

# Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 6, No. 29

© 1968 Intercontinental Press.

September 9, 1968

50c

## AS EXPECTED...

It's Another  
Case of --



**A Hawk and a Hack**



**A Hack and a Hawk**

**From Czechoslovakia:**

The Importance of  
Isaac Deutscher's Work

**Documents:**

Stand of the British CP

WHAT THE DEMOCRATS REVEALED AT THEIR CHICAGO SHOW

As the 5,600 national guardsmen, 6,000 troops, and 11,900 police went back to their regular duties August 31, Hubert Humphrey met with a few political cronies in Waverly, Minnesota, to celebrate his victory at the Democratic party convention.

The presidential nominee of the reigning party of American capitalism interrupted the festivities long enough to declare his wholehearted support of the way police clubbed and gassed peaceful demonstrators at the convention under the direction of Chicago's political boss, Mayor Richard J. ("Shoot-to-Kill") Daley. "Quit pretending," Humphrey said, "that Mayor Daley did anything that was wrong."

As Humphrey lauded his fellow Democratic wheelhorse, ten of the country's most prominent newspapers, news magazines and television networks sent Daley a telegram of joint protest. The telegram was the least they could do as a public gesture in view of the fact that tens of millions of people had watched on television as reporters were beaten.

"Newsmen were repeatedly singled out by policemen and deliberately beaten and harassed," said the telegram. "Cameras were broken and film was destroyed. The obvious purpose was to discourage or prevent reporting of an important confrontation between police and demonstrators which the American public has the right to know about."

The signers included top officials of Time magazine, the American, Columbia, and National Broadcasting companies, Newsweek magazine, and the New York Times.

The protest lodged by these usually cynical representatives of the capitalist communications media spoke volumes about the revulsion among the American people at the thoroughly undemocratic proceedings of the convention and the use of police force, as witnessed over television.

The graphic scenes, which occurred despite the fact that the Democratic machine was on its best behavior and trying to impress the public, indicated how deeply decayed and totalitarian-minded this capitalist political instrument really is.

Jimmy Breslin, writing in the August 29 New York Post, described a typical incident:

"Here was this young kid running with his legs out of control and his eyes

closing and hair flying each time a club came onto his head. All the way from the front entrance of the Conrad Hilton Hotel to the corner. Running, stumbling, running, staggering and then going down on his face in the middle of Michigan Av. In the City of Chicago, the cops ran up and kicked him...the kids went into Michigan Av. and captured the whole street and began shouting slogans at the hotel. Harmless slogans. A sign of health, really. Much more health than could be found in the incredible convention held in the International Amphitheater. A convention held to build the ego of a decadent man named Richard Daley, who is the Mayor of this pigpen."

As club-wielding cops in Chicago's parks and streets and the lobby of the swank Conrad Hilton bloodied the heads of young people who had come to peacefully march -- against the war, for McCarthy, hoping to influence, or in some cases to repudiate the proceedings at the convention -- inside the Amphitheater, television viewers were treated to choice close-up shots of Daley, mocking in the aisles and shouting, "Go home!" as delegates protested the police action.

The convention was stage-managed by Lyndon B. Johnson himself. But, ironically, the president of the United States, who was wildly applauded at the 1964 Democratic convention, and who won the 1964 election by the largest majority in American history, was conspicuous by his absence.

The Democratic chieftains carried out Johnson's orders on how to run the show -- orders received by telephone as their master watched the proceedings on television -- but they acted as if he were a most unfortunate liability. They did not display his picture; they put on no demonstrations for him. Daley had even prepared a birthday party, including a giant-size cake, for the great man, who turned sixty during the convention. But Johnson stayed in Texas and, instead of the party, the delegates sang "Happy Birthday" to their leader in absentia. That was his award for his services as head of the Democratic party.

The truth was that Johnson did not dare put in a personal appearance. His lieutenants reportedly told him the bleak truth over the telephone: It was better for him not to show up because of the boos and catcalls that would surely greet him and the damage the sight of him at the convention would do to Humphrey. Johnson was the first president in twenty-four years to miss a nominating convention.

The opprobrium in which Johnson is held is a consequence in the main, of course, of his decision to plunge the United States into the imperialistic adventure in Vietnam. It could be said that he was knocked out by the antiwar demonstrations of the past three years.

