

Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 10, No. 27

© 1972 Intercontinental Press

July 10, 1972

50c



Nixon's Summitry and the Bombing of Vietnam



U.S. Supreme Court Upholds Mandel Ban

By a 6-3 decision handed down June 29, the United States Supreme Court upheld the Nixon administration's refusal to grant a visa to Belgian Marxist economist Ernest Mandel.

The decision came on an appeal by the government of a March 11, 1971, ruling by a federal court in Brooklyn, New York, that declared unconstitutional sections of the 1952 McCarran-Walter Act used as the pretext to ban the Marxist scholar. The lower court ruling was made in a suit brought by eight American scholars who contended that the government's refusal to grant Mandel a visa violated their First Amendment right to hear Mandel's views.

When Mandel was first refused entry in 1969, the decision was widely protested. Yielding to the outcry, the State Department recommended lifting the ban, but Attorney General John Mitchell refused, a decision that the *New York Times* described in an editorial as "an incredible example of autocratic insensitivity."

In overturning the Brooklyn federal court's decision, the Supreme Court majority declared that "Mandel personally, as an unadmitted and non-resident alien, had no constitutional right of entry to this country." The argument based on the First Amendment was dismissed as attempting to "prove too much."

In a dissenting opinion joined by Justices Thurgood Marshall and William J. Brennan Jr., Justice William O. Douglas wrote: "Congress never undertook to entrust the Attorney General with the discretion to pick and choose among the ideological offerings which alien lecturers tender from our platforms, allowing those palatable to him and disallowing others." □

Summer Schedule

This is a reminder that we will soon switch to our summer schedule. There will be no issues published in August.

We will resume our weekly schedule in September.

In This Issue

U.S.A.	786	Supreme Court Upholds Mandel Ban
	797	"Labor for Peace" Formed
	797	Gay Pride Marches Staged
	798	Feliciano Acquitted in First "Bombing" Trial
INDOCHINA WAR	787	Nixon's Summity and the Bombing of Vietnam—by Joseph Hansen
	795	Nixon's "Military" Targets: Hospitals, Dikes, People—by David Thorstad
ARGENTINA	798	Widespread Protest in Cities
	798	The Mass Mobilization in Mar del Plata
	799	The Violence of Those at the Top
	799	Working-Class Targets of the Repression—by Evaristo Juan Malemafi
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	803	Police, La Banda Attack Political Prisoners
	804	Police Gun Down Leftist
MEXICO	804	Hugo Blanco Leaves
	804	Guerrillas in Ambush
CHILE	805	Trotsky's "History" Published—by Luis Vitale
MIDDLE EAST	805	Fedayeen, Lebanese Regime in Agreement
SOUTH AFRICA	806	Appeal "Terrorist" Verdict
FRANCE	807	Thousands at Feminist Meeting in Paris
MALAGASY REPUBLIC	807	Declare Amnesty
BANGLADESH	808	How Youth View Awami League Government—by S. B. Kolpe
PAKISTAN	809	Karachi Strike Closes Industrial Complex—by Jon Rothschild
	810	Bhutto Bans Tariq Ali
REVIEWS	811	The Invisible World of Michael Harrington—by David Burton
	814	Socialist Strategy in the 1970s
	814	Socialist Literature in Czech and Slovak
DOCUMENTS	815	"Avanzada Socialista" Comments on Mar del Plata
	816	Freedom for the "October 20" Prisoners!
	816	Committee Asks Angela Davis to Aid Political Prisoners in Ukraine
DRAWINGS	795	Richard Nixon; 800, Alejandro Lanusse; 808, Abdul Kader Siddiqui; 810, Z. A. Bhutto—by Copain

Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Village Station, New York, N.Y. 10014.

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, Ernest Mandel, George Novack.

MANAGING EDITOR: Allen Myers.

COPY EDITOR: Lawrence Rand.

EDITORIAL STAFF: Gerry Foley, Jon Rothschild, George Saunders, David Thorstad.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.

ASSISTANT BUSINESS MANAGER: Steven Warshell.

TECHNICAL STAFF: H. Massey, James M. Morgan, Ruth Schein.

Published in New York each Monday except last in December and first in January; not published in August.

Intercontinental Press specializes in political analysis and interpretation of events of particular interest to the labor, socialist, colonial independence, Black, and women's liberation movements.

Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of Intercontinental Press. Insofar as it reflects editorial opinion, unsigned material expresses the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism.

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 10 Impasse Guemenee, Paris 4, France.

TO SUBSCRIBE: For one year send \$15 to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Village Station, New York, N.Y. 10014. Write for rates on first class and airmail. Special rates available for subscriptions to colonial and semicolonial countries.

Subscription correspondence should be addressed to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 116, Village Station, New York, N.Y. 10014. Because of the continuing deterioration of the U.S. postal system, please allow five weeks for change of address. Include your old address as well as your new address, and, if possible, an address label from a recent issue.

Copyright © 1972 by Intercontinental Press.

Nixon's Summitry and the Bombing of Vietnam

By Joseph Hansen

To find a parallel in cynicism to the summit conference staged by Nixon and Brezhnev May 22-29, it is necessary to go back to the eve of World War II, when Stalin made his pact with Hitler and boasted that it was a historical contribution to "peace."

However, the ceremonies accompanying the signing of even that agreement were more restrained than the Nixon-Brezhnev show. In 1939 Ribbentrop for the Germans and Molotov for the Russians were designated to sign the historic scrap of paper. Stalin stood modestly in the background; Hitler was not even present. In 1972, Nixon and Brezhnev clinked champagne glasses while the Pentagon brought the U.S. air war in Vietnam to new heights of destructiveness and mass murder. Within minutes after the newscasts on the great step taken toward "peace" by Nixon and Brezhnev, the television screens switched to scenes of the escalated bombing in Vietnam.

In 1939 the Kremlin pictured German-Soviet friendship as having been "cemented in blood." Brezhnev, if he wished, could repeat that boast with even greater justification in relation to Nixon in 1972.

What Was Accomplished?

All the agreements signed in the Moscow television show were reached before Nixon left the White House.

In a dispatch from Moscow published in the May 26 issue of the *New York Post*, Gaylord Shaw listed the following:

"The two accords signed on Tuesday [May 23] were agreed upon at least a month earlier.

"One, on cooperation in medical science and public health, was announced on Feb. 11.

"The second, on cooperation in environmental protection, was signed in Moscow more than a month ago. . . .

"Two more agreements came on Wednesday. One, on cooperation in science and technology, was settled on April 11 when a broad exchange agreement was signed and announced. The other, establishing a joint space exploration program, was agreed on in Moscow April 6, and the details were fully reported in the American press weeks ago.

"Yesterday's lone agreement, intended to prevent naval confrontations on the high seas, was concluded in Washington 10 days ago. But Nixon had Secretary of the Navy John Warner fly from the Pentagon to Moscow to sign the agreement inside the Kremlin as the champagne glasses clinked again."

The agreement to prevent naval confrontations on the high seas was in the true spirit of the summit conference, coming as it did immediately after Nixon ordered the mining of all the harbors in North Vietnam. The plain meaning is that Soviet ships will not attempt to run the U.S. blockade of North Vietnam.

Both sides affirmed the existence of "realistic conditions"

for an expansion of trade. Concrete negotiations, however, were deferred until later in the summer. Nixon, it was leaked to the press, was insisting that the Kremlin compel Hanoi to meet the terms he had laid down for ending the Vietnam war, that is, giving up the Vietnamese struggle for national liberation.

As for the accord worked out in more than two years of strategic-arms limitation talks [SALT], this was ballyhooed as the most promising achievement of the summit conference.

The *Wall Street Journal* took this with "a grain of salt." Writing in the May 26 issue of this U.S. businessman's newspaper, staff reporter Richard J. Levine said:

"President Nixon has declared in Moscow that 'an agreement in this area could begin to turn our countries away from a wasteful and dangerous arms race and toward more production for peace.' When it comes—perhaps this afternoon—it will undoubtedly buoy the hopes of people throughout the world.

"But some of the initial optimism is likely to fade as the narrow nature of the pact becomes clear. For the hard reality is that the SALT agreement is riddled with loopholes; because it doesn't limit the quality of the weapons involved, the two superpowers can continue to upgrade their offensive nuclear missiles, adding more warheads as well as more destructive warheads. And they can freely persist in developing new bombers, submarines and other conventional war machines. Thus, the accord won't halt either the international arms competition or the seemingly inexorable growth of the U.S. defense budget, now climbing above \$83 billion yearly."

Levine quoted Paul Warnke, a military expert who served as an assistant defense secretary during the Johnson administration, as saying: "The SALT agreement won't interfere with any of the projected American (offensive) strategic programs."

Warnke predicted further that these programs will increase the strategic-weapons budget by \$5,000,000,000 to \$6,000,000,000 annually by the middle of this decade.

Thus there was no reason for the surprise voiced widely in the U.S. communications media over Secretary of Defense Laird's testimony June 5 before the Senate and House appropriations committees that the arms-limitations agreements just signed in Moscow would not permit a reduction in spending on offensive strategic missiles. At most, Laird said, \$550,000,000 might be saved on "defensive" weapons.

The Nixon administration has asked for \$83,400,000,000 in defense (war) appropriations for the coming fiscal year. Of this, \$8,800,000,000 has been earmarked for offensive strategic missiles. Laird said that "some brakes" had been put on what he called the Soviet strategic build-up. "If we take unilateral disarmament action before agreement is reached, there is no chance for an

agreement." He explained that as a result the agreements just signed in Moscow would lead to no savings in the \$8,800,000,000 strategic budget for the coming fiscal year.

Laird also testified that the current escalation of the war in Vietnam would add \$3,000,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000 to the present defense budget.

Nixon Stands Up to "Bullying"

To properly weigh the attitude of the Kremlin at the summit conference, it is necessary to recall some key preceding events.

Nixon began escalating the bombings during the first part of the year. On March 23 he canceled the Paris peace talks, explaining the following day that he had done this because the Vietnamese had been using the talks as a means of "bullying the United States."

In fact the White House delegates had been taking a truculent attitude in the Paris talks since last September. This line was proving ineffective with the U.S. public. A Harris poll, published March 16, showed that 53 percent of the sampling gave Nixon a "negative" rating on his handling of the negotiations. Only 43 percent gave him a "positive" rating.

The truth was that the Vietnamese had succeeded in the talks, as elsewhere, in gaining sympathy by refusing to kowtow to Nixon's bullying. For Nixon, who required a victory and a settlement on his terms to justify his four-year course of keeping up the war, the talks had become an embarrassment.

On March 30, one week after Nixon's cancellation of the Paris talks, the Vietnamese launched their massive counteroffensive. If they had chosen to use the terminology of the Pentagon, they could have called it a "protective reaction ground strike."

They scored impressive victories. In particular, they exposed the fraudulent nature of Nixon's "Vietnamization" program. The Saigon puppet armies disintegrated in face of the advancing liberation forces.

Nixon responded by ordering the most massive bombing in history.

This was still not sufficient, however. He sent more warships, especially aircraft carriers, and stepped up the bombings still further.

Sectors of the U.S. ruling class became nervous over Nixon's tactics. The *New York Times* said in an editorial April 9:

"It is sophistry to suggest that air attacks against the North are necessary 'to protect the lives' of withdrawing American forces in the South, especially when these 'protective' strikes place many additional American lives in jeopardy. President Nixon is in fact committing this country to a perilous new war of unpredictable dimensions in Southeast Asia. If Congress is serious about reasserting its constitutional role in the war-making process, it had better act quickly."

Nixon paid scant attention to the division within the ruling class over his course. On April 15-16 U.S. planes, including B-52s for the first time, bombed Hanoi and Haiphong.

In the United States the antiwar movement scored an impressive achievement with the nationwide April 22 demonstrations. Similar demonstrations in many other coun-

tries showed that the antiwar movement was responding internationally to the need to express greater solidarity with the Vietnamese.

As the North Vietnamese continued to gain victories, the White House appeared to be caught in a crisis. Nixon delivered a most belligerent speech April 26. He reentered the Paris talks only to leave again within days.

On May 8 Nixon delivered his infamous speech announcing his intention to "interdict" all shipment of supplies to the Vietnamese. He had ordered the harbors of North Vietnam to be mined. He had ordered the overland supply lines from China bombed so as to make them unusable.

In the same speech Nixon singled out the Kremlin for a specific warning. He in effect ordered Stalin's heirs to stand aside while he proceeded to pour such fire power on North Vietnam as to wipe that country off the face of the earth unless Hanoi capitulated. At the same time he dangled a carrot—he was still willing to go ahead with the projected summit conference.

The mining of the harbors of North Vietnam was a major military move. In the June 10 *New York Times*, Washington correspondent Neil Sheehan reported what the White House cabal expects to gain from it:

"Nixon Administration officials say they intend to deny North Vietnam any sea-borne goods that are essential to its long-term war effort. About 85 percent of the 2.2 million tons it received last year from China, the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries arrived by sea, most through the now mined port of Haiphong. American military leaders say the mining is reasonably effective.

"Current plans also call for bombing by the Navy from aircraft carriers in the Gulf of Tonkin and by the Air Force to try to reduce the flow of weapons, ammunition, petroleum, food, clothing, medical supplies and other goods moving by alternate routes. The main routes from China consist of two railroads, the northeast line to Kwangsi Province and the northwest line to Yunnan, eight roads and the Red River waterway."

In short, Nixon's scheme was to seal off 85 percent of the supplies, including food, clothing, and medical necessities, which the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam had been receiving; and to cut off the remaining 15 percent by continual bombing of the rail lines, roads, and waterways leading down from China.

The Johnson administration considered mining the ports of North Vietnam but refrained because of the exceedingly dangerous nature of the gamble. It could touch off a vigorous response from the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, the powerful allies of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Nixon also refrained for the same reason during the preceding years of his administration. What led him to think he could now get away with it?

A Triumph for Maoism

The answer is to be found in the conclusions Nixon drew from his trip to Peking February 21-27. Even before that trip, Nixon could judge the attitude of the Mao regime toward the Vietnamese by one telling fact (not

to mention others)—the decline in military assistance ("from \$145 million in 1967 to \$75 million last year," according to C. L. Sulzberger in the May 24, 1972, *New York Times*). Nixon, however, put Mao Tsetung and Chou En-lai to the acid test.

In the weeks before his departure, he stepped up the bombings in Indochina. During his stay in Peking, he kept up the bombings.

The response of Mao and Chou was up to Nixon's fondest hopes. It was to be seen in the television spectacular of wining and dining and clinking of glasses while napalm splashed on Vietnamese civilians.

Nixon's hosts thus gave him the green light to do whatever he liked in Vietnam. His decision some two months later to mine the harbors of North Vietnam can thus be marked down as one of the results of the Maoist policy of seeking "peaceful coexistence" with U. S. imperialism.

There were other consequences. The reception given Nixon in Peking released Brezhnev and Kosygin from all restraint in following their own policy of bidding for "peaceful coexistence" with U. S. imperialism.

No matter what lengths the Kremlin bureaucrats went to in crawling on all fours before Nixon in their projected summit conference with him, they were assured in advance of freedom from attack from their Chinese counterparts. After all, what could Mao and Chou say? Wouldn't the heirs of Stalin and Khrushchev only be doing what had been done three months earlier in Peking?

As it turned out, Mao and Chou could not even point to the qualitative change in the war—the mining of the harbors of North Vietnam—and score the betrayal committed by Brezhnev and Kosygin in toasting Nixon in face of such an action. They themselves had paved the way for this by putting on a rehearsal with Nixon in February.

The two summit conferences in Peking and Moscow thus represented a widening of the rift between China and the Soviet Union at the expense of North Vietnam and the Vietnam revolution. Instead of closing ranks against the common foe, they were now vying for favors from U. S. imperialism.

Harry Schwartz, writing in the February 21 *New York Times* about this turn in the relations between China, the Soviet Union, and the U. S., made the following acute observation:

"The Kremlin has been wooing the President frantically, trying to get across the message that he doesn't need to make a deal with Mao Tsetung because he can do better in Moscow when he flies there in May.

"This transparent Moscow bidding for Mr. Nixon's favor substantially strengthens his hand in his talks this week with Chairman Mao and Premier Chou En-lai. Those two shrewd and practical leaders are fully aware of what the Kremlin is doing, and they could hardly help feeling the pressure to provide the President with some tangible benefits that would encourage him to resist Moscow's blandishments.

"The President is in the position of the lovely maiden courted by two ardent swains, each of whom is uncertain of what happens when the young lady is alone with his rival."

Schwartz's analogy, of course, doesn't quite hold. It would be more accurate to say that Mao and Brezhnev are in the position of two lovely maidens, each out to do business

with a very well-heeled swain, who is quite certain what he wants to do with them. Aside from this rectification, Schwartz's observations can be said to represent informed opinion in American ruling circles.

"Winding Down the War"

Nixon won office on the promise that he had a "secret plan" to end the war. The secret plan turned out to be nothing but a scheme to stall for time in hope that a military victory could be achieved.

The opposition to the war, particularly in the United States, compelled Nixon nonetheless to make a considerable concession—gradual withdrawal of American ground forces.

In compensation for this, however, Nixon escalated the air war. The official records in Washington show that during the Johnson administration, U. S. planes dumped 3,100,000 tons of bombs on Indochina. Since Nixon assumed office, U. S. planes have dumped more than 3,400,000 tons. In this field, Nixon caught up with and outdid the war criminal of the Democratic party.

The statistics of the destruction and death rained on Vietnam by the U. S. war machine provide a poor index of the suffering inflicted by the world's richest power on the poverty-stricken population of a small country, yet they do serve to indicate to what lengths U. S. imperialism is prepared to go in trying to put down a struggle for national liberation.

The use of herbicides to defoliate wooded areas so as to "deny hiding places to the Vietcong" is a good example.

From 1961 to 1970 a fleet of C-123 cargo planes operating from Bienhoa air field flew more than 30,000 missions. "Flying at treetop level," James Rowen wrote in the June 24 issue of *The New Republic*, "the pilots released an estimated 100 million pounds of herbicides, 'treating' 4 million acres." The destruction included upwards of 250,000 acres of vital mangrove forests.

The forest-destroying herbicide, "agent orange," that was used has various side effects such as poisoning livestock. Humans are not immune. The American Association for the Advancement of Science has reported an abnormally high rate of stillbirths and birth defects in the heavily sprayed Tayninh province.

