the radio.

At the end of April some seventy workers organizations issued a long indictment of violations by the government and the bosses of the rights of the people, including the right to organize. They called for united struggle to remedy this situation, declaring that "the rule of law is invoked only against the humble and exploited, while a minority of privileged persons, who enjoy impunity, engage in the most criminal sort of institutionalized violence."

"We are living under a regime of force," the statement said, "with a democratic façade, whose respect for the constitution does not go beyond formalities."

The workers organizations pointed out that in the three years of the Balaguer government there have been more than 400,000 unemployed out of a work force of about 1,500,000. With a "very high, a crushing cost of living...more than 70 percent of the workers earn less than 80 pesos [1 peso = US\$1] per month." Another 20 percent earn less than 120 pesos monthly. Also included in the statement was a list of cases where the workers and peasants have been repressed by the

army and the police.

This statement, which was sent to labor and legal organizations abroad, included a call for a demonstration in Santo Domingo on May 1. The government was forced to authorize the demonstration, the first to be permitted in all the time it has been in office.

The leaders and rank and file of the following organizations participated in the May Day assembly:

CASC [Confederación Autónoma de Sindicatos Cristianos -- Independent Confederation of Christian Trade Unions]; Partido Revolucionario Dominicano and its worker organizations; the Partido Comunista Dominicana [Dominican Communist party -- a party holding an independent position in the international Communist movement]; and the Movimiento Popular Dominicano [Dominican People's Movement -- pro-Maoist but independent].

The theme of the demonstration was working-class unity to win "the desired social gains and an end of the crimes and abuses against the workers and peasants." Thousands turned out for the assembly. After the event was over, the police arrested and beat up about fifty persons at various points in the city.

While the workers movement still lacks an effective leadership and a transitional program, this converging opposition is laying the bases for a socialist revolution in the Dominican Republic.



MAY DAY DEMONSTRATION IN SANTO DOMINGO. Part of massive crowd of workers at Juan Pablo Duarte Olympic Center during demon-

stration against Balaguer regime called by workers organizations. Banner at right reads, "Down with Government Terrorism!"

MEXICAN POLITICAL PRISONERS DEMAND PRISON REFORMS

[The following letter of protest was sent April 26 to Brigadier General Mario Cedillo Granados, the warden of the Preventive Prison of the Federal District in Mexico, by a group of political prisoners held there.

[The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

* * *

The undersigned, who are political prisoners confined in Dormitory N of this prison, address you to inform you of the following:

We support the action carried out by our fellow political prisoners in Dormitory M on April 22 and we subscribe to the demands that these compañeros presented to you orally on the following day. In this regard, we ask:

Unification of all political prisoners in one dormitory. The fact that we are kept divided involves one more repression against us.

But, besides this, experience has shown that the problem of the relations between the prison authorities and the political prisoners can only be resolved when the political prisoners are isolated in a single dormitory. Moreover, there are legal provisions which require grouping prisoners in the same section according to the crimes of which they are accused.

In addition, we demand:

1. Elimination of Section H as a section for political prisoners.
2. Elimination of degrading physical searches of our visitors, especially those of the female sex.
3. Abolition of the arbitrary decree that permits only one person defending us to visit us per day.
4. Humane treatment of the prisoners by the penal authorities. A definitive prohibition of the blows, insults, and harassments to which the prisoners have been subjected -- especially those prisoners on general detail.
5. Elimination of the "commandos," who, using gangster methods, keep the common prisoners' sections in subhuman conditions. Replace them by commissions democratically elected by the prisoners.
6. Improvement in the quantity and

quality of the food so that the full amount budgeted is used (ten pesos [12.49 pesos = US\$1] per person according to your report). That would help a little to alleviate the chronic malnutrition afflicting the prison population.