The feud within the ruling class over tactics in Vietnam and how to handle the deepening opposition at home prevented the Democratic machine from putting on a well-oiled performance like the one staged by the Republicans at Miami. Those in control at Chicago demonstrated less than adroitness in handling the critical voices inside the convention. Instead of trying to placate and absorb them as a loyal opposition -- which they were to the core -- the men running the show decided to use their favorite weapon on them, the steamroller.

The Humphrey-Johnson-Daley machine, in close alliance with the most reactionary wing of the party, the Southern bourgeois, and with the labor bureaucrats serving as a cheering squad or remaining silent, simply clubbed the opposition -- with actual police clubs in the streets, with parliamentary tricks and the chairman's gavel in the Amphitheater.

In full view of the television audience, motions at the Chicago convention were passed "unanimously" amidst a great outcry of uncounted opposition delegates; bands would play loudly to drown out critical speakers; a gang of political ward heelers and city employees sat in the gallery -- which was closed to the public -- with banners reading, "We Love Mayor Daley," dutifully cheering the speeches of the Illinois delegation and booing Daley's opponents in the party.

The foreign press ridiculed and castigated the convention and its candidate. The London Daily Express, one of Britain's most conservative newspapers, said that the Chicago cops "are the same kind of men who 'eliminated' the Jews in Nazi Germany, the same kind of men who kept Stalin's terror alive in the Soviet Union, the same kind of men who shoot down refugees on the Berlin wall...All these men have one thing in common, they enjoy their work."

The Paris daily Le Monde said "millions of television watchers witnessed staggering scenes of brutality, defenseless young people chased mercilessly, kicked, punched, and clubbed with unheard-of violence."

The Times of London wrote, "Mr. Nixon's reputation for power-hungry op-

portunism is nicely matched against Mr. Humphrey's thralldom to President Johnson's personality and policy..."

The London Sun added, "There is an almost unbelievable audacity of thought that the world is prepared to accept a leader who is chosen in circumstances that resemble a concentration camp that is colloquially referred to as Stalag '68."

The two central themes ramrodded through the convention were hard-line support for Johnson's war against the Vietnamese people, and racist-minded upholding of "law and order," the new formulation for the old slogan about keeping the black people "in their place." This was extended to cover the clubbing of antiwar demonstrators, "Yippies," and young McCarthy supporters.

On both issues the Democrats can be expected to lose votes. In contesting the Republicans for the support of the most reactionary sectors of the population, they are burdened by Johnson's failure to defeat the Vietnamese revolution, and by Humphrey's image at the convention of a candidate inspiring, not "law and order," but shocking violence.

The Republicans, of course, are not one whit better. Their exploitation of the difficulties faced by Humphrey is pure demagoguery.

The finishing touch to the nominating process, as practiced by the Democrats at Chicago, was the police raid on the McCarthy campaign headquarters at the Hilton Hotel August 30, in which McCarthy's campaign workers were given a generous sample of Humphrey's democracy. This violent attack on followers of the liberal wing of the ruling class itself may prove costly to Johnson's heir.

The central aim of the McCarthy campaign was to draw the new generation of radicalizing youth into the two-party system on the plea that it does offer hope and can be reformed. The bite of a police club tends to be rather convincing evidence to the contrary.

A fresh layer of young people will now turn away from the two-party system in disgust. Looking at the two candidates, Nixon and Humphrey, they will be inclined to agree with the Socialist Workers party that the champions selected by the political bosses and ruling class are as close to being identical as it is possible for two rubber stamps to be.

VENEZUELA PREPARES FOR THE DECEMBER ELECTIONS

Caracas

Next December 1, elections will be held in Venezuela for Congress, the state assemblies, municipal councils, and above all the presidency of the republic. About two years ago, the current Acción Democrática [Democratic Action -- the party of Rómulo Betancourt] candidate, Dr. Gonzalo Barrios, went to Bern, Switzerland, where this party's leader lives, to get approval for his aspiration to become the next president of Venezuela, since in the extremely favorable circumstances in which that party found itself in 1966 being its candidate was equivalent to election.

Not only did Barrios get Betancourt's assent but first in London and later in Washington and New York his candidacy won the approval of the magnates of world imperialism. In Paris, in good French, he presented to the press his rather jocular views on the guerrillas (this gentleman, despite all of seventy years, is a bit juvenile; he is known in Venezuela for his dullness and good humor).