One of the worst consequences is *permanent* destruction of the soil. Under the tropical sun, the denuded areas change into laterite, a bricklike material on which nothing will grow. Much has been written about this.

Because of lack of studies on the subject, the consequences of the massive bombing of the country are not well known. Perhaps the study by Arthur H. Westing and E. W. Pfeiffer, entitled "The Cratering of Indochina," in the May issue of the *Scientific American* may help to alter this. It deserves the widest publicity.

"In the seven-year period from 1965 to 1971," they noted, "the area of Indochina, a region slightly larger than Texas, was bombarded by a tonnage of munitions amounting to approximately twice the total used by the U. S. in all the theaters of World War II."

During three tours of the war zones to assess the damage done by herbicides, the two authors became increasingly conscious of the scarring of the landscape by bomb and shell craters. "From the air some areas in Vietnam look like photographs of the moon." They estimated that Indo-

china is pitted with 26,000,000 bomb and shell craters. Most of these are in South Vietnam, their estimate being 21,000,000.

They became interested in determining the ecological effects of this "physical alteration of the terrain." Here are the figures they provide on the *amount* of bombing:

"In the seven years between 1965 and 1971 the U.S. military forces exploded 26 billion pounds (13 million tons) of munitions in Indochina, half from the air and half from weapons on the ground. This staggering weight of ordnance amounts to the energy of 450 Hiroshima nuclear bombs. For the area and people of Indochina as a whole it represents an average of 142 pounds of explosive per acre of land and 584 pounds per person. It means that over the seven-year period the average rate of detonation was 118 pounds per second. These average figures, however, give no indication of the actual concentration; most of the bombardment was concentrated in time (within the years from 1967 on) and in area. Of the 26 billion pounds, 21 billion were exploded within South Vietnam and 2.6 billion in southern Laos. The bombardment in South Vietnam represented an overall average of 497 pounds per acre and 1,215 pounds per person; the major part, however, was focused on two regions: the five northern provinces and the region around Saigon."

One of the main objectives of the Pentagon has been to "disrupt and destroy the social and economic fabric of rural, agricultural Vietnam in order to drive the peasant population into areas under central control and to deprive the guerrilla enemy of a power base."

"Only about 5 to 8 percent of the U.S. bombing missions in Indochina have been directed at tactical military targets, that is, in direct support of troops. The rest of the bombing missions are described as 'harassing' or interdiction' attacks. They are also referred to as strategic bombing missions."

The authors described them as follows:

"From 1966 on the B-52's carried out incessant attacks on a schedule of almost daily missions. From an altitude of 30,000 feet, where they are usually unheard and unseen from the ground, they have been sowing systematic destruction. A typical B-52 mission, comprising seven planes on the average, delivers 756 500-pound bombs in a pattern that saturates an area about half a mile wide and three miles long, that is, nearly 1,000 acres. Thus on a schedule of four or five missions per day of seven sorties each, such as was followed during 1971, the B-52's alone were creating about 100,000 new craters each month."

The authors studied craters in various parts of Vietnam. In hilly terrain the tearing up of the land promotes erosion. The area in and around craters is vulnerable to laterization.

Comparatively recent craters are bare of vegetation. Later coarse grasses may appear in the bottom and vines may trail down the sides. The craters, which may be 20 to 40 feet across and 5 to 20 feet deep, cannot be cultivated. It is not practical to bring in soil from elsewhere to fill them. "They thus become permanent features of the landscape."

In the Delta and coastal regions, many of the craters, having penetrated the water table, remain filled with water,

becoming breeding grounds for mosquitoes.

Rice-growing has been disrupted. The intricate irrigation systems have been broken up in many instances. Near the seacoast, bombing has opened the land to encroachment by salt water. Rice paddies pocked by craters have been abandoned, one of the reasons being the hazard of unexploded munitions buried in the ground. "A number of farmers have been killed by the detonation of such shells or bombs by their plows. Moreover, the ubiquitous missile fragments in the ground cut the hooves of the water buffaloes used as draft animals, causing infection and death of the animals. The unexploded bombs and shells lying about in the soil of Indochina are known to number several hundred thousand."

Vietnam's once prime timberlands have suffered particularly from the bombing. "The heavy shelling and bombing have damaged the trees in three ways: outright destruction, riddling of the timber by missile fragments and subsequent weakening of the trees through infection by wood-rotting fungi."

Damaged rubber trees are particularly susceptible to fungi. "A French official of a rubber plantation told us he had lost 80 percent of his trees within two years after a bombardment of his plantation."

The ruthlessness of U.S. imperialism is shown in still another way:

"Bombardment and defoliation are by no means the only methods used by the U.S. military in its struggle with vegetation in Indochina. Beginning in the mid-1960's a vast program of systematic forest bulldozing has been developed. The employment of massed tractors organized into companies for extensive forest clearing had apparently replaced the use of herbicides to deny forest cover and sanctuary to the other side. The effectiveness of the tractors, called Rome plows, is in some ways clearly superior to that of chemicals and is probably more destructive to the environment. When we visited a land-clearing operation in August, 1971, we watched about 30 such plows (20-ton Caterpillar tractors fitted with massive 11-foot-wide, 2.5-ton plow blades and with 14 tons of armor plate) scrape clean the remaining few areas of the Boi Loi Woods northwest of Saigon. We learned that in the 26 days prior to our visit the company had cleared 6,037 acres. Four other companies were also in operation and these five units had cleared a total of 750,000 acres as of August, 1971. We visited an area that had been plowed several years previously and it had regrown to cogon grass (*Imperata*), making further successional stages to the original hardwood forest very unlikely."

Westing and Pfeiffer point to past experience to show what massive use of high explosives can do to land:

"There is evidence from previous wars that the effects will be long-lasting. A decade after the end of World War II the craters of heavily shelled areas on Okinawa were still barren of vegetation and reddened by rusting shell fragments. On Eniwetok craters were clearly in evidence two decades after the war. Four decades after World War I vegetation in the Negev desert of Israel outlined the craters from that war, and even in France's Verdun area many of the World War I craters are still clearly visible and in some cases to this day are devoid of vegetation."

In their conclusion, the authors said that the full consequences of the American presence in Indochina have

yet to be assessed.

"The cumulative impact of the munitions attack on the land has to be seen to be grasped fully. Reports by military observers speak of the landscape's being 'torn as if by an angry giant,' and of areas of the green delta land's being pulverized into a 'gray porridge.' Our brief survey has only suggested some of the grim consequences for the present and future life of the inhabitants of Indochina. Still to be assessed are the effects of the persisting bombardment on the people's habitations, on the animal life and general ecology of the region. The damage caused by the large-scale disorganization of the environment may be felt for centuries.

"Meanwhile the steady bombardment and shattering of the land, shielded from the Western world's view and concern by the wide Pacific Ocean and the supposed 'winding down' of the war, goes on with no end in sight."

Ferocity Unmatched in History

To bring things up to date, it is necessary only to indicate how Nixon has escalated the bombing beyond all previous levels.

"Never before in the Vietnam war, or perhaps in any war," Sydney H. Schanberg wrote from Hue in the May 27 *New York Times*, "has air power been used with such ferocity. Military sources have confirmed, for example, that strikes by B-52 stratofortresses, each of which drops 24 tons of bombs, have been used against enemy troops as small as 20 or 30 men."

In the May 22 issue of *Intercontinental Press*, Allen Myers, who has been following developments in Vietnam closely, cited two reliable commentators in the bourgeois press on the intensity of the bombings.

"The air war against the peoples of Indochina has already reached an intensity that almost defies comprehension," Myers wrote. "The explosive power carried by the giant B-52 bombers is particularly staggering. Their effect was described in the May 3 *New York Times* by Raphael Littauer, a physicist who coordinated a study of the air war conducted by scientists at Cornell University:

"They carry over 100 bombs each, to a total of 30 tons, and shed them rapidly from a close-formation flight at high altitude. The bombs explode in dense pattern covering, for a typical mission of six planes, 1.5 square miles with 150 tons of explosives. Such a B-52 box of distributed tonnage is lethally effective. It is easy to calculate that the blast overpressure will exceed 3 PSI (pounds per square inch) everywhere within the pattern, enough to knock down any residential structures other than reinforced concrete. Six hundred points will be hit directly by bombs, and all locations in the area will be within 125 feet of such a hit.

"By way of comparison, the Hiroshima [atomic] bomb covered 6 square miles to 3 PSI—just four times the area of the B-52 pattern."

Myers notes that the April 16 raids on Hanoi, about five weeks before Nixon arrived in Moscow, included enough B-52s to equal three-fourths of the destructive power of the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima. *Every day*, B-52s fly the equivalent of ten six-plane missions over Indochina. That represents a force two and a half times as great as the Hiroshima bomb.

Myers cites the *New York Times* report further:

"'Territories under enemy control,' Littauer wrote, 'are subjected to sustained bombardment to deny the enemy the fruits of his victory—the population resources he has come to control. An uglier phrase for this is *scorched-earth policy*. An unspeakable price is exacted from the people of Indochina in return for "saving" them.' (Emphasis in original.)

"Littauer was describing the situation *before* the latest escalation. Some of the terrible possibilities for the future were mentioned by columnist Anthony Lewis in the May 13 *New York Times*:

"If mining Haiphong does not work in the sense of making the North Vietnamese accept Mr. Nixon's terms—and almost no informed person thinks it will—what will this President do next? Bomb the Red River dikes to flood North Vietnam? Use B-52's to turn Hanoi into a salt plain? Use nuclear weapons?

"Nothing can be excluded. The possibilities may sound fantastic now, but even a little while ago so did mining Haiphong. And each step makes the next easier."

In a dispatch from London published in the June 26 *New York Times*, Anthony Lewis cited new facts showing that what sounded fantastic in May was already a reality in June.

"Over the last month North Vietnamese officials and diplomats have said repeatedly that American planes are bombing dikes. The charges have been extremely specific and detailed.

"On May 26, for example, North Vietnam's Ministry of Water Conservancy listed in a statement 42 alleged raids on dikes in the Hanoi area and seven other provinces, giving dates and places. On June 22 in Paris, a North Vietnamese diplomat gave further details of asserted dike bombings, and shelling by American ships, and appealed to world opinion to stop it."

This "could of course be just propaganda," Lewis said. "But now, over the last few days, two pieces of evidence have come to hand that make it harder to dismiss the charge that the dikes are being deliberately attacked."

One of the items is a report by Jean Thoraval, a correspondent of Agence France-Press. "On June 24 he and some other foreign reporters visited Nam Dinh, a town sixty miles south of Hanoi. He found its textile mills and commercial center in ruins from bombing. Then he went to some of the dikes protecting Nam Dinh, about fourteen miles from town. He reported:

"One of the dikes was completely cut. Several were gutted, with gaps in the dike itself and hollows, evidently caused by bombs, alongside. Deep cracks were visible everywhere. The landscape was almost what one might have expected to find on the moon."

The second piece of evidence came from "a highly reliable, non-Communist diplomatic source of information on North Vietnam." This source has concluded that "without doubt there is now systematic bombing of the dikes."

Lewis continued: "The rainy season is just under way in North Vietnam; the rivers usually rise toward the top of the dikes between July and September. No one should be in any doubt about what systematic destruction of the dikes at this time might mean. It would bring into play, justifiable for once, that much-abused word genocide.

"Fifteen million people live on the Tonkin plain, one of the more densely populated areas of the world. Some

would drown in floods if the dikes failed; many more would be in danger of starvation after flooding of the rice paddies."

Lewis observed that Nixon has already begun to equivocate about bombing the dikes—specifically after dinner at John Connally's ranch in Floresville, Texas, on April 30.

Lewis concluded with the following paragraph:

"Is the United States now systematically bombing the dikes of North Vietnam? Americans know from experience that such things can happen without a President informing the public—or without the President knowing. Those American officials or members of Congress who care about the possibility of causing mass civilian deaths in North Vietnam might want to ask."

To appeal to a congress of war criminals was hardly realistic. Yet it would have been just as utopian of Lewis to address the Soviet or Chinese leaders.

Unanimity in Moscow and Peking?

The purging of Lin Piao, Mao's "closest comrade in arms" and the man designated in the Constitution of the People's Republic of China to succeed Mao, led to persistent speculation that he was opposed to a "peaceful coexistence" deal with U.S. imperialism at the expense of Vietnam. Lin Piao, it has been suggested, favored establishing a common defensive front with Moscow against the aggression of U.S. imperialism. As yet no hard evidence has appeared that might confirm this line of speculation.

It is highly dubious that Lin Piao, even if he favored an oppositional view of this kind, would have gone so far as to try to overthrow the regime of Mao Tsetung and Chou En-lai; that is, to risk touching off a political revolution. Most likely he was eliminated in a mopping up operation tied in with the intrabureaucratic struggle that lay at the bottom of the "Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution."

Lin Piao, of course, has not been permitted to speak for himself. Under the Stalinist system, to which Mao has added his own refinements, even a *potential* oppositionist is marked for elimination. The first step in the case of Lin Piao, as of others before him, was to place a wide strip of tape across his mouth. The next step was to bundle him out of sight. His subsequent fate is a carefully guarded state secret.

If we concede the possibility that Lin Piao might have argued for a different course than selling out Vietnam to Nixon in return for a seat in the United Nations and that this was the reason he was purged, then we must conclude that he was cut down as an object lesson to any others in the bureaucracy who might have shared similar opinions. If Mao would not hesitate to place the head of Lin Piao on a pike, what fate awaited lesser figures in the bureaucracy?

That Mao and Chou were not concerned about possible opposition to their counterrevolutionary foreign policy was demonstrated when they delivered substantial quantities of new military equipment, including jet fighters and tanks, to Pakistan June 2. This was the first consignment of economic and military aid worth \$300,000,000 granted to President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto when

he visited Peking early in February.

The shipment included sixty MIG-19 jet fighters, the type of equipment needed against the B-52s now bombing North Vietnam with impunity.

But then what Mao and Chou want, like their peers in Moscow, is "peaceful coexistence" with U.S. imperialism and its satellites.

Somewhat more substantial information than in the case of Peking is available about differences in top Kremlin circles over the capitulation of Brezhnev and Kosygin to Nixon.

The syndicated Washington columnist Jack Anderson reported (in the *New York Post* May 15) that the CIA had received "reliable" information that the heads of the armed forces in particular were against inviting Nixon to a summit conference under the circumstances.

Diplomatic channels in Moscow also passed on reports about hot discussions in the Political Bureau. The name of Pyotr Y. Shelest was mentioned in this connection.

That there was substance to these reports was shown by the announcement in Moscow May 25, three days after the arrival of Nixon, that Shelest had been dismissed from Communist party leadership of the Ukraine. That gesture must have pleased the royal guest.

On June 15, *Pravda*, the Communist party daily, admitted for the first time that there had been differences in the Political Bureau over inviting Nixon to Moscow after he mined the harbors of North Vietnam. According to the newspaper, the talks with Nixon went ahead "despite obstructionist actions by rightist and leftist foes of relaxation" and those who wield "revolutionary phrases."

Yu. Chernov, the author of the article, did not identify the opponents. He said it was to the credit of the Political Bureau that "the dialogue took place despite the complexity of the international situation and in face of the sometimes direct opposition of those who like to warm their hands by fanning the fires of hostility and tension."

The world's greatest practitioner of warming his hands by fanning the fires of hostility and tension is, of course, Nixon. In acknowledgment of one of his supreme achievements in this field, the mining of the harbors of North Vietnam, the counterrevolutionaries in the Kremlin toasted him with champagne.

Cuba and North Vietnam

Without waging an open struggle, the Cuban government has indicated its opposition to the summitry carried on by Peking and Moscow. During Nixon's trip to Peking, the Cuban press gave greater publicity, as was proper, to the continued bombing of Indochina than it did to the various summit talks. These were handled by the Cuban editors with contempt. The "x" in Nixon's name was replaced throughout by a swastika, as has been customary in the Cuban papers and magazines for some time. (See *Intercontinental Press*, May 1, 1972, for a photographic reproduction of an example.)

At a news conference in Sofia on May 26, while Nixon was in Moscow, Fidel Castro was asked about a report in a Mexican newspaper that he would meet with Nixon in Warsaw on June 1. "There is nothing to talk to Nixon about," he said.

The reporters asked him to say more and to say it

in English for the benefit of the American television audience.

"We would never think about talking with Nixon about anything," Castro replied. "What would we tell him? To stop being an imperialist? To lift the blockade of Cuba? To stop his acts of aggression?"

Despite their feelings, the Cubans will not put up a vigorous opposition to the Kremlin's policy of seeking "peaceful coexistence" with U.S. imperialism. Because of the nearness of their island to the U.S., they are exceptionally vulnerable to military attack. Without heavy outlays in material aid, including military equipment, from the Soviet Union, the Cuban revolution would have been crushed long ago. The U.S. blockade has made Cuba even more dependent on Soviet supplies. One of the prices exacted by the Kremlin for this aid has been political concessions from the Cuban leaders.

In addition, the Cubans have floundered in their efforts to extend their revolution to the rest of Latin America, oscillating between fostering the schema of guerrilla war and crossing class lines. This has weakened their base of support in the Western Hemisphere and made them more vulnerable to pressure from Moscow.

The position of the North Vietnamese government is much like the one held by the Cubans. Articles have appeared in the Hanoi press indicating opposition to the betrayals committed by Peking and Moscow. An example is the sharp criticism that appeared in *Nhan Dan*, the organ of the North Vietnamese Communist party, of some of Nixon's statements during the Moscow summit conference.

At a luncheon in the Marinsky Palace in Leningrad following a visit to the Piskarevskaya Cemetery May 27, Nixon evoked the sufferings of a child named Tanya, who lost her family during the Nazi siege of Leningrad. The speech read by Nixon expressed the hope that "the little Tanyas and their brothers and their sisters will be able to grow up in a world of peace and friendship among people—all people in the world."

Nhan Dan, in an unmistakable allusion to the Moscow bureaucrats, said: "It is obvious that in order for the children of the world to be able to avoid being massacred and to live in peace, the adults will have to oppose the American imperialists and not recoil in the face of their threats. All men of conscience must distinguish between what is reasonable and what is absurd, between what is good and what is evil, between friends and enemies."