7. Reorganization of the medical service which presently suffers from many deficiencies -- the staff is too small and most of the time there is no medicine; the prison directors and those in charge of the medical department accuse each other of dereliction; special diets, which are necessary in the treatment of many sicknesses, have been forbidden; prisoners have to buy their medicines outside; etc.

8. Introduction of the Federal District minimum wage for workers in the prison and the elimination of unpaid labor for so-called trustees. Development of new sources of work.

9. An increase in the time for recreational activities, in accordance with the most elementary norms of group hygiene that are stipulated and carefully maintained by most prisons throughout the world.

10. Admission of Sunday visitors without their having to go on a list in advance and without numerical restrictions.

11. An end to the restriction on books, magazines, and other material for intellectual work.

The foregoing demands are in no way extraordinary and fall within the spirit of the rights granted to prisoners in a detention prison. For this reason, they should be granted to us. We will persist in our struggle to achieve these demands.

Signed:

José Luis Calva Téllez, Hugo David Uriarte y B., Eduardo Fuentes de la F., Gumersindo Gómez C., Mario Rechy Montiel, Pablo Alvarado Barrera, Miguel Cruz Ruiz, Raúl Contreras A., Rolf Meiners Huebner, Víctor Rico Galán, Gilberto Balam, Oliverio Pérez Galicia, Justino Juárez M., Carlos Aguilera D., Fabio Erazo Barbosa;

Oscar Fernández Bruno, Roberto Iriarte J., Adolfo Gilly, Luis E.G. Del Toro y N., M. Alberto Reyna de la Cruz, Antonio Gershenson T., Enrique Condés Lara, Francisco Luna Leal, Daniel Camejo Guanche, Gerardo Peláez Ramos, Adán Nieto Castillo, César Catalán Sánchez, Ysaías Rojas D.

Books

REVOLUTIONARY PERSPECTIVES -- AN INTERNATIONAL VIEW

By Gerry Foley

FIFTY YEARS OF WORLD REVOLUTION, 1917-1967. An International Symposium. Edited by Ernest Mandel. Merit Publishers, 873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003. 366 pp. \$7.95. 1968.

This work is an unusual achievement in international revolutionary collaboration. Written by fifteen leaders of the Trotskyist movement representing eleven countries and nearly all parts of the world, the essays in this book study the full spectrum of problems and questions that have confronted revolutionists since the Russian October opened the epoch of world socialist revolution.

Of special current interest is the essay entitled "Economics of the Transition Period" contributed by the book's editor, Ernest Mandel, who is the author of the definitive two-volume work, Marxist Economic Theory. This well-known Belgian socialist scholar and political leader gives a systematic Marxist analysis of the transition from capitalist to socialist economic relations. He examines a number of specific problems that have arisen in those countries, embracing one-third of humanity, where capitalism has been abolished but socialism has not yet been achieved.

Among the questions studied are the relationship between planning and democracy in making economic choices; economic relations among workers states; trade between the noncapitalist and capitalist countries; the meaning of the "socialist market economy" reforms in the Soviet Union and East Europe; and the role of moral and material incentives in promoting productivity in a socialized economy.

Mandel's introduction to the book is a valuable contribution too. It succeeds in giving a clear overview of the development of the socialist revolution since Marx's time and thereby in giving a focus that unites all the individual essays.

Broad guidelines to the unfolding of the revolutionary epoch are also provided by George Novack, the American Marxist philosopher, in his essay "The Uneven Development of the World Revolutionary Process." Novack explains why the first socialist revolution occurred in backward Russia and how this example of the uneven development of history has shaped the contemporary world.

Two essays deal with the central event in the history of the twentieth century, the creation of the Soviet state and its bureaucratic degeneration. The essay by Sirio Di Giuliomaria, a leading member of the Gruppi Communisti Rivoluzionari [Revolutionary Communist Groups -- the Italian section of the Fourth International, the world party of socialist revolution founded by Leon Trotsky], gives a sketch and analysis of the history of the Soviet state from Lenin's day to the de-Stalinization. Di Giuliomaria describes Lenin's last fight against the rising bureaucracy led by Stalin, and the Stalinist machine that was erected after the death of Lenin and the defeat of the Left Opposition. He ends his essay by setting forth a program for antibureaucratic revolution in the Soviet Union and the other bureaucratized workers states.