When he returned to Caracas, as his first step he resigned his post as Minister of the Interior, the most important executive post next to that of president, in order to take the reins of the party organization. Betancourt and Leoni were chairmen of Acción Democrática before becoming candidates for the presidency of the republic. This time, Barrios had to be satisfied with the title of general secretary because the chairmanship of the party was already occupied by an old leader of his own generation, Dr. Luis Beltrán Prieto, who was at the same time chairman of Congress.

With the popular poet Andrés Eloy Blanco dead and the famous novelist Rómulo Gallegos retired from politics, the four outstanding figures in Acción Democrática today are Rómulo Betancourt, Raúl Leoni, Gonzalo Barrios, and Luis Beltrán Prieto -- the last named was so really only up to October 1967.

At that time a veiled struggle opened up inside the party for the presidential nomination. On one and the same day Barrios would be holding a meeting in the west of the country and Prieto another in the east, and vice versa. The curious thing is that both held the same ideas, defending the party and the government's achievements and differing only in their style of rhetoric. While both have a hearty speaking style, Barrios' jokes are less comprehensible to the public than Prieto's.

There was a real electoral campaign inside Acción Democrática, something never seen before. The rank and file began to take sides. Prieto was already emerging as the more popular of the two nationally, not only because of his good-humored nature and his look of a black fisherman off of Margarita Island but because behind the scenes he was being presented as the avenger of the humble and neglected rank-and-file membership.

Barrios said nothing fundamentally different from what his rival was advocating. But someone in the shadows was emitting a murmur that sounded like a siren song to the ears of the party membership. The peasants, workers, artisans, and petty bourgeois in the party have fought for ten years to defend the regime against the fierce assaults of extremists (of the left and right and above all the military conspirators against Betancourt) and all this sacrifice has resulted in very slim gains for them. At least these gains haven't been much in comparison to the benefits acquired by the privileged classes, the traditional enemies of the patient Acción Democrática members.

Prieto (so the sirens sang) was going to call the leaders to account for betraying the membership. The man who directed this operation from behind the scenes was Dr. Jesús A. Paz Galarraga. Betancourt detests him as a foe but he is the man politically most like him. He opposed the Pérez Jiménez dictatorship valiantly, reorganizing the party in his native state of Zulia, site of the country's richest oil resources. He gave up practicing medicine to devote himself fully to politics. In all the splits in Acción Democrática, except when the group left that was to become the MIR [Movimiento de la Izquierda Revolucionario -- Movement of the Revolutionary Left -- a generally Castroist formation], Paz Galarraga sided initially with the dissidents only to abandon them at the decisive moment.

A skillful organizer, like Betancourt, he strove to group around him all the malcontents, utilizing his position as secretary general to facilitate this. He left this post only to turn it over to Barrios. But his plans were already under way. He realized that his moment was approaching. He promoted the candidacy of Prieto, who held the post of chairman of the party, and swayed in his favor the poorest party members, those frustrated in their ambitions, and some who were well taken care of but because of an excess of greed were running into great obstacles in their bureaucratic careers.

Once again Acción Democrática was

divided. Its leadership had to officially recognize the struggle of these two tendencies in the form of primary elections, that is internal elections which would determine the candidate once and for all.

Betancourt was blamed by his own followers, including many Prieto supporters, for the division because of his desire to remain in Europe. He returned to Venezuela for a few weeks in an attempt to prevent a split. His plans, however, went further than this. He had a stake in a Barrios victory because that way he could assure himself control of the government, which would permit him to launch his own candidacy again for the 1973 elections (the Constitution would not permit it before that time). But if the winning candidate were Prieto, control of the government would be in the hands of his enemy Paz Galarraga, whose presidential aspirations for 1973 were discernible; he would be in his fifties at that time.

Betancourt decided to gamble on supporting Barrios (who, as we shall see, is not one of his uncritical supporters like other leaders in the category of Carlos Andrés Pérez or Luis Augusto Dubuc), in the hope that with all the resources of the government in his hands his candidate would surely win. In case of defeat, Betancourt trusted that he could reorganize the party at his leisure so that it could serve his irrepressible thirst for personal power, which by the greatest efforts could be contained for five years more.

In October 1967 the Acción Democrática primaries were held. Roughly two-thirds of the Acción Democrática electorate voted in favor of the Prieto tendency. But, as was to be expected, the Betancourt leadership disqualified this result. Prieto then proclaimed himself the authentic representative of the party and claimed the party name and symbol (since illiterates vote in Venezuela, every candidate has a color and a symbol) for himself.