The newspaper observed that on another occasion, during a banquet, "Nixon bragged that he would like to create a world of peace for all peoples."

Nhan Dan commented: "The president's fine words are being drowned out by the noise of American bombs that day and night are plunging the Vietnamese homeland into mourning."

Noting again that "Nixon says that the great powers must set an example and not let themselves be drawn into confrontations provoked by small powers," *Nhan Dan* commented: "Does he want the great powers to follow the example being set by the United States in Vietnam? He threatens other countries so that they will let the United States have its way, and he denies them the right to support the victims of this aggression. This kind of talk is coming from an international hooligan."

Up to now, the Vietnamese have expressed only muted opposition to the course of "peaceful coexistence" with U.S. imperialism set by Moscow and Peking. One of the reasons is their excruciating dependence on Moscow and Peking for military equipment and other material aid. Another reason is that they have not yet settled accounts with Stalinism.

Are they resourceful enough to mount telling pressure on their two giant allies? This remains to be seen. It is to be noted, however, that during both the Peking and Moscow summit meetings they made no attempt to create a scandal that might have embarrassed Nixon's hosts.

What is to be expected instead is that enormous pressure to meet Nixon's terms will be exerted on Hanoi by both the two giant allies. On this Peking and Moscow have succeeded in reaching de facto agreement. In return for small favors from Nixon, they are working in concert against the Vietnamese revolution. They have made a united front on a single issue. This was the meaning of Soviet President Nikolai V. Podgorny's trip to Hanoi June 16-18. He came as an agent not only of Brezhnev but of Mao and of Nixon.

The Antiwar Movement

The most effective support to the Vietnamese national liberation struggle has come from the international antiwar movement that formed around the slogan "U.S. Troops Out Now!" and that has sought since 1965 to mobilize nonexclusive mass demonstrations in the streets to further this objective.

Nixon's announcement May 8 that he had ordered the mining of the harbors of North Vietnam met with an immediate reaction from antiwar activists. Preparations went ahead at an accelerated pace for nationwide demonstrations in the U.S. May 21. Similar actions elsewhere in the world were given fresh impetus.

Alarm swept sections of the American ruling class over Nixon's risking a showdown with Moscow and over what might develop out of the upsurge in the antiwar movement.

The incipient crisis failed to develop thanks to Nixon's collaborators in the Kremlin. On May 11 the Soviet government issued a statement that (1) criticized the mining of North Vietnam's ports, (2) did not assert the right of North Vietnam's allies to continue shipping material aid and military equipment to the beleaguered country, (3) did not warn of countermeasures unless Nixon deactivated his mines, (4) did not encourage antiwar demonstrations.

The same day the statement was issued, as a further assist to Nixon, Nikolai S. Patolichev, the Soviet foreign-trade minister and a member of the Communist party Central Committee, made a "courtesy call" to the White House. Before reporters and photographers, he participated with Nixon in a staged display of a "cordial atmosphere."

On his way back to the Soviet embassy, Patolichev was asked by a newsman whether Nixon's visit to Russia was still on.

"We never had any doubts about it," the Soviet diplomat said through an interpreter. "I don't know why you asked this question. Have you any doubts?"

Moscow's refusal to stand up to Nixon's "bullying" tac-

tics seriously injured the antiwar movement. It served to decrease the size of the May 21 demonstrations, for the sense of urgency was gone. Still worse, instead of helping to raise the political level of those concerned about ending the war by encouraging them to engage in significant action in the streets—an extraparliamentary action—the Kremlin's decision to appease Nixon set this process back.

The antiwar movement in the United States already had to contend with the election-year efforts of "peace" candidates, particularly in the Democratic party, to divert the movement from mass demonstrations in the streets into drumming up votes for capitalist candidates.

McGovern was the cleverest at this game. His phenomenal rise as "presidential timber" in the Democratic party is ascribable almost totally to his success in turning antiwar youth into crusaders for his candidacy, and therefore into supporters of capitalist politics. This was the role that Eugene McCarthy sought to play in 1968. McGovern indirectly owes much to Peking and Moscow's dedication to the policy of "peaceful coexistence."

Nonetheless the main gainer was Nixon. That was why he scheduled the two summit conferences as opening "spectaculars" in his campaign for reelection. He, of course, calculated correctly. The "average voter" sincerely wants an end to wars and peace on earth, and thinks that this can be achieved if the leaders of "the two sides" just "get together."

According to a Harris poll released June 27, the American people approved Nixon's summit meeting in Moscow by 82 percent.

"As occurred in the wake of Nixon's earlier visit to Peking," Louis Harris said, "the Moscow summit journey appears to be paying Nixon handsome political dividends. He increased his lead over his prospective opponents for the White House from 2 to 12 points as a direct result of his achievements in Russia."

The poll showed nonetheless that on a deeper level Nixon has not convinced the American people that his summitry has changed the world situation. By 50-32 percent, a majority were dubious of the claim that "the likelihood of other wars has been diminished." A majority of 51-31 percent did not feel that "we are closer to a settlement in Vietnam" as a result of the Moscow summit meeting. And by 47-32 percent, a plurality of the American people remained unconvinced that "the world is a more peaceful place to live in."

The deep-seated opposition of the American people to the war in Vietnam assures that it will remain a key issue in the 1972 elections no matter what Nixon does in collaboration with the Chinese and Russian bureaucrats to try to bury it. The "average voter" cannot help but think, "What would happen if Nixon had another four years in the White House with not even the curb of considering how to get reelected?"

Nixon's monstrous decision to bomb Vietnam out of existence if the Vietnamese do not drop to their knees is likewise disturbing the conscience of the American people more and more. Are those who fail to speak up and fail to act any better than those in Germany who acquiesced in the operation of Hitler's gas ovens?

Clearly, despite all the difficulties, the antiwar movement is duty bound to continue its work along the same

lines that have already had such impact. "U.S. Troops Out Now!"

The Fourth International

The world Trotskyist movement, organized in the Fourth International, has stood in the forefront of the struggle in defense of the Vietnamese revolution. It has followed developments with the utmost attention, utilizing the Marxist method to reach key conclusions. Its forecasts have stood the test of time.

Besides contributing on the theoretical level, the Fourth International has participated in mass mobilizations on all continents, although it must be admitted that some sections have an uneven record on this.

In the United States, the Socialist Workers party has advanced the stand of the world Trotskyist movement on Vietnam in two ways. On the American scene it has been the most vigorous and consistent advocate of non-exclusive mass mobilizations around the slogan of "U.S. Troops Out Now!" In fact, the Socialist Workers party and its youth affiliate, the Young Socialist Alliance, were part of the first sector of the antiwar movement to advance this line.

It took some hard fighting in the beginning to win the developing movement to this policy. And it took continued hard fighting over the years to maintain it against the various tendencies, particularly the Communist party, which wanted to convert the antiwar movement into an appendage of this or that "peace" candidate of the Democratic party.

The second way in which the Socialist Workers party has advanced the Trotskyist stand on Vietnam has been in the elections. In 1968 it nominated an antiwar slate headed by Fred Halstead and Paul Boutelle as candidates for the presidency and vice-presidency. In 1972 the two main candidates are Linda Jenness and Andrew Pulley.

The main purpose of engaging in the electoral struggle is not to win votes—these cannot be obtained in proportion to the strength of the Socialist Workers party because of restrictive electoral laws and the huge financial resources of the two capitalist parties in the United States. But the elections do provide unusual opportunities for advancing the cause of revolutionary socialism propagandistically. Trotskyist candidates on the ballot likewise provide voters with an opportunity to register their opposition to the war in Vietnam in a meaningful way.

For the world Trotskyist movement, the aggression of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam has constituted the central international issue since 1965 when Johnson escalated the war. It still considers it the central international issue.

Again and again and again it has pointed to the danger that U.S. intervention in Vietnam could touch off World War III. It has called attention to the fiendish weapons the Pentagon has been testing out in Vietnam. From the beginning it has warned that the assault on Vietnam constitutes an assault on all the other workers states; and year after year it has urged the Soviet and Chinese governments to grant adequate material aid to the Vietnamese and to close ranks against the common enemy.

The world Trotskyist movement recognizes that it re-

quires substantial forces to cause U.S. imperialism to pull out of Indochina and that these can be assembled only among the ranks of the workers and their allies. That is why the Trotskyists have persisted in pressing for mass mobilizations. This course also represents the most effective way in the current situation to advance revolutionary socialism and to build the revolutionary party required for a socialist victory.

The betrayals of the Vietnamese revolution by the Chinese and Russian bureaucrats at the two summit meetings have made the tasks facing the Trotskyists more difficult. But the betrayals have also served to educate

many revolutionists who still had confidence in the two centers. They will move toward the Trotskyist movement, which has never wavered in its support of the Vietnamese revolution.

The Vietnamese have provided the world with an imperishable example of courage and heroism in holding out against overwhelming odds. Millions have been moved by what they have done. The example of the Vietnamese has helped inspire fresh revolutionary outbursts around the globe. Even in the United States their example is sinking into the minds of the people. These are omens of the coming doom of U.S. imperialism. □

Hanoi Asks International Action Against Bombing

Nixon's 'Military' Targets: Hospitals, Dikes, People

By David Thorstad

One of the most murderous bombing assaults in the history of warfare is currently being waged by the United States in Vietnam. So serious are the attacks in the northern part of the country that they are raising the specter of genocidal acts on a par with the bombing of Dresden and Coventry during World War II.

The heaviest concentration of U.S. firepower in the South has been in Quangtri Province, where Saigon puppet forces launched a "counteroffensive" to recapture the province near the end of June. Prior to the puppet thrust into the province, reported *New York Times* correspondent Craig Whitney July 2, "the B-52s were flying record number of missions, dropping more than 2,000 tons of bombs a day on North Vietnamese troop concentrations around Hue to prevent them from launching an offensive of their own."

The June 25-26 *Le Monde* reported that on June 22-23 some 100 of the giant bombers dropped 3,000 tons of bombs. So saturated has the province been with bombs, noted Whitney, that what will be left of it "is a matter open to some real doubt."

"Seventeen American cruisers and destroyers in the South China Sea and over 100 B-52 bombers from Thailand and Guam are reportedly pounding the enemy's Quangtri positions almost continuously," reported Sydney Schanberg in the June 29 *New York Times*. "Large numbers of jet fighter-bombers from Thai bases or aircraft carriers are also said to be



NIXON: Denies eyewitness reports of bombing of hospitals and dikes.

providing close combat support."

The criminal bombing raids against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam are the most devastating it has ever been subjected to. It is apparent that

this wave of air raids, with the deliberate and systematic destruction of industrial and civilian targets, reflects the desperation of the imperialists in view of the failure of their policy of "Vietnamization" and their inability to thwart the NLF offensive in the South. It is part of a frantic diplomatic and military offensive by the United States to force the Vietnamese freedom fighters to capitulate, even if this requires the destruction of everything built by human hands in that country.

On June 24, the Hanoi leprosarium was bombed. "Pellet bombs were dropped on buildings housing patients and staff (twelve patients wounded by pellets)," reported *Le Monde* June 28. The same day, Air Force F-4 Phantoms wrecked the Thainguyn steel works 30 miles north of Hanoi. It was North Vietnam's only producer of structural steel of the type used for bridges, railroads, and buildings.

On June 25, bombs "effectively destroyed" the usefulness of the Vietri power plant 25 miles northwest of Hanoi, blacking out part of the capital.

On June 26, according to a report in *Le Monde* June 28, "many houses" on Quan-Tranh and Trinh-Hoai-Duc streets in Hanoi were bombed in the course of attacks on the Hanoi tuberculosis hospital and the dispensary located in the area. The same day, two dispensaries in the center of Haiphong were attacked with pellet bombs, leaving many wounded. A working-class district three kilometers

long was attacked with dart bombs.

On June 27, more than 320 strikes were carried out against North Vietnam, some against a number of targets within the city limits of Hanoi and Haiphong. In these raids, Hanoi's Bacmai airport was bombed. According to Agence France-Presse, this attack also left a nearby residential area seriously damaged. The North Vietnamese press agency reported that numerous civilians died when the country's largest hospital at Bacmai was bombed. In addition, navy planes dropped a guided bomb on a power plant a few miles north-northwest of Haiphong.

Perhaps the most ominous aspect of the current bombing raids with their no-holds-barred policy toward civilian targets is that they are deliberately weakening and in some cases actually rupturing the dike system. This is particularly dangerous as the rainy season gets under way and the water level peaks during August and September.

"From April 10 to June 10," reported *Le Monde* June 24, "there were sixty-eight aerial bombings and several bombardments from ships" directed at the intricate system of dikes and hydraulic works in the North. "Thirty-two important sections of dikes and thirty-one hydraulic works were heavily damaged. The various river basins—those of the Red River and its tributaries, the Clear River and the Black River, the Thaybinh River, the Songday River—were attacked. The powerhouse for the Thacba dam was destroyed. Just one crack in the dam, which it took ten years to build, would be catastrophic, for its lake reservoir would gush forth and engulf hundreds of thousands of inhabitants. The same would happen with the Doluong dam—in Nghean—which has also been attacked."

Agence France-Presse reporter Jean Thoraval inspected the dikes protecting the town of Namdinh on June 24. "One of the dikes was completely cut," he stated. "Several were gutted, with gaps in the dike itself and hollows, evidently caused by bombs, alongside. Deep cracks were visible everywhere. The landscape was almost what one might have expected to find on the moon."

On June 30, he inspected the dike at Phuly, a town about 40 miles from Hanoi, and found it to be seriously damaged. The dike has a complex

system of sluice gates that hold back the muddy waters of the Songday and prevent ten districts of Namha Province from being flooded. "Here and there we saw craters that women were patiently filling by hand. Houses near the dike had been blown up by the bombs, while others were without roofs.

"The system of sluice gates no longer worked, for the six doors could not move up or down. The reinforced-concrete pillars had been destroyed or cracked.

"As for the dike itself, apart from craters in it, it was full of cracks, some of them about a foot wide."

Each year since 1954, Vietnamese peasants have carried 2 to 3 million cubic meters of earth to reinforce the 4,000 kilometers of dikes. Now there is serious danger that the damage being inflicted on them will result in disaster. "Perhaps some of the large dikes have already been jolted by the explosions without the engineers even realizing it," noted *Le Monde* June 24.

Following the destruction of two additional dikes on June 21, the North Vietnamese decided to appeal to world public opinion to stop Nixon before a national catastrophe occurs. North Vietnamese representative in France Vo Van Sung issued this statement to the press June 22: "In the name of the Vietnamese people, the DRV delegation in France strongly condemns the Nixon administration's extremely barbaric acts of genocide in systematically attacking the dikes and hydraulic works in North Vietnam. We vigorously denounce these acts and alert French and world public opinion to the extremely serious crime that the Nixon administration is committing not only against the Vietnamese people but against humanity as a whole. The Vietnamese people call on the peoples of the world, international organizations, and the world scientific community to act while there is still time to stay the bloody hand of the American aggressors and to energetically demand that they stop their bombing of dikes and hydraulic works as well as all acts of war against the Vietnamese people."

The next day, the Hanoi newspaper *Nhan Dan* published three articles on the destruction of dikes and urgently called for a collective effort on the part of the population to protect them.

During his televised news conference June 29, Nixon cynically dismissed

the eyewitness reports of dike destruction as "inaccurate" and repeated the official line that the dikes are not an authorized target and therefore are not being bombed. Meanwhile, hardly a day goes by without new evidence of dike destruction. As long as the massive bombing of the North goes on, such destruction is bound to continue.

Not only will the bombing go on, according to William Beecher in the July 1 *New York Times*, but there are plans to step it up in an effort to shut off any delivery of supplies overland from China. "Senior Defense Department sources say that additional key targets in North Vietnam have been pinpointed and soon will undergo intensive air strikes." The unnamed "key targets," according to Pentagon analysts, are in addition to the mining of ports and the bombing of bridges along the two rail lines from China. "This new effort should tighten the noose almost completely," one military official declared.

The bombing is only one side of Nixon's strategy for bringing the Vietnamese to their knees. The other side is the flurry of diplomatic activity emanating from his journeys to Moscow and Peking. Nixon is hoping that Hanoi's allies will apply diplomatic pressures on it to grant the desired concessions. Although they have done this in the past, the Vietnamese have held firm in their determination to rid the South of imperialist domination.

More light has been shed on this role of Hanoi's allies as intermediaries between Washington and Hanoi by the revelations of four heretofore unpublished volumes of the Pentagon Papers. These volumes, which were obtained by columnist Jack Anderson, deal primarily with the secret diplomacy of the Johnson administration. They show that both Warsaw and Moscow played important roles in pressuring Hanoi to take part in negotiations.

One of the most important revelations of these unpublished papers is their confirmation of the assertion of revolutionary socialists that Washington's "peace" proposals are designed to give it a continued foothold in South Vietnam. The papers show, Neil Sheehan observed in the June 28 *New York Times*, that it was "not for want of diplomatic machinery" that the war could not be resolved, but that "Ha-

noi and Washington could not reach a peace settlement because they could not compromise their basic disagreement over who would hold power in

South Vietnam." As the unpublished papers put it, "Who shall govern SVN [South Vietnam] is what the war is all about." □

Unionists Demand Out Now!

'Labor for Peace' Formed in U.S.

The largest labor gathering ever held in the United States against the Indochina war took place in St. Louis, Missouri, June 23-24. Conference delegates—there were 986—passed a resolution calling for the immediate withdrawal of all U. S. forces from Indochina.

The conference was initiated this spring after three union officials returned from visiting North Vietnam. Clifton Caldwell, vice president of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, Harold Gibbons, vice president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, and David Livingston, secretary-treasurer of the Distributive Workers of America, were joined by forty other officers of international unions in calling the conference. The forty-three conference initiators are officers in nineteen different unions; in all, delegations representing thirty-five unions from thirty-one states attended the conference. The United Auto Workers, the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, the Teamsters, the Clothing Workers, the Meat Cutters, the Teachers, and the United Electrical Workers were among the most heavily represented unions.

The policy resolution adopted by the delegates linked the war with the domestic problems of inflation, unemployment, and wage controls. It stated in part: "We demand the immediate withdrawal of every American soldier, every gun, every plane, every warship, and every dollar. . . ."