A process intimately bound up with the Russian revolution and its degeneration is described by Ross Dowson, the editor of the Canadian socialist paper Workers Vanguard. Dowson describes how building the Communist International was part and parcel of winning the Russian revolution and how the International withered and was eventually abandoned after the bureaucracy rose to power.

In his essay "Is Marxism-Leninism Obsolete?" Joseph Hansen, the editor of Intercontinental Press, discusses the uses of the Marxist method in dealing with present-day reality. In connection with this discussion, he dissects the major arguments put forward by opponents of scientific socialism for relegating the ideas of Marx and Lenin to the archives of intellectual history.

The essay by James P. Cannon, the national chairman of the American Socialist Workers party, examines how well the Leninist theory of a disciplined party of professional revolutionists has stood the test of time. He sums up some of the lessons learned by the Trotskyist movement in its forty years of experience in trying to build parties of this type.

Three essays deal with categories of revolutionary theory where the Trotskyist movement has historically made its greatest contribution. A detailed study of the development of the concept of permanent revolution and of Trotsky's differences with Lenin over the 1905 revolution is contributed by Livio Maitan, one of the leaders of the Gruppi Communisti

Rivoluzionari and a member of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.

Fernand Charlier, a leading Belgian Marxist, gives a comprehensive study of the development and dynamics of the various forms of bureaucracy that exist in modern society. His main emphasis is on bureaucracy in the workers movement, especially its most sophisticated form, in the bureaucratized workers states.

Georg Jungclas, a veteran of the prewar German Trotskyist movement, gives a compact and thorough study of the most important example of the rise of a fascist movement -- the Nazi victory in Germany. He recapitulates Trotsky's criticism of the role of the Communist and Socialist parties in making a fascist victory possible and offers a valuable, concise history of the events leading up to the fascist take-over. Some interesting features in Jungclas' study are an account of the ideological development of the German Social Democracy after it renounced the revolutionary perspective, and fresh documentation on the ultraleft period of the German CP.

An analysis of the question of proletarian internationalism is given by Pierre Frank, a long-time leader of the French Trotskyist movement and a member of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International. Frank discusses the theory of "socialism in one country" as well as the more recent bureaucratic theories of "polycentrism" and "national communism" that have emerged from the process of the breakup of the Stalinist monolith.

"The National Question and the Black Liberation Struggle in the United States" by George Breitman, the American Marxist scholar who is the author of several books and pamphlets on Malcolm X, is a good example of an analysis that applies a classical contribution of Leninism to a contemporary problem. Breitman uses Lenin's teaching on oppressed nationalities as a tool for examining the role of the Afro-American population in the revolutionary process beginning to develop in America.

Three essays deal with the problems facing revolutionists in the underdeveloped countries, problems which are relatively new for the revolutionary movement and have gained special prominence in the last two decades. Two contributors from Latin America, Nahuel Moreno from

Argentina and Hugo González Moscoso from Bolivia, deal extensively with the questions of guerrilla warfare and the role of the peasantry in achieving the socialist revolution.

Moscoso, who is general secretary of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario [Revolutionary Workers party -- the Bolivian section of the Fourth International], writes from a country where guerrilla warfare is now in progress. He gives an assessment of the lessons of the successful guerrilla war in Cuba. His essay describes the process of permanent revolution that took place in Cuba and compares it with the stagnation and retreat that ensued in Bolivia after the anti-imperialist revolution of 1952 failed to develop into a full socialist revolution.

Nahuel Moreno's essay is a history and analysis of the development of revolutionary warfare in China and Vietnam and the character of the regimes and doctrines that have arisen on the basis of this experience.