The National Board of Elections rejected these claims and was upheld by the Supreme Court. Prieto had no other recourse but to set up his own shop, which he dubbed the MEP [Movimiento Electoral del Pueblo -- People's Electoral Movement], insisting, however, that his thinking remained the same as it had been throughout his thirty years membership in Acción Democrática.

Further, Prieto declared that he would not go into opposition to the Leoni government. The AD daily La República responded by quoting Paz Galarraga when Dr. Raúl Ramos Giménez left AD (he now belongs, along with Domingo Alberto Rangel and others, to a party called PRIN). Ra-

mos Giménez had said the same thing that Prieto was proclaiming, that his party would still be Acción Democrática, and Paz Galarraga answered him that the dynamics of the struggle would bring him into the opposition.

The "dynamics" consisted in the government's driving out all those who had the slightest association with Prieto, from governors of states to chauffeurs in the ministries. Faced with this all-out attack, the MEP was forced to go into opposition.

\* \* \*

The elections are four months off. We have already taken a look at two of the candidates. There is another one who launched his candidacy before them, Dr. Rafael Caldera, the leader of the Christian Democratic party COPEI. This is the fourth time he has run for president. The example provided by his coreligionist Frei in Chile greatly encouraged his party, but even more heartening was the split in the Acción Democrática colossus, against which all the other parties in Venezuela have broken their lances since the fall of the dictatorship.

With AD [Acción Democrática] split, the Catholic party had a good chance to win, being the second strongest party in the country in organization and in popular pull. The perspective improved even more when the owner of a newspaper and periodical chain, Miguel Angel Capriles, allied himself with it. He dreams of developing the same influence in Venezuela that his colleague Axel Springer exercises in Germany.

The rival to the Capriles chain is El Nacional, the daily with the most prestige and the largest circulation. This paper is controlled by Miguel Otero Silva. An ex-Communist millionaire always on good terms with the official Venezuelan left, Otero Silva stopped writing novels and poetry this year to throw all his strength against the compact between the angels and the devil represented by the bloc between COPEI and Miguel Angel Capriles.

Otero Silva brought Vice Admiral Larrazábal, who became provisional president on the fall of Pérez Jiménez; Arturo Uslar Pietri, a well-known writer who heads a paper with no prestige other than his own personal reputation; and Jóvito Villalba, the leader of another such party, who was a very close associate of Betancourt and Leoni, to his home so many times that he finally compelled them to agree. None of these three leaders is of much importance. Like old bullfighters they live mainly on bygone glories. Added together they do not make three; perhaps one and a half or two. But this

sum is sufficient (after all Miguel Otero Silva knows how to make calculations) to prevent Caldera from reaching the presidency of Venezuela.

The pact was sealed, and the candidate they agreed on is worthy to be the hero of one of those satiric poems that Miguel Otero Silva himself composes with fine flair. We can be certain that Silva will finally cast him in that role, if we can assume that he has not already done so. This hero's name is Miguel Angel Burrelli Rivas, a natural born bureaucrat and boorish opportunist whose political ideas correspond to those of Cardinal Quintero or General Eleazar López Contreras,\* who was president from 1936 to 1941.

Since his youth (he is barely 45), he has been part of the entourage of one powerful man or another; but this has not prevented him from considering men who are now powerful his inferiors. An anecdote he himself tells gives us a picture of his character. When he was studying law at the University of Mérida he had a job in the university. The day of graduation came, but he did not graduate with his classmates. Taking advantage of his position, in the morning he received his title as an administrator of the university and in the afternoon when the time came for the graduation ceremony, he was there already like a senior jurist, with a cap and gown, seated on the platform beside the rector and the professor of the university.

These are the four main candidates. There are two more but their importance is so slight that they need not be mentioned. In my opinion the election will go to Barrios or Prieto: in Barrios' case because he seems to have the majority of the peasantry behind him and because he has mobilized on his behalf the immense resources of the Venezuelan government, which has a very high budget for an underdeveloped country; in Prieto's case because, backed by a political machine very much like Acción Democrática's, he has been able to exercise a certain attraction on the masses.

Prieto appears as the candidate of the left. PRIN has given him its support, and a good many Communists want to vote for him.