"To achieve this goal and to insure that there will be no more Vietnams, we here today establish *Labor for Peace* as a national organization. We declare our intention to bring into our midst ever-broader sections of the trade-union movement. . . ."

The structure of the new group provides for establishing a permanent headquarters and staff to distribute

educational materials. A steering committee composed of forty-five union officials was elected, and a speakers' bureau is planned.

A major debate at the conference centered on a proposal made by a delegate from the New York teachers union calling for a one-day general work stoppage to protest the war and wage controls. In an initial straw vote, the majority of the delegates supported this proposal, but after the conference organizers pressed their opposition to it—on the grounds that the U. S. labor movement was not yet ready for such an action—the original

proposal of the conference sponsors was adopted.

The last attempt to set up a U. S.-wide labor antiwar organization was in 1967, when the Labor Leadership Assembly for Peace (LLAP) was founded in Chicago. That body immediately turned its attention to Eugene McCarthy's presidential campaign and soon disappeared.

While the St. Louis conference was twice as large, and considerably more militant than the LLAP gathering, the failure of the conference organizers to project any concrete activity apart from education, and the organizers' stress on the importance of "dumping Nixon" in 1972 demonstrated the danger of the new group's losing its independence by going into the McGovern campaign.

The future evolution of Labor for Peace thus remains an open question. But the size of the conference, the militancy of its participants, and the organizers' apparent desire to continue its work raise the possibility of the addition of a powerful new social force to the antiwar movement. □

Thousands Demand Equal Rights

Gay Pride Marches Staged in U.S. Cities

Thousands of homosexuals took to the streets throughout the United States on June 25 to commemorate the third anniversary of the New York Christopher Street "riots," when hundreds of gays fought back against police raiding a Greenwich Village gay bar. Since then, hundreds of gay groups have grown up throughout the country.

In New York, about 7,000 marched, despite the fact that it rained until only an hour before the march. Demonstrators chanted "Out of the closets and into the streets!" and "Gay Power" and carried signs representing the spectrum of gay groups, including Gay Veterans for Peace, Radicalesbians, Gay Youth, Gay Activists Alliance, Daughters of Bilitis, and Mattachine Society. Among the marchers were Dr. Benjamin Spock, presidential candidate of the People's party, and three New York candidates of the Socialist Workers party. An SWP statement supporting full civil and human

rights for homosexuals was well received by participants.

Other cities where "gay pride" demonstrations occurred included San Francisco, where 2,000 took part in its first such march; Detroit, where 200 marched; and Los Angeles, where 1,000 marched past thousands of on-looking supporters, many with raised fists.

The Los Angeles march focused on four demands: 1) Repeal all statutes regulating sexual behavior between consenting individuals; 2) No "crimes" without victims: release all persons convicted of so-called sex offenses; 3) End discrimination against gays in all areas of life; 4) End police harassment of gays.

More than 6,000 participated in a Philadelphia gay pride march June 11, including many heterosexuals behind a banner proclaiming "Straights for Gays." Half of those marching were Black. □

Feliciano Acquitted in First 'Bombing' Trial

A Bronx, New York, jury on June 22 acquitted Puerto Rican nationalist Carlos Feliciano of charges of attempted arson and possession of a bomb. The government claimed that Feliciano had been planning to bomb an army recruiting station when he was arrested on May 16, 1970.

The defense maintained that the main "evidence" in the case—a bomb supposedly discovered by police in Feliciano's car—had been planted by a police agent who had been following Feliciano for about a year.

In their summations, both the prosecutor and defense attorney said that

Feliciano could be acquitted only if the jury agreed that he was being framed. After nine and a half hours of deliberation, the jurors voted to acquit him on all counts.

Feliciano still faces two more frame-up trials, however. One, which is expected to begin in September in Manhattan Supreme Court, is on another charge of attempted arson and bomb possession. The second is on a charge of perjury and is based on a technical error that Feliciano made in applying for a hunting rifle permit. □

Student Killed, Hundreds Arrested

Widespread Protests in Cities Across Argentina

"The sixth anniversary of the taking of power by the armed forces was not commemorated by the military government, but the country's main cities were shaken by violent protest demonstrations directed against the authorities," reported a United Press International dispatch from Buenos Aires in the June 30 issue of the New York Spanish-language paper *El Diario-La Prensa*.

The army and the police massed in the capital of Buenos Aires on June 28 to prevent any demonstrations. The city's center area was declared an emergency zone.

"Yesterday morning," reported UPI June 29, "150 students abandoned the medical school of the University of Buenos Aires, which they had occupied the night before. The group Jóvenes Peronistas [Peronista Youth], supported by other student groupings representing various political tendencies, called a demonstration for yesterday 'in order to repudiate the sixth anniversary of the Argentine revolution.'"

All traffic in the capital was being strictly controlled by the army, and movement after 7 p.m. was banned. According to a report in the *New York Post* June 29, university students in Buenos Aires built barricades of desks and furniture, which they set aflame, and then later built new barricades with automobiles. Approximately 300 have been arrested in the capital, according to UPI.

The severe repression began following protests a week earlier by students, workers, and leftist organizations in Tucumán. Police there attacked a demonstration organized by public employees demanding better salaries.

In the clashes that occurred in Tucumán, more than 700 demonstrators were arrested, and one student was

killed when a tear-gas grenade exploded in his face.

Demonstrations and clashes with police have been widespread in a number of other cities as well, among them Córdoba, Rosario, Salta, La Plata, Mendoza, San Nicolás, and Santa Fe. □

An Eyewitness Account

The Mass Mobilization in Mar del Plata

[The following account of the general strike in Mar del Plata on June 14, which we reported in our last issue (see "General Strike Wins Release of Prisoners" pp. 768-69), has been translated by *Intercontinental Press* from the June 21 issue of the Buenos Aires weekly *Avanzada Socialista*. A translation of some editorial comments by *Avanzada Socialista* appears under "Documents."]

* * *

MAR DEL PLATA, June 17—The mobilization began with the students but rapidly spread to other sectors. The first unions to take a stand were Light and Power, the Tile Setters, Postal Workers, the Bus Drivers Union,

among others. All these sectors, together with Intersindical [Interunion], which includes the flour workers and miners, began to put pressure on the CGT [Confederación General del Trabajo—General Confederation of Labor] to call a strike. The "62 Organizations" had already indicated their support through a press release.

The university staffs, associations of professionals, and political parties also joined the mobilization. The bar association decided at a general meeting to participate in the action. The university teachers, the deans, as well as the rector joined in.

The political parties, among them the UCRP [Unión Cívica Radical del Pueblo—Radical Civic Union of the People] and the FIP [Frente de Iz-

quierda Popular—Front of the Popular Left], issued statements demanding release of those who had been arrested, and denouncing the repression. The PSA [Partido Socialista Argentino—Argentine Socialist party] called on all the parties to form a broad commission to give more power to the mobilization. The proposal was accepted by the PSP [Partido Socialista Popular—Popular Socialist party], the Communist party, the Juventud Peronista [Peronist Youth], the ENA [Encuentro Nacional de los Argentinos—National Encounter of Argentinians] and the FIP. The Social Democrats and the UCRP turned down the proposal.

On Monday [June 12] a meeting of 1,000 persons, most of them students, was held. They decided to call a strike.

The presence of the labor movement at the head of the mobilization polarized the whole population. A large number of sectors began to join the strike. These included the Universidad Católica [Catholic University], Agronomía de Balcarce [Agricultural School of Balcarce], teachers of both the primary grades and high schools, nonteaching staff, the associations of psychoanalytical studies, of psychologists, visual arts, the engineers' center, etc.

The high-school students played a very important role. They elected delegates by schools to a coordinating body. The student vanguard was made up of youth from the high schools and from the working class. An eloquent index of the participation of the youth was the fact that of the 105 arrested—all of whom were later released—the big majority were youth.

The army mobilized a huge force. They brought in troops from nearby areas as well as special detachments from the federal district.

Businessmen and the middle class opposed the strike. Terrified, they closed shop, and the school authorities called a holiday.

Nevertheless the strike was a complete success. Even the newsstands, daily papers, buses, and taxis stopped work. The rank and file of the unions that refused to support the strike (building trades, textile, and office workers) likewise joined the action. They organized picket squads that went from plant to plant in the unions

whose leaders had acted as strikebreakers and got their comrades to down tools.

Despite the levy of troops, the workers and students formed into columns.

These swelled to 300, 400, and up to 1,000 persons. People applauded from their doorways and helped demonstrators get away when they were chased by the military. □

Argentina

The Violence of Those at the Top

[The following is the fifth installment of a lengthy feature on repression in Argentina that appeared in the April 25 issue of the Buenos Aires newspaper *Nuevo Hombre*. Its publisher, Dr. Silvio Frondizi, was arrested as

a result of the publication of this issue and subsequently released. The newspaper has been banned. Translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Working-Class Targets of the Repression

By Evaristo Juan Malemfi

Several times throughout this report we have stated or implied that the problem of repression reflects a conflict between two antithetical poles: the repressive dictatorship with its specialized bodies, and the repressed people, particularly the most conscious layers.

In this installment we shall see making their way down the heart-rending path of repressive cruelty workers who are faithful defenders of the interests of their class, upstanding teachers, journalists, students, etc. There remain many others who, despite great effort on our part, we were unable to include.

Specifically there is no mention in this installment of members of armed organizations, of guerrillas. It is they who are perhaps today bearing the brunt of repressive violence. They—unfortunately—have had to be almost exclusively included in the preceding installment dealing with torture.

Given the multiplicity of possible examples, in each case we have selected those that are most typical. Any omissions are the result only of the difficulty of obtaining information, space limitations, and in the final analysis our inability to do any more than

we have in carrying out the task we have undertaken.

Workers

Next Friday [April 28], Agustín Tosco, assistant secretary of the Córdoba CGT [Confederación General del Trabajo—General Confederation of Labor] and general secretary of the light and power union in the same region, will have completed one year in prison. As in so many other cases, he is being kept in prison for no other reason than for allegedly disturbing "public tranquillity." In this way, the regime, which did not hesitate for a moment to murder Eduardo Monti in Olmos Prison, hopes to paralyze the mobilization of the Argentine working class. Hipólito Solari Yrigoyen, the union leader's defense lawyer, told *Nuevo Hombre* about the outrages committed during the imprisonment of Tosco.

"On April 28, 1971, Agustín Tosco was going home at midnight. Suddenly, three patrolmen stopped his jeep and took him at gunpoint to the provincial police headquarters. The next day, he was transferred to Buenos Aires on an air force plane and was placed in Villa Devoto Prison, on orders from the executive branch. The operation was carried

out by the federal police, the provincial police, and the air force. The person directly responsible was none other than General Alcides López Aufranc. The evidence is conclusive: On the morning of April 29, President Agustín Lanusse and his minister [of the interior] Mor Roig were to arrive in Córdoba. Both were informed of the move during the flight. Of course, they did not hesitate to accept the fait accompli. Meanwhile, the government rushed to issue its version of the incident. The undersecretary of the interior, Eduardo Belgrano Rawson, displaying great imagination, explained that the union leader had had himself arrested while he was walking through the city of Córdoba in the middle of the day. The remark is not unusual, for Belgrano Rawson has not hesitated to repeatedly slander Tosco.

"The executive order providing for the imprisonment of the unionist appeared several days after the fact—such things are customary under this dictatorship. The order asserted that the move was 'necessary for the maintenance of public tranquillity under the current state of siege.' Once again the terms of this order betray the farce: in principle, only a constitutional government has the authority to impose a state of siege and, therefore, to take steps to safeguard the security of the country.

"On the other hand, Tosco was subjected to very harsh conditions in the prison. Order 5015/63 from the Guido era was applied to him; this limits to one the number of defense lawyers a person may have (common prisoners are allowed as many as twenty), and it bars visits by anyone who is not a direct member of the prisoner's family. This was hard on the union leader, who was locked up in a solitary cell and had no opportunity for contact with other political prisoners because he was denied recreation privileges. His wife and children live in Córdoba. More than once they had to put off a visit because they lacked the economic means to pay for the trip to the capital. Today this situation is even more serious. His recent transfer to Rawson Prison puts 2,260 kilometers between him and his companion. The arrest of Ongaro, who was placed in the same cell, helped alleviate the loneliness for a time. But since the release of the graphic artist, Tosco has been for-

bidden to speak to anyone but a guard.

"There are other things too that indicate the viciousness of the government. On April 9, without warning, he was transferred to Rawson. They took him out of Villa Devoto in handcuffs and at gunpoint, with all kinds of weapons pointed at him. Under these degrading circumstances he was taken in a heavily guarded prison van to Palomar and from there, by plane, to his new destination.

"Together with Dr. Arnaldo Murúa of Córdoba, we initiated the necessary legal steps the very day he was arrested. The process, which involved



ALEJANDRO LANUSSE

presentation of an appeal for habeas corpus, clearly revealed how Argentine justice operates. In this appeal we laid the basis in principle for freedom for Agustín Tosco.

"Although we knew that it was useless to make such a request we believe it is necessary to struggle for rights. But in addition, we questioned his transfer to Buenos Aires, and this we had every right to expect to win on.

"Many curious things came to light around this point. The transfer could only be carried out on the basis of an executive order. Such an order, of course, did not exist. When the Supreme Court realized that thanks to this error it would have to give

in to our request, it issued an official letter to the executive indicating in a veiled way what it needed posthaste. The government official who received the note did not understand the message: his reply ingenuously reconfirmed the nonexistence of any order. Actually telephone calls from the judges had to be made before the phantom order made its appearance several days later—dated September 21, no less. Naturally, our habeas corpus motion was turned down without further ado.

"On January 6, in a statement to the press, Mor Roig expressed doubts that Tosco was continuing to have any effect on public tranquillity. Therefore, on January 13, we presented another motion. We requested the court to issue an opinion informing us whether the conditions leading to Tosco's arrest still prevailed. Leopoldo Isaurralde, a judge who is quite well known for his excessive harshness, did not grant our request. Nevertheless, the federal court reversed his ruling and obliged the court to give in to our request. The executive branch deliberately ignored this and made no reply. We immediately demanded that the official, Morello, be put on trial for abuse of authority and violation of the duties of a public official. Isaurralde again did not hesitate before denying our motion.

"Today things do not look encouraging. It is certain that this dictatorship will not free Tosco. And while there are no real reasons for him to be kept under arrest, there are also no indications that the government is at all interested in correcting the situation."

'Poverty Boroughs'

On March 2, Coordinación broke into an office of *Barrio Comunicaciones* [Community Report] and beat up and arrested several persons. In addition, on Monday, March 23, a couple and their four children became victims of repression. The defense lawyer in these cases, Dr. Héctor Sobel, spoke with *Nuevo Hombre* together with the families involved. The evidence they present reveals the brutality of the measures taken against the poor neighborhoods.

Dr. Sobel. "Every day, we read reports in the papers of torture used against political prisoners and union

members, or about the 'disappearance' of such and such a person (Néstor Martins, the Verd couple, Pujals, etc.), or of brutal attacks on student and popular demonstrations. But we hear and know very little about the form the system's repression takes in the badly named 'poverty boroughs,' which are in reality working-class districts, except when some raid becomes public knowledge because of its scope. Daily the worker who lives in these working-class districts sees himself messed over and knocked about by the police, who function as the masters and overseers of property and life.

"Some of their usual activities are: threatening merchants, who must hand over a daily or weekly quota if they want to be left alone (Al Capone taught the police this trick); arresting people at any time and for any reason and then demanding payment of a 'fine,' which is used to advance the cause of no one but those who collect it; arbitrarily and violently arresting people without any kind of explanation, but only the usual blows and insults; shooting into the air during the early hours of the morning; etc. In these cases, the usual excuses giving political or trade-union activities as grounds for the police behavior cannot be invoked. There is only one explanation for this daily, constant repression: it is social repression; it attacks the worker for no crime other than that of being a worker; it is inspired by hatred for the people. As one of the police once said while he was beating a worker: 'This'll teach you who's running this show; you think you're a real hot son of a bitch, really somebody, but you're nothing but a piece of shit.'"

Nuevo Hombre. "Why don't you tell us a little about how it all happened?"

Man. "We were at a wake at a friend's place. Some time passed, and then around 10 o'clock at night, in came the men from the 46th. There was a guy in the place that the police may have recognized, and they began to ask what we were doing there. The question seemed rather odd since the police could see the dead man in the coffin. In the middle of all this I came over to try to clear things up when one of the police gave me a gash in the face. So I asked him, 'What's going on, sir? Why did you hit me?' He replied, 'You shut your mouth,' and grabbed me by the coat and threw me out into the street.

I went back and asked them, 'What has gotten into you? You can't come in and treat us like this at a wake. We're not making a ruckus or anything.' They beat me so much that I don't really want to remember it; they really took it out on me. Well, my sister came out and hollered, 'Why are you beating my brother up like this? Leave him alone, please.' Right away they jumped on her and pulled her by the hair and used judo on her—like this, with the side of the hand. . . ."

Woman. "They pulled us by the hair. . . . They pulled us down to the floor . . . then they kicked us. Our legs are full of bruises."

Man. "And they kept right on beating so that I have continued to feel bad up to this moment; I have to undergo an electrocardiogram, and it hurts a lot when I bend over and when I breathe. I still can't work very well. I've been worn out, and my nerves are shattered."

"While they were beating my sister, my wife came and asked them not to beat me. They grabbed her by the hair too, lifted her up, dragged her to the ground, and kicked her; she had the baby in her arms. There was mud, I know. . . ."

Wife. "I was all covered with mud. They grabbed me by the hair and pulled my by the ankle. . . ."

Man. "So they took me to the 46th. There they beat me some more, and hit me with a machine gun butt. Inside there was a policeman who also beat me. His badge number was 31-179."

N. H. "What did they tell you at the commissariat?"

Man. "There, after beating me, they held me in a side room near the entrance. While there I saw them bring in my brother, beating him, pulling him up by the hair, and twisting his arms in all directions like savages; when he was with me, the other policeman began beating me again. Shortly after, they beat my wife again too at the 46th."

Wife. "They grabbed me by the hair and twisted my arms behind my back—I was carrying the kid. In my fright, I handed the baby to my sister. They took me inside, beat me, and hurled insults—'So this is the way they live here.' All this for no reason at all. No one had insulted them or anything."