An essay by Sitaram B. Kolpe, a leading member of the Socialist Workers party of India, the Indian section of the Fourth International, rounds out the treatment of the colonial revolution. Using his own country as his example, Kolpe investigates the claims of the nationalist regimes in the underdeveloped world to have found a "third road" of development between capitalism and Marxian socialism -- "Ghandian Socialism," "Arab Socialism," "African Socialism," etc. This essay devotes special attention to Moscow's invention of a new category of "noncapitalist" and "neutral" states in the underdeveloped world.

The usefulness of the book as a whole is enhanced by the inclusion of a bibliography of 100 of the most important Marxist works.

In view of the diversity of countries and areas of the world represented in this anthology, it is a notably unified and complete study of the major problems and questions which our epoch has posed for revolutionists.

This book is very clearly the product of an international movement deeply engaged in the day-to-day struggles of the new generation. It reflects the worldwide experience of the Trotskyist movement in building the initial cadres of future mass parties, of the revolutionary international.

CONGO-BRAZZAVILLE STUDENTS BEGIN STRIKE

Students at the Center of Higher Education in Brazzaville went on strike May 5. They demanded that the subjects

of examinations be announced at least ten days in advance and that student representatives be among the judges.

Campus Unrest in the U.S., a Case Study

REPORT ON THE HARVARD STRIKE

By Fred Halstead

This spring has seen the most extensive wave of student demonstrations, occupations of campus buildings, and other forms of struggle in colleges and universities in the history of the United States. This new radicalization, of course, is part of the worldwide radicalization of the young generation, especially in the advanced capitalist countries, which reached its peak to date in the May-June 1968 upheaval in France.

American developments, while part of this general phenomenon, have their own logic and dynamic, flowing from the specific conditions in this country: a growing mass resistance to the criminal war in Vietnam and the heightening tempo of the black liberation struggle, yet with the absence of any large working-class party, relative prosperity among the white sector of the population, and the isolation of the students from both the actual working class and from the historical traditions of the revolutionary workers movement.

The April 1969 strike at Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts, is typical of the current series of campus strikes and occupations. The events at Harvard are of special interest because of the role of Harvard as the most exclusive of all American institutions of higher learning, where the cream of the youth of the bourgeoisie itself acquires the training to assume command of the government and financial empire of American imperialism.

The April struggle dated from an incident in December 1968 when a meeting of professors of the faculty of arts and sciences was scheduled to be held in Paine Hall to discuss the future of the Reserve Officers Training Corps [ROTC] at Harvard.

Students are not allowed to attend faculty meetings, but several hundred showed up at Paine Hall before the meeting began and held a sit-in, demanding that the faculty deal with the issue on political, not technical academic grounds.

The meeting was canceled and more than 100 students were disciplined, some by having scholarships revoked, others by probation.

The issue was explained in the January 13-26, 1969, issue of Old Mole, a Boston "underground" newspaper friendly to SDS [Students for a Democratic Society], as follows:

"As a result of student protests against the Vietnam war, the presence of ROTC has become an issue on the Harvard campus this fall....In the liberal view, ROTC courses, presently offered for credit, do not measure up to Harvard's high intellectual standards. Course credit should be withdrawn, but ROTC should be allowed to remain on campus as an extra-curricular activity.

"In the radical view, ROTC is bad because it provides leadership for an Army engaged in the suppression of just popular movements at home and abroad. Hence ROTC should be abolished."

The same issue of Old Mole reprints excerpts from a letter from the Department of the Army, U.S. Army ROTC Instructors Group, Harvard, to the members of the Faculty Committee on Educational Policy. Appealing to the committee to fully support ROTC, the letter said:

"Today reliance upon colleges and universities for officers is greater than ever. For example, the 1968 graduating classes [throughout the country] contained over 11,000 newly commissioned officers who, as they enter the ranks of the active Army, will fill 85% of the required annual input needed to provide the junior leaders for today's troop units...The Armed Forces simply cannot function...without an officer corps comprised largely of college graduates...Who is prepared to trust their sons -- let alone the nation's destiny -- to the leadership of high-school boys and college drop-outs?"