---

\* Following the end of the hated Juan Vicente Gómez dictatorship [1908-35], the new dictator, López Contreras, got rid of some of the most despicable figures of the old regime. His most notable achievement, however, was to tilt the balance against Shell Oil and in favor of Standard Oil in the battle between these rival imperialist plunderers of Venezuela's natural resources.

The leftism of the MEP is well illustrated by these two concrete facts: last April a general strike was staged in Maracaibo in resistance to the government. It paralyzed the city completely. The MEP had an overwhelmingly preponderant influence in all sectors. What attitude did this party adopt? Once the first part of the wages of the sanitation workers was paid, which was the immediate cause of the strike, the MEP called for general demobilization...as the French Communist party did after General de Gaulle's speech.

The second example is even more telling. The Confederación de Trabajadores de Venezuela [Labor Federation of Venezuela] is presided over by an MEP leader and there are a good many pro-Prieto trade-union leaders there. Although the Acción Democrática people and the followers of the MEP are fighting for control of the Confederación, they have both concluded a truce for maintaining "labor peace" in Venezuela.

Another point could be mentioned on which AD and MEP have no difference -- policy on the oil question, the basis of the national economy. The author of this policy is Dr. Juan Pablo Pérez Alfonzo, a member of Acción Democrática. He advocates continually increasing the state share of profits from the oil industry. But it is notorious that not only the two parties mentioned but all the rest lag far behind Pérez Alfonzo's proposals when it comes to practice.

As is known, PRIN was formed by the fusion of a wing of Acción Democrática led by Raúl Ramos Giménez, which split at the end of the Betancourt period, a faction in the MIR which left under the leadership of Domingo Alberto Rangel, young people active in the URD [Unión Republicana Democrática -- Democratic Republican Union] of Jovito Villalba, and former members of the PCV [Partido Comunista Venezolano -- the Communist party of Venezuela].

It is a very heterogeneous group which, despite strenuous efforts, has not been able to overcome either its organizational weakness or the ideological poverty that goes with political eclecticism, the cement binding the various factions together. None of them know how to make the revolution they preach so loudly -- some offer liberal solutions, others Marxist-tinted ones, and all are hoping for a miracle. The wonder-worker to whom they have commended themselves, it would seem, is a saint who does not offer revolutions.

The Venezuelan Communist party, which Fidel Castro holds up as a model of reformism and treachery, is experiencing one of its bitterest moments in

these elections. The government outlawed it five years ago but permits it to act freely under the name of "UPA" [Unión Para Avanzar]. This acronym, corresponding to the Spanish interjection "upa!" [up-a-daisy!], suits it very well because the Venezuelan Communists have strained so hard to lift the heavy load of deciding what to do about the elections that they are already fighting among themselves. Pompeyo Márquez (in hiding because he escaped from prison) wants the PCV or "UPA" votes to go to Dr. Prieto. However, the Machado brothers, Gustavo and Eduardo (who are following the straight and narrow because they have been pardoned), prefer to support Burelli, or anyone but Prieto. The Machado brothers say that Prieto is an accomplice in the persecutions, deaths, and jailings (in fact he approved of them when he was in AD) and that he would treat the Communists as badly as Betancourt. Márquez doesn't think so and argues in Prieto's favor that he called for an amnesty (the result of which would be that the "UPA" would again become the PCV).

Their only concern is the fate of the Communist party; they care little about educating the Venezuelan masses as to the real meaning of bourgeois elections with bourgeois candidates. They limit their revolutionary lessons to preaching an anti-imperialism that is not

anticapitalist and a narrow nationalism that transcends Venezuela's borders only to hail the deeds of the Soviet bureaucracy.

The MIR is again divided. Some of those who did not leave with Rangel have taken the same position as he in renouncing armed struggle. Others uphold armed struggle in the form of rural guerrillas but have not yet taken a position on the elections. This holds true also for the followers of the former Communist party leaders Douglas Bravo and Luben Petkoff.

All the presidential candidates are talking about making a change in national policy. Barrios says this implicitly in proposing to improve on what Betancourt and Leoni have done. It is certain, however, whichever of the four candidates wins, the one thing that will not occur in Venezuela is a change, because all four have a stake in continuing the essential features of the present situation. Those really working for a radical change in the country, after all the errors that have been made in the past, are divided. But, in any case, these revolutionists see the present electoral campaign as an opportunity to propagate and promote certain ideas while unmasking the apostles of this false democracy.