N. H. (to the sister). "Did they take

you prisoner too?"

Sister. "We got out of that place with my sister, his wife, and a younger sister. We went to ask for my brother, but they did not let us get in. 'Go to the corner of the next block.' There the ones who beat us were coming out. They were coming out like they were crazy. 'Move on,' they told us, and they pushed me forward and grabbed me by the hair. They were already holding my other brother by the arms and were kicking him and kicking him until their shoes came off; they dragged him along, beating him all the while. This brother went with us, after getting out of bed since we women were afraid; they beat my brother without any cause."

N. H. "What reason did they give for arresting you?"

Wife. "Drunkenness and other kinds of intoxications. . . ."

Man. "And a pile of laws. . . ."

N. H. "And did you tell them that they were picking you up at a wake, and that all these reasons were lies?"

Man. "They didn't ask me anything."

Sister. "They did what they wanted. They wrote and smashed and smashed and knocked over and smashed and knocked over, wrote, knocked over. . . . They filled out the papers just the way they wanted."

Wife. "Finally it came out that it was all because of drunkenness and that we would have to pay a fine if we wanted to get out."

Man. "The next day more or less around noon they called me in to sign a paper; they let me go at eleven. Everything on the paper is false. Why didn't they put down how they treated us and what they did to them [the women]?"

N. H. "But you had to sign under coercion?"

Man. "Oh, yes, always under threats. We were told that if we signed in the afternoon, we could leave. We had to sign. You couldn't be in a place like that, or in Devoto either. We had to sign in order to get out, and also because of the threats that they made."

N. H. "Do you know if other similar cases occurred there, if other people were picked up and beaten?"

Man. "We know that these people who beat us also beat several others. They beat up a small boy, and even a girl, and a few days before that they beat a woman and her husband when they were putting up their hut. They told them that they could not

stand in the door to their homes, that they had to stay inside. They hit the woman and dragged her inside by the hair. I don't know what kind of morals these people have."

Brother. "The policemen who arrested my brother at the wake are the same ones who beat us in the door to the 46th. They were taking orders from a head man named Alonso who was wearing civilian clothes. This man has already been tried once for assaulting others. I said this in my report to the judge."

N. H. "In what court was Alonso accused before?"

Sobel. "There is an accusation of injuries and abuse of authority before the court of Dr. Hermelo, secretariat Méndez Villafañe, and another one before the court of Dr. Liporace, secretariat Sanchis Ferrero. What's more, his sister-in-law was in the hospital."

Man. "Oh, yes. We forgot to mention that. My sister-in-law was not at the wake that night. When she saw me being beaten and heard my sister screaming, she and my brother got up, and then they were beaten too. She was in very serious condition as a result of this and had to spend eleven days in Fernández; she lost her child. She was pregnant, and in serious condition."

N. H. "She was pregnant and lost the child?"

Wife. "Yes, she was in serious shape. She was nearly dead when they took her away."

Man. "Anyone who came onto the scene had to be punished. She didn't, but they beat her up anyway, for no reason."

Wife. "You couldn't open your mouth. If you made a sound they'd make you swallow your tongue."

Sobel. "The sister-in-law came with some others to see what was going on. They put her in an office, beat her, and left her there until around four or five in the morning. After that, they let her go. She had lost blood, and when she reached home she was in a semiconscious state. The neighbors called an ambulance, which came and took her to Fernández."

Man. "A neighbor lady had to help her since the rest of us were all in the commissariat."

N. H. "But is it more or less normal for these gentlemen over there to start beating people for no reason?"

Man. "Many of them are used to

doing this sort of thing for no reason. Just the other night they took away several boys 12 or 13 years old who were playing in the street. This isn't right. The kids were just playing. I don't know how you can stop this kind of thing. They are used to carrying on this way and since they know that we are all very humble people here, they take advantage of us. We never say anything to them; they seem to be on the lookout for weak spots."

N. H. "Haven't the people in this district ever gotten together to see what they could do to put an end to this?"

Man. "Well, when this all happened, my brother-in-law and my wife went to see a lawyer (who is participating in the interview). He went with them to tribunals with a medical examination to make a statement before the judge. That's where we are now."

Wife. "Well, you know, there are a lot of people who are afraid of the police. They don't dare to do anything around them. If people would get together and were a little stronger, things would be different. All it would take is a little push."

Man. "While they were beating my wife, they beat the little kid, too."

Wife. "While they were hitting me it seemed to me that they had also struck the boy because—this is really too much—he had a big bruise on his nose; the kid was so scared he wasn't even crying. I thought they had broken his nose. When the baby saw me being beaten, he cried out, 'Hey, leave my mama alone!' He's a kid two and a half years old."

Man. "The kids were so scared that night that they talked in their sleep."

Wife. "They screamed. They woke up scared to death and saying, 'Mommy, Mommy! The police! Where's daddy? Where's daddy?' They went for more than a week like this without being able to sleep peacefully."

Man. "Since that night, I have been restless and nervous. At work I always find myself thinking about all this. I'm really furious about it, the way they go around beating up women. I've got a lot of anger built up inside me!"

Nuevo Hombre also spoke with other neighbors of *Comunicaciones*.

N. H. "Why doesn't each of you tell us something about repression in this district."

Neighbor 1. "In the Martín Güemes district, some lands have been taken over by squatters. When people had

gotten settled down in their huts for one day, the police came and began to destroy everything. They used horses to knock things over and break furniture. They were from the 46th. There was a woman with a baby wrapped in a blanket. The police broke in and threw the baby against a wall."

Neighbor 2. "They picked me up the other day because I was bad-mouthing the prefecture. See this patch of hair that's missing? And these bruises? They were drunk!"

Neighbor 3. "On the night of March 2, six policemen came into the home of one woman, without any credentials or any orders. They beat up her fifteen-year-old son and sixteen-year-old nephew, who were in their underwear. They also picked up a neighbor. For two blocks, two cops dragged the son. They put a white hood over him, punched him, and took him off to Laprida. We wanted to follow, but they threatened to shoot us. They kept on going toward Retiro."

Neighbor 4. "They always say they're looking for thieves. But that's a crock of shit. They come every night and take people away. Some day they'll get theirs!"

Neighbor 2. "When they come, they go to the grocery store and take a bottle of oil, two kilos of roast beef, etc. If they don't get what they want, the place is marked."

(At this point, we had to interrupt the interview and hide the recorder because a police car kept going by outside.)

Neighborhood Associations

Injustice, embezzlement, sinecures, etc.—these are the axes around which the municipal and communal policy of the dictatorship revolves. With a great deal of effort, neighbors are now forming self-defense groups. The police, who are aware of their power and fear them, try to decapitate these groups.

Dr. Roque Bellomo told *Nuevo Hombre* about the case of Edgardo Enrique Vicario, president of the coordinating committee of the Neighborhood Associations of Córdoba.

N. H. "What can you tell us about the Vicario case?"

Dr. Bellomo. "Edgardo Enrique Vicario, a 40-year-old lawyer and father of five, was president of the coordi-

nating committee of the Neighborhood Associations of Córdoba. . . . Another farce of the GAN [Gran Acuerdo Nacional—Great National Agreement]. . . . It so happens that 2,000 Córdoba families were defrauded by a housing construction company that mortgaged their lands. Before the signing of the deed, a mortgagee showed up prepared to evict them all; he even had a date set for the auction. At this point, action was taken to prevent the auction from being held, to expose these speculators, and to notify the government and request that it take steps to hold up the process. . . . Well, while Manrique was on a trip to Córdoba, the residents stopped him and in no uncertain terms demanded that he solve their problem. The reply he gave? To repress the 'rebels.'

"Then they arrested Vicario and the entire committee. The funny thing about it is that after a few days they let them go, but when Vicario walked out he was arrested by the police and turned over to the executive branch for having 'disturbed public tranquillity. . . .' He was held prisoner in Devoto until December 17, when he was transferred to Rawson. There has been no trial, no judge, no concrete charge brought against him, nothing. . . ."

N. H. "Could you tell us what prisons are like in Argentina?"

Dr. Bellomo. "One characteristic is that the prisoners are divided up in accord with the way the regime looks at their ideology. For example, prisoners belonging to the ERP [Ejército Revolucionario del Pueblo—Revolutionary Army of the People] are put together with those of the Communist party, Montoneros are put with those from the FAP [Fuerzas Armadas Peronistas—Peronista Armed Forces], those from the FAL [Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación—Armed Forces of Liberation] are put with those from the FAR [Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias—Revolutionary Armed Forces], and so on. . . . The prisoners, who are kept together in groups, make use of their time by holding classes in history, reading, discussing politics, etc. There are even professors who give classes. . . . They don't waste their time. The most 'dangerous' prisoners—like Raimundo Ongaro, when he was a prisoner, or Tosco—are kept in cells. This is in Devoto.

"In Chaco the situation is different. This is practically a concentration camp. They are not allowed to read there, and they receive visitors once a month. It's as though the outside world did not exist. It's a completely self-contained prison system, like what you find in a concentration camp. This system holds for those who have been sentenced, not for those who are on trial. There is a complete lack of communication, which is a typical form of mental torture.

"The situation is worst of all, in my opinion, in Rosario, because there conditions are subhuman. No visits of any kind are allowed. Everything is made difficult for the prisoner. Not to mention the discomfort of the cells, the humidity, the lack of food, the thirst. . . . They do not even provide underclothes or blankets, so the prisoners have to bear up under the cold as best they can.

"I do not know what the situation is like in Rawson, but sending people there is obviously a way of completely separating the prisoners from their families, who are unable to travel so far."

Dominican Republic

Police, La Banda Attack Political Prisoners

In mid-June there were disturbances inside La Victoria Prison in Santo Domingo during which at least eighteen prisoners were reported wounded. According to an eyewitness interviewed in the June 17 issue of the Santo Domingo daily *El Nacional*, the incidents were deliberate assaults on the political prisoners by other inmates who were members of the right-wing terrorist organization La Banda. The whole thing was instigated by the police, asserted the witness, who, said the newspaper, "asked that his name not be given for obvious reasons."

On June 11, ex-police lieutenant Oscar Núñez Peña was seen holding a meeting with members of La Banda for three-quarters of an hour at the prison. When he left, La Banda thugs went out onto the prison's patio and began hurling insults and death threats at the political prisoners, the witness stated. Later on the same day, the bandits again took to the patio and

N. H. "Aside from the farce that the GAN presupposes, what ideological requirements does this system of repression reflect?"

Dr. Bellomo. "When Lanusse took power, Mor Roig said that there were 300 political prisoners in the entire country; this figure has increased glaringly to the point where there are now more political prisoners in Villa Devoto than common prisoners, and they have a higher rate of turnover. Without any doubt, all this reflects a fascist outlook on politics and national life. The regime believes that it can maintain order through repression, and by running the country as if it were one big barracks. Besides, they are afraid; they are very afraid because for them all these people in the streets represent revolution, while they—the fascists—represent counter-revolution. But the country will not be pacified through repression, torture, and hunger, but through social justice. The day the people become the government, not long from now—this is what they don't understand—the revolution will begin."

[To be continued.]

threatened the political prisoners, only this time they were armed with clubs and poles.

In self-defense, the political prisoners picked up pipes and poles too. "Under these circumstances, the police entered the patio—there were about thirty of them—and instead of calming things down or restraining the two groups that were struggling with each other, which it was their duty to do, they went after the political prisoners, kicking them and beating them with clubs." The La Banda members and various henchmen from the Trujillo regime also imprisoned in La Victoria took advantage of the police assault "to join forces with the police in the attack on the political prisoners, who retreated in order to avoid a direct confrontation with the police and fortified themselves in their cells; they were then locked up."

The next day, the political prisoners were kept locked up in their cells. The thugs used this opportunity to

continue their attacks, this time by throwing rocks at the political prisoners. A number of common prisoners were so infuriated by this that they came to the defense of the political prisoners. Another battle ensued. This time between seventy and eighty police were on hand, and they turned on the political and common prisoners in an "orgy of punching and clubbing."

Among others, ex-President Juan

Bosch sharply criticized the "brutal and savage outrages" at La Victoria.

According to another report in *El Nacional*, the political prisoners are alleged to be members of the MPD (Movimiento Popular Dominicano—Dominican Popular Movement), the PCD (Partido Comunista Dominicano—Dominican Communist party), and the 14th of June Revolutionary Movement. □

Police Gun Down Dominican Leftist

Angel Rincón (Aníbal), an activist in the MPD (Movimiento Popular Dominicano—Dominican Popular Movement), was shot to death by police in Santo Domingo on June 24. According to a report in the June 25 issue of *El Nacional*, the victim had been the object of constant harassment by the police. On several occasions his apartment had been broken into. He was killed by one bullet, which struck him in the head.

Members of his party charged that his murder was part of a plan to eliminate various leaders of the MPD.

"Immediately following the murder of Rincón," reported Rafael Reyes Jerez, "members of the police force

surrounded the spot and arrested dozens of young people, including two young girls who were just passing by the area."

A police spokesman asserted that Rincón had been shot while a street meeting was going on. "But neighbors pointed out that there never was at any time a street meeting going on in that area, but that they did hear 'a lot of shooting.'"

A police source admitted that Rincón had been shot by two members of the police force, but claimed that they had first been shot at. The source did not explain why none of the police had been wounded. □

Hugo Blanco Leaves Mexico

Hugo Blanco, the exiled Peruvian revolutionist, has left exile in Mexico, where he has remained since he was expelled from Peru last September, for Argentina. "I am going to Buenos Aires," he told journalists during a stopover in Lima's Jorge Chávez airport June 12, "because I will feel closer to Peru there. I have no specific plans, but it is possible that I will give some lectures, as I did in Mexico. I have a visa for Argentina, and I don't know how long I will stay there."

Blanco was not allowed to enter Peru, but was obliged to wait in the international section of the airport while the plane refueled. During the one-hour stopover, friends and supporters of the campaign being waged in Peru to end his exile were able

to talk with him. He was also interviewed by journalists.

Blanco noted that only pressure from the Peruvian masses could bring about his return. "It was their pressure that brought about the removal of the 25-year prison sentence against me, and this same pressure can make it possible for me to return," he observed, according to the Peruvian *Prensa* June 13. "Since I am not allowed to enter my country, I have become an ambassador of Peru to the people of other countries, to whom I will explain the real truth about the conditions under which the Peruvian people live."

The following is a report from a participant in the group that met Blanco at the airport in Lima:

"We had very short notice that Hugo Blanco would pass through Lima, but this did not prevent his comrades and close associates from gathering to greet him. Stationed on the observation deck of the airport, we anxiously awaited the arrival of the plane from Mexico City.

"The plane arrived at 6:20 a.m. We saw Hugo disembark in the midst of other passengers, responding to our shouted greetings with the clenched-fist salute. Once in the airport waiting room, he was interviewed by several reporters who had come to meet him, and we were able, from the second floor, to speak with him in Spanish and Quechua.

"When the stopover was at an end, we watched him leave as he had come: walking with raised fist and looking up defiantly. Filled with emotion and determined anger, we chanted our promise over and over: 'Hugo Blanco Will Return!'" □

Mexican Guerrillas in Ambush

"Following several months of calm, the Mexican guerrilla movement has again erupted violently, putting an end to any hopes the government had that it had wiped it out last February," stated a United Press International dispatch from Mexico City in the June 30 issue of the New York Spanish-language daily *El Diario-La Prensa*.

On June 25, it reported, ten soldiers were killed in a guerrilla ambush in the Sierra Madre. The action was generally attributed to the guerrilla group Brigada de Campesinos Para la Justicia (Peasant Brigade for Justice) headed by Lucio Cabañas.

Near the end of last year, the government launched a campaign against the guerrilla movement. The campaign culminated with the death of guerrilla leader Genaro Vázquez Rojas on February 2, and the arrest of dozens of guerrillas throughout the country over a period of several months. Between January 1 and February 1, according to UPI, at least eight guerrillas were murdered by the army. "Last Sunday," observed UPI, "Lucio Cabañas reopened the almost healed wounds of the Mexican guerrilla movement." □

Despite CP Protests

Trotsky's 'History' Published in Chile

By Luis Vitale

Santiago de Chile

The Chilean state publishing house, Quimantú, published Leon Trotsky's *History of the Russian Revolution* in May. The two-volume work was published in an edition of 8,000 and was quickly sold out. A second edition of 15,000 copies is planned.

The publication of this work has been made possible by the current political situation in Chile, in particular the rising workers' movement and the radicalization of various socialist layers that have carried out joint actions with the revolutionary left. Actually, it was through interminable discussions with the Communist party that the socialist brigade at Quimantú defended the right of the Chilean workers and students to have access to one of the most brilliant works of the most important revolutionary thinker in the twentieth century after Lenin.

When the work had already been approved by the editorial committee, headed by the socialist Alejandro Chelén Rojas, top leaders of the CP, including Senator Volodia Teitelboim, showed up in the printing house to demand that the decision to publish the book be revoked since the CP was vetoing the spreading of Trotsky's ideas. The socialist brigade appealed to the rank-and-file workers of the Production Committee, which is a "workers' participation" group formed by Popular Unity in all state-run companies. The Quimantú Production Committee backed the decision to publish the book.

Following this, the CP demanded that the problem be taken up by the central committees of its own party and the Socialist party. The CP plenum resolution of March 15 of this year, drawn up by Deputy Orlando Millas,* stated in the section on "the ideological struggle" that there has been a "gross allocation of public resources to publish anti-Soviet works by this selfsame Trotsky." (*El Siglo*, March 16).

*Millas became finance minister in the recent shake-up of the Chilean cabinet. —IP

Various newspapers have made reference to these political differences within the government parties. The most important Chilean magazines have

commented on the publication of the book, and bookstores are displaying it as a major publishing event. The first edition was sold out in two weeks. There were book salesmen who headed for factories and the mining district; hundreds of copies were sold to workers in this way. Most could not believe that Quimantú had actually managed to publish a work by Trotsky. It was a thrilling experience to see how the workers in publishing grabbed up the first copies to come off the presses. □

Operations Against Israel Suspended

Fedayeen, Lebanese Regime in Agreement

"We will arrest anyone with arms who comes within 10 kilometers of the border," a Lebanese army officer told *Washington Post* correspondent Jim Hoagland June 27. This is the real essence of a new "agreement" between the leadership of the Palestinian fedayeen and the Lebanese government. Officially announced June 28, the accord climaxed a week of negotiations between Lebanese government leaders and Yasir Arafat, head of Fateh and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO).