The letter describes as "disturbing" the fact that "there are brilliant young Harvard men with God-given leadership abilities who seem content to waste two years of their life by allowing themselves to be drafted to serve as a private..."

"About 45% of all Army officers currently on active duty are ROTC graduates; 65% of our First Lieutenants and 85% of our Second Lieutenants come from the ROTC program..."

"ROTC is under attack at Harvard now because a small group of student extremists -- a tiny minority of the student body -- have played upon the inherent anti-war sentiment shared by a majority of peace-loving, traditionally isolationist Americans. The Vietnam war, grievous to virtually all of us, is the immediate source of their blanket denunciation of everything related to the military...."

This admission of the power of antiwar sentiment is extremely interesting.

The letter continued: "More important than any point thus far made is the role of Harvard University in setting a pattern of ROTC policy for the entire academic community... 'As Harvard goes, so goes the Army ROTC program' might produce a disaster of real proportions if the ROTC concept is weakened and degraded nationwide."

Under pressure of the agitation against ROTC the faculty of arts and sciences on February 4 voted to remove academic credit from ROTC courses and faculty rank from ROTC instructors, but ROTC was to remain on campus under this recommendation.

The crisis of April 1969 began with a meeting of the Harvard-Radcliffe SDS chapter on Tuesday, April 8, to discuss "militant action" against ROTC. The meeting, attended by several hundred persons, adopted three demands on ROTC:

(1) Abolish ROTC immediately by breaking all existing contracts with the Department of the Army.

(2) Replace all ROTC scholarships with university scholarships.

(3) Restore scholarships withdrawn from students who took part in previous ROTC demonstrations (at Paine Hall).

In addition, three demands on the issue of "Harvard Expansion" were adopted. This refers to plans by several universities in the area to greatly expand facilities with the aim of turning Cambridge into a community largely devoted to military and big-business research, displacing many residents. A campaign to expose this and its effect on rents had been launched by the Cambridge Peace and Freedom party. This issue appears to have been initiated entirely by the student radicals as part of the SDS concept of "community organizing," though residents suffering from evictions and rent pressure are not unsympathetic. This issue has been pressed with special vigor by the Progressive Labor party (Maoist) caucus within SDS.

For PL, this issue serves as a substitute for demands for black control of the black community (including black studies departments), which PL opposes as "nationalist" and "dividing the working class."

The three antiexpansion demands were:

(1) A rollback on rents for Harvard-owned apartment buildings to the level of January 1, 1968.

(2) No evictions at one apartment building which is scheduled to be replaced by a political science library.

(3) No evictions of the 182 families in buildings to be torn down for medical school expansion. That made six demands in all.

No demand for a black studies department was included at this meeting, though the black students had been negotiating unsuccessfully with the administration on this question for some time.

On the question of the action to be taken, the April 8 SDS meeting voted approximately as follows: not to occupy a building immediately, but to take steps of an educational and agitational character leading up to an occupation within a week. The vote on this was close, with about 150 for immediate occupation and 170 for the motion that passed.

The next morning the SDS executive council met and "interpreted" the vote as an authorization to proceed with an occupation at noon the same day, when a rally was scheduled. Some 1,000 attended the noon rally, and Norm Daniels, a member of the PL caucus, called for students to occupy University Hall, the main administration building. At this point most of those present were opposed to this and only about thirty entered the hall. As the rally continued, however, and speeches by several faculty members angered students, more entered the hall.

By 4 p.m., when the administration issued an ultimatum that all those inside were subject to arrest for trespassing, there were nearly 400 students occupying the building with some 800 outside, most of whom were sympathizers.

The first occupiers ejected the university administrators from their offices. Later the students began going through the files.