July 20

#### HANOI POSITION ON CZECHOSLOVAK EVENTS REMAINS UNCLARIFIED

Hanoi's continued silence on the events in Eastern Europe puts in doubt the extent of North Vietnamese support for the Soviet moves. So far the only comment on the Soviet invasion in North Vietnam has been the Radio Hanoi broadcast on August 28 praising the "noble objective" of the intervention. This broadcast is the only basis for the accounts that North Vietnam endorsed the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

According to Jacques Decornoy, writing in the August 30 Le Monde, reports are now coming out of Hanoi that North Vietnamese officials privately repudiate this broadcast. Accordingly he questions whether the Radio Hanoi statement represented the position of North Vietnam.

It is unlikely that the party leaders had time to meet and frame an official position before the statement was broadcast. Furthermore, the hasty declaration supporting the Kremlin before Peking had announced its position seems to run counter to the desire of the North Vietnamese to steer clear of involvement in Sino-Soviet polemics.

It would be surprising for the

Vietnamese to take a position before they knew what line Peking intended to take and even more so for them to authorize such a broadcast if they knew that Peking would oppose the Soviet invasion.

Also, the North Vietnamese have little reason to cheer the crushing of democratization in Czechoslovakia. The Czechoslovak youth fighting for socialist democracy have been among the most enthusiastic supporters of the Vietnamese struggle, expressing a much more active support for the Vietnamese cause than under the Novotny regime. And Hanoi must be well aware of this since the National Liberation Front Mission is located in Prague.

Moreover, whatever the limitations of the Dubček regime's proletarian internationalism, it has not given Hanoi less aid than its predecessor.

In view of all this, it is difficult to assess the August 28 Radio Hanoi broadcast. It is possible that a pro-Soviet faction or group of individuals like the Escalante clique in Cuba was responsible for it. In any case, as yet the Vietnamese have not clarified their attitude toward the intervention in Czechoslovakia.

FIDEL CASTRO'S SPEECH ON THE SOVIET OCCUPATION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

[Continued from last week.]

We can say -- and today it is necessary to speak clearly and frankly -- that we have seen to what extent these ideals and international sentiments, that state of alertness and awareness of the world's problems, have disappeared or are very weakly expressed in certain socialist countries of Europe.

We would not say in all these countries, but in more than one socialist country of Europe. Those who have visited these countries, including Cuban students on scholarships, have often come back completely dissatisfied and displeased and have said to us: "Over there the youth are not being educated in the ideals of communism and in the principles of internationalism: the youth there are highly influenced by all the ideas and tastes prevalent in the countries of Western Europe. In many places the main topic of conversation is money and incentives of this or that type, material incentives of all kinds, material gains and salaries." As a matter of fact, an internationalist and communist conscience is not being developed in those places.

Some have told us in amazement: "There is no such thing as volunteer work; volunteer work is paid for. Pay for this kind of work is a general thing. It is considered there that true volunteer work is almost an anti-Marxist heresy." All sorts of things are done, to such an extent that even the degree of skill in landing an airplane or making a parachute jump determines the granting of one kind of incentive or another. Many of our people have been shocked more than once by such vulgar use of material incentives or such vulgar commercialization of human consciousness.

Added to all this is the preaching of peace. In the socialist countries peace has been incessantly and wide preached. And we ask ourselves, what are all these campaigns leading up to? Do we say this because we are in favor of war? Do we say this because we are the enemies of peace? We are not the enemies of peace; we are not in favor of wars; we do not advocate universal holocausts. I feel obliged to say this because when we analyze these questions, right away it always brings up the cliché, the schemata, the accusations of warmongering, of promoting war, of being irresponsible and so on and so forth.

Our position on this matter is clear. No one can question the danger posed to the world by the existence of imperialism and the aggressiveness of imperialism.

No one can question the danger posed to the world by the tremendous contradiction between the existence of imperialist domination over a great part of the world and the earnest desire, the need, of the peoples to free themselves from the imperialist yoke.

The real promoters of war, the real adventurers, are the imperialists. Now, then, these dangers are real; they are a reality. And this reality cannot be changed by simply preaching, in one's own house, an excessive desire for peace. In any case, the preaching should be done in the enemy's camp and not in one's own camp, because this would only contribute to stifling militancy, to weakening the people's readiness to face the risks, sacrifices, not only the possible ultimate sacrifice of one's life, but also material sacrifices.