"I am very satisfied with the results," said Lebanese Prime Minister Saeb Salam after the last meeting. The exact terms of the "results" were not disclosed, but fedayeen sources indicated that the commandos would cease all operations against Israel originating from Lebanese territory "for the time being." The June 29 *New York Times* reported that a commando disciplinary body will be created to enforce the agreement.

"Informed sources" said that about half the 2,000 fedayeen now in various areas of southern Lebanon would transfer their bases to Syria. The same sources suggested an interpretation of the phrase "for the time being": "... if and when the Middle East cease-fire broke down, the guerrillas would resume their operations."

The agreement provides for a unified fedayeen information service to function out of Beirut, but that service would not be permitted to issue military communiqués from the city. The real effect of this aspect of the accord will likely be the transference

of the fedayeen headquarters out of Lebanon. Fateh and el-Saiqa (the Syrian-Baathist-backed commando group) are expected to move to Syria. Arafat was in Damascus June 24 negotiating with Syrian President Hafez el-Assad and is believed to have gotten the latter's agreement for such a step.

There have been reports that the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP), whose relations with the Syrian government are not good, will move its headquarters to Algiers and its information center to Kuwait.

On June 29, one commando group, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine-General Command (PFLP-GC), announced its refusal to recognize the new agreement. A spokesman for the group said it would continue its activities "in the depth of enemy territory." The PFLP-GC is headed by Ahmed Jabril, a former Syrian army officer. It split from the PFLP in 1968 and is generally regarded as a terrorist-oriented, right-wing outfit. It is not a member of the PLO. The PFLP-GC has centered most of its operations on attacks against civilian targets inside Israel.

Youssef Najjar, described by the June 30 *New York Times* as Arafat's representative in Beirut, warned that the PLO leadership is prepared to apply strict measures, "including force if need be" to prevent violations of the agreement.

The Israeli attacks on Lebanon on June 21 and June 23 thus seem to have achieved their aim—to push the remaining fedayeen, who have not

been in a strong enough position of late to threaten Israeli border areas anyway, far enough to place the Israeli state well beyond the reach of the fedayeen.

Key to this Israeli strategy has been the attempt to drive a wedge between the fedayeen and the non-Palestinian Arabs of Lebanon. In the June 23 *Washington Post* correspondent Jim Hoagland wrote that in the opinion of "Lebanon's highest officials" and "some senior diplomats" in Beirut, the recent Israeli assaults "were designed to exacerbate commando-community friction and bring about a popular demand in Lebanon for a crackdown on the commandos."

In a June 28 article, Hoagland suggested that this tactic was successful and quoted several citizens of the Druze village of Hasbaya, which came in for heavy bombing during the June 21 invasion. "The Israelis were looking for fedayeen. It is the fedayeen's fault," said Hasbaya Mayor Fuad Abu Saleh. "We want the fedayeen to stay out. No fedayeen, no trouble," commented a university student.

Such statements should not be viewed as in any way typical of Lebanese attitudes. The Druze, a break-away Islamic sect, have always been staunchly conservative and hostile to the fedayeen and the Palestinians.

Nevertheless, there has clearly been an erosion in active support for the fedayeen among the Lebanese masses, who in 1969, for example, took to the streets of Beirut to prevent a government crackdown on the fedayeen. This erosion of popular support has been crucial in giving the Lebanese regime political maneuvering room to increasingly restrict the functioning of the Palestinian resistance movement.

The fedayeen policy of viewing their fight against the Israeli state as fraternally related to but politically separate from social struggle in Lebanon itself led them to regard the Lebanese masses solely as a "host." Intervention into Lebanese politics was thus excluded, and no organizational form for merging the Palestinian and Lebanese struggles was created.

Under these conditions, ties between the Lebanese masses and the fedayeen could only be tenuous. After the successive weakening of the Palestinian positions in both Jordan and Lebanon, it was only a matter of time

before the Israeli and Lebanese governments would combine their attacks on the fedayeen, complete the latter's isolation from the Lebanese masses, and thus leave the Palestinians standing alone to face the power of both governments and their armies.

The shifting of the fedayeen centers from Lebanon to Syria will further restrict the commandos' freedom of

action. The Syrian government has never let the fedayeen carry out attacks on Israel from Syrian territory, and the internal political conditions there are even more precarious than in Lebanon. On the other hand, the Syrian masses have a more solid tradition of radicalism than the Lebanese, and potentially could serve as a most powerful ally of the Palestinians. □

The Case of the 'Unity Movement Thirteen'

South Africans Appeal 'Terrorist' Verdict

Thirteen members of the African People's Democratic Union of South Africa/Unity Movement (APDUSA), convicted last April of having violated South Africa's notorious Terrorism Act, have appealed their convictions and sentences. The case is expected to be heard by the Appeal Court at Bloemfontein during the July-August term.

The APDUSA members were arrested in February 1971 and held in solitary confinement, undergoing continual torture, until August 1971, when their trial began. The eight-month trial was the longest of its kind in South African history. The defendants were found guilty on the following four counts:

- That they joined in a conspiracy to commit certain acts to endanger the maintenance of law and order in South Africa and to overthrow the government by force with the assistance of a foreign power.

- That they conspired with the Unity Movement leadership in Zambia to collect funds to finance a campaign to recruit people in South Africa to undergo political and military training abroad, persuaded and assisted people to leave the country secretly, and helped people evade the police.

- That they assisted four "Zambian agents"—APDUSA members who had returned to South Africa—to incite, instigate or procure people for military training abroad and did actually recruit such people.

- That they gave help to known terrorists in several ways.

Upon conclusion of the trial (April 6), Judge Neville James handed down sentences totaling 209 years in

prison, the terms to run concurrently. The length of time each defendant will have to serve in jail is as follows: Kader Hassim, Joseph Vusani, Mogami Moeng, Mfolwane Mbele, Pindiso Zimambane, eight years each; Dan Mahanjane and Ngcikwa Vimba, seven years each; Frank Anthony, Robert Wilcox, and Surinarayan Venkathnam, six years each; and Max Tabata, Albert Shangana, and Montford Mabuto, five years each.

The trial became a focus for the worldwide antiapartheid movement, and the government was compelled to allow observers from the International Commission of Jurists to attend the proceedings. The international publicity mounted on behalf of the defendants seems to have been crucial in convincing the regime to allow the case to be appealed.

The prosecution's case was revealed to be wholly fraudulent during the trial. It was only the sweeping, undemocratic character of the Terrorism Act, which places all burden of proof on the defense and even then makes mere political statements "terrorist" crimes, that allowed the court to find the defendants guilty. According to *Intlabha-Mkhosi*, the London organ of the Unity Movement, the defendants did not deny being members of the Unity Movement, but "contended that if members of APDUSA had indeed returned to South Africa they had come to revive the organization and to seek volunteers who would undergo political training abroad and later return to help build the organization. Political training had to be received abroad because conditions inside

South Africa did not make this possible."

The government's case was based on evidence given by witnesses who had been held for long periods by the police before giving testimony. The star witness was one David Ngeleni, an alleged coconspirator who turned state's evidence and was granted immunity by the police. Witnesses who were able to refute Ngeleni's claims—most notably Dr. Limbada, a member of the Unity Movement now in exile—were not allowed to testify, the judge having found Ngeleni a "remarkable person by any standards" who "left the court with a very strong impression that he was a man who, having made up his mind he was going to tell the court what he knew about the APDUSA movements in Botswana and Zambia, set out to tell the truth as honestly and fearlessly as he was able."

The defense appeal is based on the failure of the court to allow Limbada and other competent witnesses testify, the irregularities—to use a polite term—committed in taking evidence from other witnesses, the severity of the sentences, and, most importantly, the mistreatment of the defendants themselves and the court's refusal to admit testimony about that mistreatment.

On this point *Intlabi-Mkhosi* (May 1972 issue) wrote: "Throughout the trial the accused from Pondoland told in the most horrifying detail of their tortures, ill treatment, and interrogations conducted by the Security Police at the forest camp at Mkambathi. Four of the accused (Mbele, Zimambane, Vimba, and Mahajane) had made an application supported by 16 affidavits and statements, 11 of which were from ex-South African detainees now living in London, all providing detailed descriptions about Security Police treatment including torture, solitary confinement, and methods of interrogation. . . .

"The accused, who made this unsuccessful application, had witnessed one of their number (Mthayeni Cutshela) die from the torture inflicted upon him, while another detainee attempted to slit his own throat to escape the police brutality. In his judgment, justice James dismissed all allegations against the police whose blunt denials of any wrong behaviour he fully accepted."

There is some evidence that if sufficient international pressure is ap-

plied, even the police-controlled South African court system can be forced to dismiss frame-up charges against opponents of the government. Joseph Tshukuda Maleka, originally charged along with the "Unity Movement Thirteen" of violating the Terrorism Act, was tried separately before the Supreme Court in Pietermaritzburg. The trial began in February, and on March 23, Maleka was found not guilty on all counts.

The prosecution's case was shown to be so unconvincing that the court responded favorably to a defense motion to dismiss the charges. Especially noteworthy about the trial is the fact that the testimony of David Ngeleni—he was the bulwark of the state's case in the Maleka trial as well as in the APDUSA trial—was disregarded as nonsense. "To each member of the court," wrote presiding Justice Har-

court, ". . . he [Ngeleni] appeared to be an unreliable witness, slippery, and appeared to tell lies under oath. We are unanimously of the opinion that the evidence of this witness cannot be accepted."

Harcourt's estimation of this stool-pigeon, which contrasts rather sharply with Judge James's admiration for him, is of particular significance for the APDUSA appeal.

The verdict in the Maleka case shows that, given sufficient international strength, victory can be won even in South Africa. The Unity Movement has urgently requested funds to pay for the costly appeal process for the thirteen victimized revolutionists. The London Committee of the Unity Movement of South Africa can be reached at 120 Grandison Road, London SW11, Great Britain. □

Thousands at Feminist Meeting in Paris

The Mutualité in Paris, which holds between 3,000 and 4,000 people, was filled to overflowing May 13-14 for the "Days of Denunciation of Crimes Against Women." The meeting, open to both men and women but attended mostly by women, was called by three organizations, Mouvement pour la Libération des Femmes (Women's Liberation Movement), Mouvement pour la Liberté de l'Avortement (Movement for Freedom of Abortion), and the "Choice" group.

The program included testimony and discussion on the strike of "underage" unwed mothers at Plessis-Robinson and living conditions at similar institutions, the state of hospital-care for women, female homosexuality, rape, abortion, housework and professional life, and other aspects of the condition of women in contemporary French society.

A report of the meeting by Pascale Biquard printed in the May 27 issue of *Rouge*, weekly newspaper of the Ligue Communiste, French section of the Fourth International, described the French women's movement as a "movement in gestation: heterogeneous, shot through with contradictions, bursting with confusions, but very much alive."

The assembly reflected this clearly. "Along with the denunciation of 'every form of power, including leftist power'

(sic), it was also proclaimed that the struggle of women was part of the class struggle: 'We were born of the class struggle; we were born in May '68 because the class struggle carries within it and develops the struggle against all oppression.'" □

Declare Malagasy Amnesty

Yielding to the pressure of the mass explosions of April and May, General Gabriel Ramanantsoa, acting Malagasy head of state, declared a general amnesty for political prisoners on June 16. The most important effect of the move will be to release some two thousand youths arrested in 1971 during a peasant rebellion. Included among them is Monja Jaona, leader of the far-left Monima party, which the government blamed for the uprising.

But lest anyone get out of hand, on June 25 the general banned all demonstrations in the country, claiming that the regime had to act against a "minority of troublemakers" who were trying to seize power. In fact, this decree is believed to be Ramanantsoa's response to a call for mass marches issued June 23 by the members of the May 13 Movement, a united-front group favoring the dissolution of the reactionary parliament and the removal of foreign military bases from Malagasy. □

How Youth of Bangladesh View Awami League Government

By S. B. Kolpe

It was the youth of Bangladesh that fought the Pakistani military junta till the bitter end. Youth formed the hard core of the Mukti Bahini that waged the liberation war against heavy odds and ultimately triumphed.

How do the youth look at the problems of independent Bangladesh? During my recent two-week tour of the war-ravaged country, I talked with several youth leaders. I am presenting the views of three of them—Abdul Kader Siddiqui, twenty-three, who led an independent guerrilla army inside Bangladesh, Major Ziaur Rahman, thirty-six, a young army officer who initiated the revolt on the fateful night of March 25, 1971, and Rashed Khan Menon, twenty-seven, a former Maoist leader who plunged into the liberation struggle, defying his cothinkers.

I met "Tiger" Siddiqui, popularly known as the commander of the "Kader Bahini," in Tangail district at the Dacca Press Club, where he had come to present his "fullest allegiance to the leadership of Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman in his task of realizing socialism."

Tall and handsome, Siddiqui is still feared by his opponents. As the leader of 17,000 commandos and 120,000 volunteers, he ran virtually a parallel administration in central districts of Tangail and Mymensingh during the period of the army crackdown.

He was the first commando leader to surrender his arms to Sheikh Mujib after the country's liberation. Yet he has been accused by leaders of the Chhatra League, students' front of the ruling Awami League, of indulging in "subversive activities." The charges against him are that his men have not surrendered all their arms and that he was still running his own parallel administration in Tangail district.

Dressed in kurta and pajama and sporting a neat beard, he talked to me, claiming to be a modest soldier of the Bangladesh revolution. "I am a soldier," he said, "if not by profession at least by temperament. And it is with this determination that I fought hand to hand with Pakistani soldiers. If need be I shall shed the last drop of my blood and take the bullet in my chest to preserve the independence of my country."

Siddiqui was critical of some of his "highly placed" critics. He said: "These gentlemen lived comfortably at Mujibnagar drawing Government allowances and felt satisfied with broadcasting radio talks while we of the Mukti Bahini, unfed, ill clad, and inadequately armed, kept the Pakistani army engaged in grim and bloody battles inside Bangladesh."



ABDUL KADER SIDDIQUI

He added, "Now, when the country is free, these gentlemen have come back to bluff the people. They are deliberately slandering us as subversive elements." He reflects the sentiments of the revolutionary youth who stayed back and fought the occupation forces, as opposed to those who fled the country.

He referred to the "charges in the air" of "murders, dacoities [systematic robberies], forcible collection of taxes, and nonsurrender of arms. These are serious charges amounting to treason," he snapped his fingers. "If they are true, my men and myself cannot go unpunished. But you see I am still a free man. The government has not framed any charges against us."

What did he propose to do in the future? How would he help the process of "socialist reconstruction" of Bangladesh? He became quite emotional and said, "Sheikh Mujib is my permanent source of inspiration. I am not Kader Siddiqui. Kader was killed in the battle of Dhalapara. Now I exist as a living symbol of Bangabandhu's ideals and directives."

He called for the creation of a "team of selfless, devoted, and diligent officials and leaders" to ensure true implementation of the tasks of socialist reconstruction "for which banks, insurance companies, and heavy industries have been nationalized."

Siddiqui said, "The battle for freedom is

over, but a greater battle awaits us. The battle for reconstructing the shattered economy. It is a pity that many officers who actively collaborated with the Pakistan army are still retained in active service. There is need to eliminate them if an administration committed to socialist ideals is to be created." Asked whether he proposed to form a new revolutionary party of his own choice, Siddiqui denied that he had any intentions of entering "active politics." He proposed to continue his studies, which were interrupted by the liberation war.

Major Ziaur Rahman, who was the first officer of the Bengal Regiment to hoist the flag of revolt against the Pakistan army in Chittagong, is also a modest person, who has no intention of becoming "an active politician."

He has been placed in charge of the Comilla Cantonment, once the prestigious Eastern Command Headquarters of the Pakistan army. He appeared somewhat disappointed, perhaps because a junior of his, Major Shafi Ullah, has been recently promoted as the chief of staff of the Bangladesh army in place of General Osmany, who has joined the Mujib cabinet.

Zia told me that along with a few of his trusted colleagues he had planned to revolt if the Yahya regime resorted to repression. So they acted on the night of March 25, 1971, when they learned that Sheikh Mujib had been arrested in Dacca and the military crackdown had begun.

At first only 200 soldiers joined him. "We put all Pakistani officers under arrest. When others saw we did not have any resistance, more men joined us."

Zia promptly took control of the Chittagong radio station and proclaimed the emergence of a revolutionary government of Bangladesh with Sheikh Mujib as its president. His men held the radio station until March 27, when it was put out of commission by the Pakistani air force.

At first Zia and his colleagues doubted whether their revolt would succeed. But when they saw students and workers joining them in large numbers, they were convinced that victory would ultimately be theirs.

Zia explained how inexperienced students who joined the Mukti Bahini fought heroically against the Pakistani army, almost defying death. Soon Zia established contact with other officers of the Bengal Regiment and the East Pakistan Rifles who had rebelled in other parts of the country. They sought the cooperation of the political leaders and elected members of the national assembly and members of the provincial assemblies of the Awami League. Soon a unified command of the Mukti Bahini was established with eleven sector commanders in charge. At Mujibnagar a provisional revolutionary government was set up.

Zia claimed that the Pakistani army was completely demoralized by October 1971, when it realized that it could not receive any help from the outside world. Meanwhile the freedom fighters of the Mukti Bahini had built up their commando

units throughout Bangladesh and had established their own administrations in many districts.

According to Zia, General Niazi, who commanded the Pakistani forces in Bangladesh, was only too anxious to surrender to the Indian army when the latter entered the country in December. "Otherwise, you cannot explain why a well-equipped army with more than 93,000 combat soldiers with arms and ammunition that would have lasted them six months should have surrendered so suddenly and dramatically."

About the postliberation problems of construction Zia said, "All sections of our people sincerely support the four pillars of Bangabandhu's program—socialism, democracy, nationalism, and secularism."

He said that the unprecedented genocide perpetrated by the Yahya regime had united the people of Bangladesh: "The character of our people has undergone a big change. Our people want to move forward. I assure you, outsiders cannot destroy our unity, whatever happens."

Rashed Khan Menon, a popular leftist student leader, on the other hand, appeared very critical of the Mujib government, although he was confident that the "workers and peasants ultimately will march to the goal of socialism in our country."