Large numbers of documents -- some revealing connections between Harvard and the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency [CIA] -- were photocopied and removed from the building. Some of these appeared the next day in the Old Mole and in subsequent special issues of this paper. Included was correspondence between Harvard administrators and the army discussing methods for keeping ROTC on campus and for circumventing even the mild rebuke directed at ROTC by the February 4 faculty vote.

The students adopted a policy of "militant nonviolent obstruction," meaning they would barricade the doors and hold hands if police entered, but would not physically fight the cops.

About 5 a.m., Thursday, April 10 --

some sixteen hours after the sit-in began -- a mass of over 400 policemen made a swift, savage attack on the occupiers, beating both men and women, clearing the building and making more than 200 arrests. Nearly seventy-five students were injured, according to the Harvard Crimson, official campus newspaper, some of them seriously.

A special extra edition of the Crimson appeared that day containing a long article describing some of the police brutality in the raid. The cops who took part in the raid had been assembled during the night from surrounding suburban cities. The university force of fifty men was not used.

The reaction to the raid was electric, and all observers agree that it turned what began as an adventure by a relatively small number of students into a mass strike involving the majority of the student body.

One contributing factor to this was the fact that University Hall faces Harvard Yard, in full view of many student dormitories. For some reason fire alarms were turned on in these dormitories during the raid, and the occupants poured into the Yard, where they witnessed their fellows being clubbed by cops.

The cops also chased some students into dormitories and clubbed groups at random. Some people who had nothing to do with the sit-in were injured.

Shouts of "Strike!" and "On strike, shut it down!" arose spontaneously from the crowds in the Yard.

Just why the university authorities called for this raid -- when they must have known it would be an unpopular move -- is subject to some debate among strike activists. Some believe the authorities simply put into effect a previously worked out plan for such a contingency. Others believe the authorities were prodded into this precipitate move because of the damaging revelations contained in the files which were being exposed.

The official explanation issued by Harvard President Nathan M. Pusey in a press release April 11 is as follows:

"No one can tell what the consequences of their occupation of the headquarters of the central [arts and sciences] Faculty of the University would have been had it been permitted to continue, but surely it would have been virtually impossible to conduct the activity of the Faculty. Even the two-day disruption of Faculty offices has caused serious delay in administrative processes, and the occupiers had already begun to rifle and duplicate the faculty personnel

files and financial records. The alternatives were to restore the building to its rightful officers at once or to allow an entrenched effort to close down the University to drag along for an indefinite period. Neither alternative was palatable, but the one chosen seemed preferable if the freedom of the University was not to be surrendered."

Pusey told the Crimson that the decision to call in police was made at a meeting of his advisers that ended at 10 p.m. April 9. It took from 10 p.m. until dawn to assemble the large force of cops.

With news of the raid spreading and arousing indignation in wide circles, the student government leaders called a rally in the university's Memorial Church for 10 a.m., five hours after the police attack. Some 2,000 persons attended, condemned the calling of police and voted to call a three-day "educational strike" on behalf of the following demands: no police on campus again; dropping of criminal charges and no punishment of the occupiers harsher than probation; a binding student-faculty referendum on ROTC; restoration of scholarships to Paine Hall demonstrators; and restructuring of the decision-making process at Harvard.

That night an SDS meeting of 350 persons, according to the April 11 Crimson, voted to support the Memorial Church strike call, but under the six SDS demands and with a separate picket line. An SDS spokesman declared: "This is our strike. It organized spontaneously as soon as the cops came on campus."

The following night, April 11, SDS held a meeting of supporters of the six demands. This meeting, attended by more than 1,000 persons, elected a fifteen-man strike committee, all SDS members, four of them from the PL caucus. A seventh demand was added -- amnesty for all demonstrators.