And when the peoples know that the realities of the world, the independence of the country, and internationalist duties demand investment and sacrifices in the strengthening of the defense of the country, the masses are much better prepared to work with enthusiasm to achieve this, to make sacrifices, understanding this need, being conscious of the dangers that arise when the people have been stirred up and softened by a constant, foolish and inexplicable campaign in favor of peace. It is a very strange way of defending peace. That is why we who at the beginning did so many foolish things out of ignorance or naiveté, for a long time now have not painted any signs around here saying, "Long Live Peace," "Long Live This," "Long Live That."

Because at the beginning, out of mimicry, by imitation, we repeated things as they arrived here, until we reached a point, well, what is the meaning of "Long Live Peace"? Let's put up that sign in New York: "Long Live Peace" in New York, "Long Live Peace" in Washington.

Let's preach peace over there, among the only people responsible for there not being any guarantee of peace, among those who are the only real warmongers, the only ones responsible for war, among the only people where the preaching of peace could help at least in weakening the huge taxes which are imposed on the people to finance their adventurous, colonialist, imperialist and exploiting wars. Not here in our camp.

A series of standards, a series of ideas, a series of practices incomprehensible to us, which have really contributed to slackening and softening

the revolutionary spirit of the socialist countries; ignorance of the problems of the underdeveloped world, ignorance of the shocking misery which exists; tendencies toward maintaining trading practices with the underdeveloped world which are the same as those carried on by the developed bourgeois capitalist world. I'm not talking about all the socialist countries, but some of them.

Technical aid. Gentlemen, our country is a country, as you know, which is in great need of technicians, great need of technicians! However, when we give some technical aid, we do not think of sending a bill to anyone, because we think that the least a developed country, a socialist country, a revolutionary country, can do to help the underdeveloped world is to send technicians.

We cannot imagine sending a bill to anyone for arms which we give him or sending a bill to anyone for technical aid, or even reminding him of it. Because if we are going to give aid and if we are going to bring up the fact every day, what we will be doing is constantly humiliating those whom we are aiding. I don't think there is any need to go around preaching about it too much.

And that is the way we act. Moreover, it is not a virtue; it cannot be claimed to be a virtue. It is something elementary and the day that we have thousands or tens of thousands of technicians, truly, gentlemen, the most elementary of our duties will be to contribute at least with technical aid to the countries which liberate themselves after us and which need our aid.

None of these ideas has ever been put forward. All these problems which have a lot to do with communist consciousness, with internationalist consciousness, and which do not play the role they should in the education of the masses within the socialist camp, have a lot to do with the explanation of these horrible instances of slackening. They explain the reason for these situations.

All of us know that the leadership which Czechoslovakia had, generally, for twenty years was a leadership plagued with many vices: dogmatism, bureaucracy, and, in short, many things which cannot be presented as examples of truly revolutionary leadership.

When we speak here, when we present our thesis about the "liberaloid" nature of this group, so warmly greeted by imperialism, it does not mean in any way that we are expressing our solidarity with the former leadership. We must bear in mind that that leadership, with which we had relations from the very beginning, even sold this country, at a high price,

many weapons which were spoils of war seized from the Nazis, weapons for which we have been paying, and are still paying for today, which belonged to Hitler's troops that occupied Czechoslovakia. I am not referring of course to the weapons which as an industrial and commercial product a country has to produce, especially if it is a country with a limited economy. We do not intend to say: give away the weapons, which you manufacture in your industry for economic exchange as part of the social production of the people, to a country of relatively few resources. But they sold us many weapons which belonged to the Nazi armies, and we have had to pay for them and are still paying for them.

And that is a fact. It is as if we were to hold back the rifles we took from Batista from a country which had just freed itself from imperialism and needed them, and then to make matters even worse, we were to charge the impoverished, destitute and underdeveloped country for them. It is as if one day we were to send the San Cristobal carbines, the Springfield and other weapons which the Batista army had to any country that liberated itself and asked for them, and then charge the country in question for them as if it were a big business deal.

Is there any doubt that this is outside the framework of the most elementary concept of the duty of a revolutionary country toward another country? On many occasions they sold us very outdated factories. We have seen the results of many of the economic concepts on which they base their business transactions, on which they base their eagerness to sell any old junk, and it must be stated that these practices led to their selling old, outdated junk to a country which is making a revolution and has to develop. I won't say it always happened that way. But the whole concept of self-financing, profits, gains and material incentives put into practice in foreign-trade agencies, leads to an eagerness to sell any old junk to an underdeveloped country. And this, of course, leads to conflicts, discontent, misunderstandings, and the deterioration of relations with the underdeveloped world. And these are facts.