Menon was formerly associated with the Communist party of East Pakistan (Marxist-Leninist), led by the Maoist Mohaned Toha. When Toha and his associates adopted a line of supporting the Yahya regime in pursuance of the Chinese policy, Menon and his associates broke with Maoism and formed their own independent Marxist group.

Kazi Jafer is a close associate of Menon's. Together they work in the Krishak Samiti, led by Maulana Bhashani. They also play an important role in the Bangladesh Sramik Federation, a national trade-union center, and the Biplabi Chhatra Union, a leftist student front.

Unlike some of the Maoist groups that adopted an ambivalent attitude in relation to the liberation war last year, the Jafer-Menon group actively participated in it. Menon said, "We were a part of the liberation war. Because of the failure of the left and the absence of a working-class leadership, the national revolution could not be completed."

Menon referred to a "conspiracy" to make Bangladesh play a "subordinate role" in relation to India with "the connivance of the Soviet Union." He characterized the leadership of Sheikh Mujib as "bourgeois," which he said was "leaning on the bigger Indian bourgeoisie." Menon had his own differences with the pro-Soviet Communist party of Bangladesh led by Moni Singh and the National Awami party led by Professor Muzaffar Ahmed, and he characterized both of them as a "revisionist trend."

He also rejected some of the Maoist groups associated with names like Toha, Matin, Sikdar, and others as "unrealistic

adventurist groups." He defined his group's attitude to Chinese Communists: "We are not their camp followers. We are independent. We criticize them whenever they go wrong. We pursue our own course of action."

He, however, supported the steps taken by the Mujib government to nationalize banks, insurance companies, and certain categories of industries. But he insisted that all major industrial undertakings, including foreign plantations and banks, should be nationalized without compensation and with workers' control over the management.

According to Menon, the economy of Bangladesh was essentially agricultural,

with 80 percent of the population settled on land. He said that feudal land tenures still existed and there was need to abolish them as a first step towards modernizing farming.

His is one of the leftist groups considered to be "extremist." Among the youth organizations, the most powerful are the Chhatra League, led by the Awami League, and the Chhatra Union, led by the Communist party of Bangladesh. A vast majority of the youth and students are not committed ideologically to any party as such; but they are intensely political and quite active. They are the major force that will determine the future developments in Bangladesh. □

After Bhutto's Police Fire on Workers

Karachi Strike Closes Industrial Complex

By Jon Rothschild

After two days of police attacks on peacefully demonstrating workers in Karachi June 7-8, the death toll stood at fourteen and the number injured ran into the dozens. By the afternoon of June 8, the city was gripped by a virtual general strike that had spontaneously broken out to protest the police violence. President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's stabilization program had been dealt its most serious setback yet.

The clashes began on June 7, when workers of Feroze Sultan Industries—part of the SITE (Sind Industrial Trading Estate) manufacturing complex—advanced the not unreasonable demand that they receive their wages, plus the 2.5 percent bonus they are supposed to get under Bhutto's profit-sharing plan. The management informed the workers that it couldn't afford to pay.

The workers then surrounded the company executives, confining them to their offices until they would agree to negotiate. (Throughout the subcontinent, this sort of activity is known as *gherao*.) The workers sent a team of representatives inside to talk.

Soon the police arrived and arrested fourteen workers on charges of *gheraoing*. The strikers tried to block the police van in which their comrades were being carted away, and the cops fired tear gas to disperse the crowd.

As the police drove off with the arrested workers, the strikers sought support in the various "labor colonies" surrounding the SITE area. Within

one hour a crowd of 5,000 had gathered at the factory. The police then opened fire. Government sources admitted that three workers were killed; a fourth died the following day of wounds sustained in the police attack.

Osman Baluch, president of the Muttaheda Mazdoor Federation and one of the leaders of the Sind Workers' Convention, a united front of six trade-union federations, told reporters assembled at a June 7 news conference that many more than three workers had been killed, but that the police had carried away their bodies. He also disputed the official police story that cops had fired after workers had shot at the police, saying that the cops had opened up on the workers on two separate occasions and that many workers had been wounded while trying to assist their wounded comrades.

A staff reporter for the Karachi English-language daily *Dawn* noted that police "gave no warning to workers over the microphone, as is done in all cases, before resorting to firing."

Baluch cited similar attacks on peacefully demonstrating workers in Lahore, Rawalpindi, Kotri, and Hyderabad. He demanded that all public officials responsible for the killings be dismissed and brought to trial for murder.

Later that night, the government imposed the so-called section 144 on the SITE district for a period of ten days. The statute prohibits assemblies

of more than five persons. The stage was thus set for the next day's encounters.

On the morning of June 8, workers from three of the labor colonies formed into a funeral procession for Mohammad Shoaib, one of the workers killed the previous day. "The entire area had been cordoned off by a heavy contingent of Police consisting of tear-gas squads, armed squads, and constabulary armed with lathis [heavy sticks often of bamboo bound with iron]. Hundreds of Policemen had taken up positions outside the colonies to ensure that Section 144 in the SITE area was observed," wrote the June 9 *Dawn*.

At 9:30 a.m. the workers' procession began. But before it reached the main road it was stopped by the police cordon. The workers began chanting slogans demanding that they be allowed to pass, and the police responded with tear gas. When the workers sought to defend themselves with stones, the "armed squad" opened fire. At least six workers were killed immediately.

But the cops did not stop there. After the initial salvo they kept firing indiscriminately and pursued the demonstrators back into the Frontier Labor Colony. The June 9 *Dawn* cited some examples of the ensuing casualties:

"Khyber Khan received a bullet in his chest while standing outside his house.

"A nine-month-old infant, Amirzada, and his mother were killed when a bullet pierced through the thin wall of their house." Police admitted to having killed ten people. Workers' sources said the toll was much higher.

By 2:30 in the afternoon, the police had withdrawn from the area. Thousands gathered near the site of the killings to protest the attack. Shops in the city's industrial areas began to shut down in protest. The Karachi district magistrate reaffirmed that section 144 was still in effect and said that police would continue to patrol the streets "to forestall any mischief."

But the police patrols could not prevent the strike from spreading. Industrial activity in the whole SITE area was paralyzed. Harbor workers, who work outside the region where section 144 was in effect, walked off the job and held mass marches.

On the night of June 8, workers in the Frontier Colony held a mass meeting to discuss what to do. Osman

Baluch addressed the gathering and urged that the strike be continued until all workers' demands were met. These included, according to *Dawn*, "withdrawal of the labour policy, which he described as a shield pro-



BHUTTO: Unalterably convinced of his own popularity.

vided to the capitalist class of the country by the Government. He demanded that all the labourers, peasants, and other members of the working class arrested by the Government recently be released immediately."

Political conditions in Pakistan today are not such that a general strike, even on a local scale, can be easily brought off. But the labor upsurge in

Karachi coincided with renewed demonstrations against the widespread use in Karachi and Sindh Province of the official state language, Urdu, as opposed to Sindhi, which is the native language of the majority of the inhabitants.

And at Punjab University, the June 24 *Far Eastern Economic Review* reported, two student factions "brawled amid a debate on whether Bangladesh should be recognized; they used sticks, knives, and even revolvers to settle the point."

In face of this growing political turmoil, Bhutto's Pakistan People's party has begun to show serious signs of split, various factions accusing others of concocting involved conspiracies aimed at alienating public support from rival factions. So far, Bhutto has remained above the factionalism, allowing members of his government to disassociate themselves, in his name, from some of the more unpopular aspects of government policy. After the Karachi shootings, for example, Minister of State for Public Affairs Mairaj Mohammad Khan, a Maoist, criticized the killings, complaining that "at a time when President Z. A. Bhutto was out of the country, repeated incidents of firing on the people, including jail inmates, betrayed a conspiracy to create an impression that President Bhutto was no longer popular."

It is doubtful that such an aim requires a conspiracy. But Mohammad Khan's trepidation is easily understood. It is after all quite possible that the Karachi workers were shot down with Chinese guns sent to the "anti-imperialist" Bhutto by Chairman Mao. □

Bhutto Bans Tariq Ali From Pakistan

Tariq Ali, a member of the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International and a member of the Political Bureau of its British section, was prevented from entering Pakistan June 25 by the government of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto.

Ali arrived at the Karachi airport June 25. As a Pakistani citizen holding a Pakistani passport, he cannot legally be barred from entering his own country, but the special police

units at the airport thought otherwise. Ali was placed under arrest while "higher authorities" were contacted.

Bhutto's predecessor, Yahya Kahn, had ordered that if Ali ever returned to the country he was to be arrested and charged with high treason in a military court for his support to the Bengali liberation struggle. But since martial law is no longer in force, the order was not implemented fully. Ali was sent out of the country on a Paris-bound flight the same day. □

The Invisible World of Michael Harrington

Of Norman Thomas, the late leader of the U.S. Socialist party, Leon Trotsky once remarked that he considered himself a socialist only as the result of a misunderstanding. In 1972, the chairman of the SP is Michael Harrington. A man of greater scholarship and sophistication than Thomas, Harrington has managed to compound the misunderstanding of his predecessor.

Thomas, it should be noted, had considerably more excuse than does Harrington. At least in the 1930s, the Socialist party had a significant following of radicalizing workers and maintained its independence to the extent of running its own presidential candidate in opposition to Franklin Roosevelt. The party today has all but disappeared into the Democratic party, where it is distinguished chiefly by its position to the right of many liberal capitalists on such issues as the war in Indochina.

The way in which Harrington views the struggle for socialism may be seen in his intervention in the current election campaign, in which he is an enthusiastic supporter of Senator George McGovern, the Democratic liberal from South Dakota. The June 18 issue of the *New York Times* printed a letter from Harrington and his fellow SP'er Irving Howe. The burden of the letter was not to criticize the inadequacies of McGovern's capitalist program, but to defend the senator by assuring right-wingers that he is not as "radical" as he has been painted:

"Now that Senator McGovern has a good chance of getting the Democratic nomination, we may expect an increase in the right-wing attacks on him as a 'dangerous radical' or even, Heaven forbid, a 'socialist.'

"The folks on the right should relax. Senator McGovern is not a socialist or even a radical; he does not propose measures that would significantly alter the socioeconomic relations of power in the U.S.; nor does he threaten the dominion of private property. As democratic socialists who would indeed like to see a fundamental

restructuring of our society so as to redistribute wealth equitably and democratize control of economic institutions, we recognize that the McGov-

Socialism by Michael Harrington. Saturday Review Press, New York, N. Y. 436 pp. \$12.50. 1972.

ern campaign does not share these goals. Socialism—from our point of view, unfortunately—is not an issue in the 1972 campaign. . . ."

Socialism, as far as Harrington and his dwindling followers are concerned, can only become an "issue" when the capitalists who control the Democratic party decide to make it one. Until that happy day, which Harrington wisely does not predict, the function of "socialists" like Harrington, in addition to certifying the nonsocialism of Democratic politicians, is to advocate "extension of the welfare state"—the reason Harrington gives for supporting McGovern.

The theory of Harrington's *Socialism* is every bit as housebroken as his "socialist" practice. Its function is to explain—regretfully, of course—why the socialist goal must be pushed off into a distant future, why "socialist" principles exclude support of the workers states, and why, in general, Harrington's socialism is indistinguishable from a rather moderate liberalism.

Harrington begins from the premise that Marx "regarded democracy as the essence of socialism" and cites the appropriate quotations to show that Marx and Engels opposed totalitarianism and believed that the emancipation of the workers is the job of the workers themselves.

No serious student of Marxism would question the fact that Marx and Engels were sincere and consistent democrats. This is a far cry, however, from saying that they regarded democracy as the "essence" of socialism. Their materialist philosophy described the class struggle as the mo-

tive force of history and regarded political forms, including democracy, as the superstructure, not the essence, of society—whether feudal, capitalist, or socialist. It would be more appropriate to say that Marx and Engels considered socialism the essence of democracy, that is, that real democracy is possible only when there is economic and social equality.

Revolutionary Marxists can agree with Harrington that the lack of democracy in the Soviet Union and China is an eloquent refutation of the bureaucrats' claims that socialism exists in those countries. But Harrington's elevation of democracy to the role of prime criterion allows him to gloss over the real gains of the Russian and Chinese revolutions and lump the workers states together with the most reactionary capitalist countries. This in turn means that the social organization of the workers states is inferior to that of American capitalism since the latter is more "democratic" and therefore "closer" to socialism.

The class nature of the Soviet Union is a question that has preoccupied the international socialist movement for decades. In the United States on the eve of World War II, during the Stalin-Hitler pact, the pressures of anti-Soviet bourgeois and petty-bourgeois public opinion gave rise to a split in the Trotskyist movement. James Burnham developed a theory that the workers state and capitalist society were both tending toward a new, "managerial" form of society. In *The Managerial Revolution*, published shortly after the split, Burnham broke completely with socialism and predicted that Hitler and Stalin were about to launch a war to destroy the "democracies."

One of Burnham's allies during the factional dispute had been Max Shachtman. Although Shachtman had denied sharing Burnham's views, he later produced his own version of them, which he applied only to the Soviet Union.

In Shachtman's parody of Burnham, the Soviet Union was declared a new form of class society, which he called "bureaucratic collectivist." This theory allowed Shachtman to maintain a nominal connection with the socialist movement, and he eventually ended up in the extreme right wing of the Socialist party, supporting U.S. imperialism's war against

the Vietnamese and providing theoretical schooling to Michael Harrington, among others.

While this is not the place for an extensive discussion of the theory of bureaucratic collectivism¹—which is not so much a theory as an apology for accommodation with imperialism—its function in Harrington's *Socialism* can be briefly noted.

Although claiming to find a new "class" in the Soviet Union and the workers states, the theory is, like the criterion of "democracy," a retreat from class analysis. Forms of the political superstructure are made the determinant of the economic substructure:

"Under this system in Russia, the party leaders do not receive their cars, villas and foreign trips because they own stock certificates, but rather as a *privilege of their political position within the bureaucratic hierarchy.*" (Emphasis added.)

"... under the Soviet model, the economic and political direction are identical. . . . political power in this system is the means of establishing economic and social power. . . ."

Harrington maintains that forced collectivization of the peasantry in the Soviet Union was the "revolution" by which the bureaucracy established itself as a new ruling class. But no such revolution is really necessary in his schema, since the "new class" is able to evolve out of the state bureaucracy.

Such an evolution, moreover, is possible in capitalist as well as in workers states, according to the author. Thus Harrington writes that the theory "may also even be relevant to the Western welfare states where an intensification of the present integration of corporate and governmental power . . . could end up in a 'liberal' bureaucratic collectivism."

In the case of China, we are told, the Communist party was "a new ruling class" from the moment Chiang Kai-shek fled the mainland, if not sooner. Harrington is a bit vague about the point at which the CP became a "new class" unto itself, but he indicates that it "established itself as a decisive force, *independent of all the classes in the nation*, before it took control." (Emphasis added.)

Truly, a remarkable act of political levitation on the part of the Chinese Communist party! Harrington, who wants to be considered a Marxist, neglects to explain where Marx erred in defining classes by their relationship to the means of production. If, as Harrington claims, the CP "owns" the means of production, what was its class nature before the revolution? Very simple, replies the theoretician of "bureaucratic collectivism"; it had no class nature at all: It was a "decisive force, independent of all the classes in the nation." And Harrington adds:

"Thus the Chinese Communists were not a party of workers, or even of peasants, even though at various times they led significant elements of both those groups. They had been forced out of an organic relationship with any of the classes of the society, which is why they themselves can be seen so clearly as an embryonic class."

Thus it appears that new ruling classes develop, not in the womb of the old society, but in splendid isolation from it, until they suddenly spring, full-grown, upon the stage of history and install themselves in power. Harrington is entitled to believe in such fantasies if he desires, but when he calls them "socialist" or "Marxist," we have the right to ask whether he has not crossed the line between misunderstanding and falsification.

Harrington's refusal to proceed from the class nature of the state and its institutions leads him to equally fantastic conclusions when he turns his attention to the advanced capitalist countries. One learns here, for example, that "there is a mass social democratic movement in America today"—a phenomenon that has escaped most observers, leading Harrington to label it "our invisible mass movement."

Harrington refers, of course, to the union movement, which is not invisible but whose "social democratic" characteristics at this stage leave a great deal to be desired, even from the standpoint, one would think, of a Harrington-style "socialism."

According to Harrington, the labor movement became "social democratic" in 1968, when the union bureaucrats mobilized the ranks to do the leg work in Hubert Humphrey's presidential campaign to a greater extent than they had done for Kennedy or Johnson in 1960 and 1964. The mean-

ing of this event, Harrington declares in rapture, was that "labor had clearly made an on-going, class-based political commitment and constituted a tendency—a labor party of sorts—within the Democratic Party." And two paragraphs further on, he adds:

"The unions, in short, had created a social democratic party, with its own apparatus and program, within the Democratic Party."

Harrington even brings in George Meany, the top bureaucrat of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations and therefore presumably the leader of this "social democratic party," to testify to his own "socialist" instincts:

"I still do not know what socialism is, despite the things that I have read. But if socialism means that under a democratic system, this republican form of government that we have, there are people who desire to secure for the great mass of the people, the workers, the wage earners, the farmers, and others, a better share of whatever wealth the economy produces, and that by providing that better share we provide a broad base of purchasing power to keep the economy moving forward—if that is socialism, then I guess I am a Socialist and have been a Socialist all my life. I do not figure that, but if that is what socialism means, that is the sort of thing I am interested in."

These puerile pseudo-Keynesian maunderings, Harrington informs us, while "too limited a program for the creation of a new society," nevertheless reflect "the same general outlook as the European social democracy." One suspects that even the most cynical class-collaborationists of that movement would regard this characterization as a slander.

Harrington's attempt to identify the ossified union bureaucrats with the labor movement and to portray the Democratic party—owned and controlled by the capitalist class—as a party of the workers is symptomatic of the sterile liberalism that he wants to pass off as "Marxism." He would do better to imitate Meany's frankness and admit that he has no idea what socialism is.

Significantly, Harrington's chapter on the future—of course, the very distant future—"socialist" transformation of the advanced capitalist countries is entitled "Beyond the Welfare State."