On Sunday night, April 13, a meeting called by the SDS strike committee, also attended by more than 1,000 persons, added the eighth demand -- the plan of the Harvard-Radcliffe African and Afro-American Association of Students (AFRO) for a black studies department. The question was raised by AFRO leaders, who also declared AFRO's support for the SDS demands. The Maoist caucus opposed adopting the AFRO demand, as they had from the beginning. The Maoists were defeated and the motion passed overwhelmingly.

This meeting also discussed what attitude to take toward another meeting set for Monday in Harvard Stadium called by leaders of the various student government bodies. The SDS leaders decided not to introduce their demands at the stadium meeting on the grounds that that meeting would

not represent the real strike.

The Monday meeting was attended by 10,000 students. It adopted the following demands: severance of all existing contracts with ROTC; the acceptance of a plan prepared by the Harvard School of Design to counter Harvard expansion; the AFRO demand; amnesty; and structural reform including the establishment of a binding student-faculty senate. A vote for an indefinite strike resulted in a virtual tie and a vote to strike for three more days was passed.

The meeting also unanimously voted to "repudiate the right of the Harvard Corporation to close our University." This was in reply to a threat by the all-powerful corporation to shut down the campus. The students' decision to challenge the authority of that body was one of the most important general effects of the crisis.

The Harvard Corporation is the principal governing board of the university. Its actions are subject only to the review of the Board of Overseers, which is elected by mail ballot of the alumni and is dominated by big businessmen. All university property is in the name of the corporation; every faculty is subject to its authority; all changes in policy or university statutes require its consent; and all degrees and appointments are made by it.

The corporation consists of seven members, the president and six fellows. All six fellows are directors or board members of major corporations.

When a member dies or retires, his replacement is made by the other six. Insofar as the faculty makes decisions, it is at the sufferance of this tiny, self-perpetuating group of top capitalists. That is the real state of democracy at Harvard -- as it is in essence at virtually every major university in the United States.

On Tuesday, April 15, over 80 percent of the students stayed out of classes, and where classes were held, many of the teachers turned them into discussions of the strike issues. This situation prevailed until the end of the week when another mass meeting was scheduled for Friday night. During this period the campus was a beehive of radical educational activity with discussions everywhere. Not only students but faculty and nonteaching employees at the school became heavily involved.

The philosophy department gave its building to the strike and became a center of activity with mimeograph machines, meeting rooms, and hallways busy around the clock.

The graphic studies department building was devoted to turning out posters, graphic displays, red armbands, etc., for the strike. This was done by the GSD Artists' Cooperative formed a day after the police raid. This group, said the April 18 Crimson, "is part of the general humanist groundswell that rose around the taking of the building. The group is not affiliated with SDS or any other political group." This was typical of much of the strike activity.

It was the artists' cooperative that designed the red clenched fist that became the symbol of the strike and which was stenciled on anything the students brought in, including shirts (which were worn) and bedsheets (which were hung out of windows as signs).

On Thursday, April 17, the faculty of arts and sciences met to "clarify" its position on ROTC. It passed a resolution which was the product of intricate behind-the-scenes maneuvering and which left the issue still to be decided by negotiations with the army. The resolution states in part:

"That the principle governing ROTC be that it operate as other ordinary extracurricular activities...[and] that existing contracts inconsistent with this principle be terminated as soon as legally possible."

The existing contracts run for three years and the resolution does not preclude some sort of contract keeping ROTC at Harvard, though it does imply a rebuke to the ROTC program which neither the army nor the corporation finds to its liking. The faculty meeting also promised other reforms in a vague way.

On Friday, April 18, the mass stadium meeting -- again attended by 10,000 -- voted on the basis of "progress" at the faculty meeting to suspend the strike for seven days, when a strike vote by secret ballot was scheduled.

On April 22, the faculty voted to adopt, with minor amendments, the AFRO proposal for an Afro-American studies department in which students would have a voting voice in appointing faculty. This would be the first time students have ever been given a direct voice in appointing faculty at Harvard.

A few actions involving fewer than 200 students were carried out by SDS or the PL caucus during the week, but the overwhelming majority of the students returned to classes. When the strike vote was held, only 4,000 voted and of those, 70 percent voted not to continue the strike at this time.

The Harvard expansion issue remains

about where it was when the strike began except that some attention has been drawn to it. The ROTC question remains in dispute and further mass struggle on this issue is quite possible.

Three features of the Harvard strike of April 1969 stand out: one, the power black students have to wrest significant concessions for their struggle; two, the rapidity with which previously nonpolitical students became spontaneously involved in overt radical activity; and three, the tremendous force of the

antiwar issue.

The administration was forced to counter the anti-ROTC demand with the most elaborate sophistry and secret maneuvers. No one, not even the army, dared to speak for retaining ROTC on the ground that it contributes to the war in Vietnam. On the contrary, they did everything they could to claim that the war is not the issue, that the real issue is academic freedom for those who want to take ROTC, or some such specious argument.

POLISH YOUTHS SENTENCED TO PRISON FOR OPPOSING CZECH INVASION

Five Polish youths have recently been sentenced to prison terms for distributing leaflets last August opposing the invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact countries, including Poland. Agence France-Presse reported from Warsaw May 7 that Piotr Zabrun had been sentenced to eighteen months in prison on May 6 and was given a fine of 1,000 zlotys [US\$250].

Romuald Lubianiec, Tadeusz Markiewicz, and Wiktor Nagorski were condemned earlier to sentences ranging from six months to a year in prison along with a total fine of 1,000 zlotys. A young woman, Sylwia Poleska, was sentenced in March to eight months in prison for the same "crime." All five are free on bail while appealing the verdicts to a higher court.

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
PHOTO: Alain Krivine, on his release from the Santé Prison, August 24, 1968	473
Alain Krivine for President of France	474
"Le Monde's" Appraisal of Alain Krivine	475
West Irian Revolt Plagues Indonesian Dictatorship	476
The Ninth Congress of the Chinese Communist Party -- by Pierre Gousset	477
DRAWING: Mao Tsetung	478
Dictatorship in Haiti Decrees Death for "Communists"	480
Students Boycott Classes in Brazil	480
The May Day Strike in Britain -- by Alan Harris	481
DRAWING: Harold Wilson	481
PHOTO: May Day Demonstration in London	482
Students at London School of Economics Press Demands	483
General Grigorenko Arrested at Trial of Crimean Tartars	484
DRAWING: Pyotr G. Grigorenko	484
Palestine Solidarity Campaign Formed in Britain	485
"Odd Things" in the Sino-Soviet Rift	486
New Social Unrest in the Dominican Republic	487
DRAWING: Joaquín Balaguer	487
PHOTO: May Day Demonstration in Santo Domingo	488
Mexican Political Prisoners Demand Prison Reforms	489
Books:	
Revolutionary Perspectives -- An International View -- by Gerry Foley	490
Congo-Brazzaville Students Begin Strike	491
Campus Unrest in the U.S., a Case Study:	
Report on the Harvard Strike -- by Fred Halstead	492
Polish Youths Sentenced to Prison for Opposing Czech Invasion	496

INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS

P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station,

New York, N. Y. 10010

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen. CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, George Novack, TRANSLATIONS: Gerry Foley, George Saunders. BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen. Published each Monday except last in December and first in January; biweekly in July; not published in August. TO SUBSCRIBE: For 26 issues send \$7.50 to Intercontinental Press, P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N. Y. 10010. Write for rates on airmail. PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 95 rue du Faubourg Saint-

Martin, Paris 10, France. INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS specializes in political analysis and interpretation of events of particular interest to the labor, socialist, colonial independence, and black liberation movements. Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of Intercontinental Press. Insofar as it reflects editorial opinion, unsigned material expresses the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. Copyright © 1969 by Intercontinental Press.