1. Readers interested in studying a Marxist criticism of the theory should see *In Defense of Marxism* by Leon Trotsky, Pathfinder Press, New York, N. Y. 1965.

The prospect for the next half-century or so is "extension of the welfare state" until one fine morning the capitalists decide to allow the Democratic party to make socialism an "issue." In the meantime, today's radicalizing youth can spend their time hustling votes for the Hubert Humphreys and George McGovern.

This outline, it will be noted, leaves remarkably little room for such characteristic events of the past half-century as wars, depressions, fascist reaction, and revolutions. To do away with these awkward detours on the evolutionary road to "socialism," Harrington is forced to decree that imperialism no longer exists. Here is the way imperialism becomes invisible to the discoverer of the "invisible mass movement":

"... petroleum investments account for 42.2 percent of U.S. funds in the developing countries and generate 71 percent of the profits from those areas. If one looks at American capital abroad, but excludes oil, then the money in the Third World is only one sixth of foreign investment, and the profits only one seventh. In other words, oil is an extremely important, and quite imperial, element in the American economy, but if its political power can be overcome, then the dollars that have been sent to Asia, Africa or Latin America are not in the least a matter of life or death for the society. The advanced capitalisms, then, are not as crucially dependent on neo-colonial investment as the classic Leninist analysis would suggest. This, to be sure, is true not because the rich nations became conscience-stricken, but only because they found more profit in other areas."

Now you see it, now you don't. If one eliminates the strongest sector of imperialism, then imperialism is not as strong as it was. Therefore imperialism has ceased to exist.

Unfortunately, Harrington neglects to inform us how the international oil cartel's "political power can be overcome" by an alliance between George Meany and Hubert Humphrey or George McGovern. This power is not exactly trifling: Seventy percent of world oil production is monopolized by seven corporations—five American, one British, and one British and Dutch. All five of the American oil companies are among the country's ten largest corporations. The two others are the largest and

second-largest corporations outside the United States. The seven have combined assets of \$69,500,000,000.

Moreover, three of the five U.S. oil corporations are controlled by a single family—the Rockefellers. A fourth, Gulf Oil, is owned 70 percent by the Mellon family. Both Rockefellers and Mellons also have extensive holdings in banking, steel, aluminum, smaller oil corporations, etc.² The "extension of the welfare state" is hardly a sufficient tool to dispossess these oligarchs of their power.

Furthermore, even if one ignores Harrington's sleight of hand with the oil cartel, the implication that neo-colonial investment is less profitable than investment in the developed countries is simply incorrect. This can easily be proven by statistics on U.S. foreign investments provided in the 1971 *Statistical Abstract of the United States*.

While the total value of long-term direct U.S. investments in the developed countries in 1969 was more than double the value of investments in the underdeveloped world (\$47,701,000,000 to \$20,000,000,000), income from the latter (\$3,273,000,000) was more than 50 percent greater than income from the former (\$2,067,000,000).

Income of U.S. investors in the developed countries averaged 4.3% of the total value of investment (3.6% in Canada, 4.8% in Western Europe, 5.7% in Japan). The comparable figure for the underdeveloped countries was 16.4%. U.S. investors in Latin America had a return of 9.0%, in Africa of 27.8%, and in the Middle East, the fiefdom of the oil kings, of 65.4%!

It is true, as Harrington points out, that after the second world war there was a relative shift of investment to the developed countries. But this is still *imperialist* investment! It is still dominated by the monopolistic giants, especially the oil trusts. It represents the postwar thrust of U.S. capitalism toward gaining a stranglehold on the economies of its European allies—a not unimportant detail that Harrington overlooks.

Mixed up with Harrington's erroneous assertion about the relative profitability of investment in the de-

veloped and underdeveloped countries is the contention that the problems of capitalist overproduction have essentially been solved by "the enormous growth in the consumption of the masses *within* the advanced nations and the consequent expansion of the internal and intra-advanced capitalist market." (Emphasis in original.) This assertion also does not hold water.

In terms of offsetting capitalism's tendency toward overproduction, it is not the absolute level of consumption that is important, but the level of consumption relative to production. A rising level of income of the masses can still lead to a crisis of overproduction unless consumption rises *more* rapidly than production. It would be hard to convince the unemployed steelworkers of the United States that world demand for steel is equal to productive capacity.

What, then, is the reason for the twenty-five years of relative prosperity in the United States that has blinded Harrington to the obvious and made him see the invisible? The answer, of course, is the dominant position of U.S. imperialism relative to its competitors at the end of World War II and the billions of dollars spent since that time to make the world safe for imperialist investment. If Harrington is aware of this spending, he forgot to mention it in his book.

But the deficit spending to maintain the imperialist forces, which permitted a slight increase of real income to American workers, has had some other consequences as well as the two and a half decades of relative stability. These include the erosion of the dollar and the consequent disturbance of trade relations, and a higher cost of production for U.S. capitalism, resulting in a loss of markets to its European and Japanese competitors. The devaluation of the pound and the dollar—and now the floating of the pound—and the increasing trends toward protectionist measures are only the opening phase of an intensified interimperialist rivalry. The rivals are not going to declare a truce with respect to the underdeveloped world.

Readers will look in vain for an analysis of these trends in Harrington's book. For him they simply do not exist. His program consists of advising the imperialists to be nice and warning the third-world nations not to attempt to control their own

2. The figures here are taken from *Middle East Oil and U.S. Imperialism* by Dick Roberts, Pathfinder Press, New York, N.Y. 1971.

destiny since they lack the Harrington-decreed "prerequisites" for successful revolution.

Thus Harrington lectures the imperialists, who are preparing to use every available economic weapon of the market to cut each other's throats: "In order to aid in economic development the advanced countries must reject the priorities of the world market that have guided their aid and trade policies." If Harrington were a shepherd, he would protect his flock by advising the wolf to "reject" its teeth.

As for the underdeveloped countries, they are informed—once again, with regret—that they can do virtually nothing to improve their own lot, but must wait patiently for the imperialists to establish a "welfare world" to complement the "extension of the welfare state." If the oppressed peoples try to take matters into their own hands, they are automatically guilty of "revolution from above" and might even offend our "socialist" author's sensibilities by establishing a "bureaucratic collectivist" state.

In return for obedience to his precepts, Harrington offers the third-world peoples his "compassion" and "active political solidarity." The value of these gifts may be judged by the Socialist party's position on the Indochina war. Instead of demanding that the U.S. get out of Indochina, the SP attacks the antiwar movement for not criticizing "both sides."

Harrington himself manages to mention the war a grand total of five times in his "socialist" epic, always only in passing, as a peripheral illustration of some other point. The strongest condemnation of the imperialist genocide that he makes is the statement that the war "was escalated"—not "Johnson escalated the war"—in 1965 and thus "caused a general retreat from all social investments," defeating allegedly excellent prospects for an "extension of the welfare state."

Although he does not specify them, it is easy to understand the reasons for Harrington's annoyance with the Vietnamese people. Their heroic resistance to the onslaught of U.S. imperialism has inspired peoples around the world with the conviction that it is possible to fight back against imperialism rather than passively accept the capitalist order.

For thousands upon thousands of

youth in the United States, the war has exploded many of the myths defended by liberals and reformists like Harrington. It has shown them that the social system in which they live is hopelessly corrupt and that the Democratic party is one of the twin

pillars supporting that system.

Harrington's aim is to persuade these radicalizing youth that it is possible to transform this rotten system by reinforcing its Democratic pillar. He is not likely to be successful.

—David Burton

Socialist Strategy in the 1970s

A Revolutionary Strategy for the 70s
—Documents of the Socialist Workers Party. Pathfinder Press, New York, N.Y. 96 pp. \$1.45, £0.60. 1972.

This volume contains three articles: "The New Stage of World Revolution," which is the report on the international situation given by Joseph Hansen to the twenty-fourth national convention of the party, held August 8-12, 1971; "Perspectives and Lessons of the New Radicalization," the major political resolution adopted by the convention; and the political report delivered by Jack Barnes, national organizational secretary, to the March 1971 plenum that preceded the convention.

The international report focuses on the place of the Indochina war in world politics, its effects on U.S.-Chinese and U.S.-Soviet relations, its reverberations in the advanced imperialist countries and in the workers states, its import for the colonial revolution, and its place in the general crisis of capitalism. The responses of the various tendencies of the world working-class movement to the challenge of Indochina are enumerated—the brazen capitulation of social democracy, the perfidious policies of both the Peking and Moscow branches of Stalinism, the internationalism of

the Cuban leadership, and the vanguard role of the Trotskyist movement in the antiwar movement on a world scale.

The convention took place soon after the announcement of Nixon's projected trip to Peking, and a good part of the presentation is devoted to analyzing U.S. imperialism's effort to enlist the aid of the Chinese bureaucracy—not only in defusing the power of the Vietnamese revolution, but also in relieving pressure on the capitalist economic situation by opening the vast Chinese market to the West.

The final section of the report describes the fundamental features of the current radicalization on an international level, its strengths and limitations, and the attitude of the Trotskyist movement toward it.

"Perspectives and Lessons" and Barnes's report to the party plenum represent the most concise statement of the SWP's conception of the current radicalization in the United States. The antiwar movement, the rise of Black and Chicano nationalism, the new wave of feminism, the prison revolts are all dealt with. The SWP is the only political tendency in the U.S. that views these developments as potential components of the socialist revolution and not as diversions to be condemned out of hand. □

Socialist Literature in Czech and Slovak

Czechoslovak revolutionists in exile are publishing a journal, *informacni materialy*, containing material on the struggle for socialist democracy in Eastern Europe and other subjects of interest to the working-class movement.

The group also publishes books in

Czech and Slovak, including works by Isaac Deutscher.

Information on the literature available can be obtained from D. Fölster, infomat, Postfach 214, 1 Berlin 10 West. □

'Avanzada Socialista' Comments on Mar del Plata

[Under separate headings below, we are publishing, for the information of our readers, four editorial comments made by *Avanzada Socialista*, a Buenos Aires Trotskyist weekly, on the recent general strike in Mar del Plata.

[The strike was touched off by students who protested the arrest of witnesses to the murder last year of Silvia Filler, a student. For further details see the eyewitness account of the events in Mar del Plata, published elsewhere in this issue, and the article "General Strike Wins Release of Prisoners" in last week's issue of *Intercontinental Press*.

[The translation of the four editorial comments is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

Mar del Plata

The "happy city" is beginning to become an unhappy city for the bourgeoisie. The mobilization of the workers, students, and populace confronted the government with the danger of a Marplatazo [semiuprising in the city]. For the first time in the history of Mar del Plata, a strike staged by the CGT with a political objective (release of Sprovieri and all the political prisoners, and in opposition to the repressive legislation), welded together the majority of the population. The murder of Silvia Filler last year angered the populace as a whole. Now the arbitrary imprisonment of the main witnesses of the crime bared the "justice" of the regime in all its nakedness. Even the most backward sectors were drawn in by the power of the mobilization.

Likewise for the first time in Mar del Plata, the army intervened in a struggle of the workers and students and occupied the university. Nevertheless the impressive military deployment could not overcome the popular indignation, and the government had no choice but to release five of the six who had been imprisoned.

News of their release had been given out the day before the strike, probably in expectation that this would weaken the demonstration. But the workers and students of Mar del Plata took the release of the five as a partial victory that could serve to give further impulse to the struggle.

The complete success of the strike and the broad participation of the workers in the mobilization indicate that we are on the right road. □

For a Giant Meeting

The struggle has just begun. The victories that have been won must become the basis for moving forward. Let us not forget that the student Sprovieri is still being held under the Parliament of Terror and has been sent to the Chaco.

The CGT, the Intercoordinating Committee, the Commission of Political Parties, all the sectors that came out against the repressive legislation and in favor of freeing Sprovieri and the other political prisoners must join together to make a common call at a Giant Public Meeting (or Popular Assembly) in Mar del Plata this week. The only way to continue the struggle is to keep up and expand the massive actions achieved the past week. The main dangers are becoming isolated or engaging in sectarianism. □

Why CGT Joined

The workers and students of Mar del Plata know Rizzo, the local general secretary of the CGT, very well. He is not exactly an outstanding fighter. The connection between Rizzo and Gómez—the fascist alleged to have murdered Silvia Filler—is a source of comment in Mar del Plata.

How could he possibly be interested in freeing the witnesses that are going to testify against "his friend"?

How could he possibly appear to be fighting, apparently against his own interests?

Rizzo, like all union bureaucrats,

has to do a balancing act to stay in office. When the pressure from the ranks is very strong, he tries to adjust his position in that direction. Between an idea or "friendship" and his post, a bureaucrat always chooses the post. Thus Rizzo had no choice but to support the work stoppage. Our comrades in Mar del Plata understood this reality very well and were able to bring pressure on the trade-union leaders, who were reluctant to support the struggle. The adherence of the CGT was decisive in assuring the mobilization. Without that, only small student skirmishes would have occurred.

Let's learn from the Mar del Plata experience. The trade-union organizations, although still in the hands of the bureaucrats, remain the only organizational form of the labor movement as a whole and its only medium for massive mobilizations. The Ruccis must also be faced with the same alternative as Rizzo. Let's mobilize to demand that the national CGT take the lead in a powerful campaign for the release of all the political prisoners, both students and unionists.

We must take advantage of every opportunity to put pressure on the national leadership of the CGT. In connection with this, the projected July 4 meeting of the Peronist and Communist youth, if it is to be effective, must be presented to the CGT, with a demand for its adherence in the struggle against the repression. □

Correct Line Wins

In *Avanzada Socialista*, we have been stressing the need for a broad nationwide campaign backed by the sectors that agree on two objectives: (1) release of all the political prisoners, both students and unionists; (2) repeal of the repressive legislation, an end to kidnappings by the police, and an end to torture.

The correctness of this position has been confirmed by the events in Mar del Plata. There the powerful pressure of the working-class and student rank

and file, aroused over the attitude of the police, compelled united action, eliminating the possibility of opposition from the ultraleft currents on the one hand, and from the union bureaucracy and the bourgeois currents on the other. The tendencies that believe the way forward is through small but very "combative" actions of the vanguard were proved wrong by what happened. In this way, the most important mobilization of the workers

and students in recent months was achieved as well as the release of five of the six who had been arrested.

Why can't all the political parties and organizations of the unions, students, and professional layers that united in the Mar del Plata events mount a common nationwide campaign for the release of the 500 political prisoners still being held in prison? Our party is pledged to do its utmost in this task. □

resolved to solidarize with these comrades in various ways, because through them the entire revolutionary movement is under attack. International public opinion has already prevented the junta from executing Alexander Panagoulis. Once again, Greek workers and students must unite with all revolutionary and democratic forces in a broad campaign of support. We must break down the isolation these comrades suffer (their lawyers were not informed of the date of the trial until a few days before it was scheduled, and then they found out only by reading the newspapers); we must avert the slow death of these comrades in the junta's jails; this must lead to their immediate release.

All support to the Athens seven!

Solidarity with Greek revolutionary youth!

General amnesty for political prisoners! □

Freedom for the 'October 20' Prisoners!

[The following statement was released by the Internationalist Communist party of Greece (in exile), Greek section of the Fourth International. We have translated it from French.]

On June 15, 1972, seven members (three of them are still at large) of the revolutionary Greek organization "October 20" were ordered to appear before the Athens Military Court. The four young militants who were arrested by the security cops on the night of October 19-20 are George Sayas, Nikos Manios, Nikos Chryssanthopoulos, and Apostolos Manolakis. They belong to a group that was preparing to blow up the power station supplying electricity to the Athens Hilton Hotel, where the grotesque U. S. vice president, Spiro Agnew, was staying at the time. The latter had come to present democratic credentials to the colonels so as to clean up their banner, sullied by the frightful repression following on the dictatorial coup; to assure that the "plaster cast" clamped by Papadopoulos on the Greek people would remain intact; and to deliver the unreserved economic, military, and political support of Nixon's America.

For having tried to denounce the tight grip U. S. imperialist interests have on Greece, the four October 20 comrades were thrown—without even the semblance of a trial—into the junta's jails, where for eight months they were subjected to the most abject humiliations and the most atrocious tortures, as Sayas's and Manios's letters reveal. For having taken the road of active resistance, they now face very severe prison terms, including possible life imprisonment, because the examin-

ing magistrate has blamed them for most of the bombs that have exploded in Athens during the past two years.

We militants of the Fourth International, while we have many differences with the October 20 group, have

Committee Asks Angela Davis to Aid Political Prisoners in Ukraine

[The following letter was addressed to Angela Davis June 15 following her acquittal on frame-up charges of conspiracy and murder. The signers, the Committee for the Defense of Soviet Political Prisoners, consist primarily of students of Ukrainian descent. The committee was formed in January 1972 in response to news of the arrest of dissidents in the Ukraine.]

Sister Angela Davis:

We congratulate you on your victory over oppression and welcome your statement that you will struggle to free all political prisoners.

In light of your righteous position we would like to inform you about the plight of political prisoners in the Soviet Union, many of whom are Marxist-Leninists.

Accompanying this letter are two books and a pamphlet about political prisoners from the largest minority in the Soviet Union, the Ukrainians.

The book *Internationalism or Russification?*, by Ivan Dzyuba, a political prisoner as of this year, denounces from a Marxist-Leninist viewpoint the Russian Communist Party for its Russian chauvinism and the consequential economic and educational discrimination against the Ukrainians and other minorities in

the Soviet Union. Likewise we have included *Ferment in the Ukraine*. This book is a collection of articles written by Ukrainian political prisoners, many of whom were members of the Communist Party at the time of their arrests in the 1960's.

The pamphlet is about the nineteen Ukrainian intellectuals who were arrested in January of this year for their political views. These men and women cry for your help. If past Soviet experience is to be our guide, we can safely conclude that the trials of the Soviet political prisoners will be closed to the Soviet as well as to the world community.

At your trial there were many foreign journalists, among them the Soviet journalist E. Baskakov. Consequently we ask you to demand from the Soviet government that foreign observers and journalists be present at the upcoming trials of the nineteen Ukrainians, among them Ivan Dzyuba, Ivan Svitlychny, Vyacheslav Chornovil and Yevhen Sverstyuk.

We want to meet with you anywhere on your itinerary before you leave for your trip to the Soviet Union in order to discuss the issue of Soviet political prisoners.

Freedom for All Political Prisoners.