Today we must state bitter truths, must admit some bitter truths. Let's take advantage of the occasion -- not as an opportunity, but as a necessity to explain some things that would otherwise remain unexplained.

We would be very unjust if we didn't point out that we have known, and our country has known, many technicians from different countries. And they include many Czechoslovak technicians, many good men who have worked loyally and enthusiastically in this country. But I am

not referring to men. I am referring to institutions, and above all, institutions that deform men.

And, despite the existence of institutions that deform men, we have often seen men who have resisted deformation by institutions.

Prior to this experience that we are analyzing today, we have had other experiences, that is, all those experiences that explain how one phenomenon leads to another, to another and to another. And there comes a time within a society when far from having developed revolutionary consciousness, communist consciousness, one finds that what has developed is individualism, selfishness, tastes of another type, indifference on the part of the masses and a decrease in enthusiasm rather than an increase.

For that reason, there are some who ask whether enthusiasm is decreasing or increasing in Cuba and whether, if we have it now, we will still have it later. Or if it comes later, is it absent now? This is something that has never worried us, because experience has taught us that, to the extent that we develop along the path of revolution, enthusiasm will become ever more politically conscious, and this politically conscious enthusiasm will increase, not decrease; the people's spirit of sacrifice, discipline, capacity for work and dedication are all growing.

That is what our own revolutionary experience has taught us. And we cannot conceive of that diminishing. We believe that to the extent that we advance, it will be even greater, and that when our country reaches a higher phase, achieves a communist society, this enthusiasm, this consciousness, will reach incomparably higher levels than we have ever before known.

We have seen the workers' attitude develop, the workers' willingness to do difficult work, their willingness to do volunteer work, to renounce overtime pay and a whole series of things like that. It is no longer the attitude of ten or of fifty or a thousand, but of hundreds of thousands of people throughout this country: tens of thousands of workers who leave their families to go off to the sugarcane harvest; tens of thousands of young people who go where they are sent -- the Isle of Pines, Pinar del Rio, Camaguey, any place -- to live under difficult conditions.

And we have seen how this spirit has spread throughout our country year after year as that political consciousness has grown.

There are thousands of young peo-

ple ever ready to go anywhere as technicians in any field. Thousands of young people saying that they are ready to go fight wherever they are needed. Our constant problem here is that everyone dreams of someday being permitted to leave the country to help the revolutionary movement wherever he may be needed.

In other words, the internationalist consciousness of our people has developed, the communist consciousness of our country has developed day by day.

And that, unquestionably, is a real achievement of this revolution, because this revolution is in touch with the realities of the world around us. Perhaps the circumstance of having the enemy so close is to our advantage. It is to our advantage not to have large armies close by to protect us; it is better to know that here we must depend on our own ability to resist, on our people's willingness to fight, to sacrifice; on our people's readiness to give their lives. And not only because this revolution was made through the efforts of this people, not only because this revolution was not imported in any way, but because ours is a very indigenous revolution which has had to defend itself in difficult situations against an ever-present, very powerful enemy.

Our people have developed their traditional spirit of struggle, of combat, their willingness to face any danger. And naturally all these factors have contributed to the development of our revolutionary consciousness.

Because, from the point of view of socialist ideas, from the point of view of revolutionary ideas, what is called for is not a justification, but rather an explanation, an analysis of how such circumstances could arise in a country such as Czechoslovakia.

And such circumstances did arise, the need did develop. That the need arose is unquestionable. It is clear that there was only one alternative, that of preventing it. But, in order to prevent it, of course, the price that must be paid is high indeed.

For a people such as ours, who throughout the history of their revolutionary development, had to face the problem of interventions, who had to struggle against the policy of Yankee imperialism, it is logical that many would react emotionally in the face of the fact that armies from outside the nation's borders had to come in to prevent a catastrophe.

And since, logically, for various reasons, our consciousness has been shaped by the concept of repudiating

such deeds, only the development of the political awareness of our people will make it possible for them to determine when such an action becomes necessary and when it is necessary to accept it even in spite of the fact that it violates rights such as the right of sovereignty which in this case, in our opinion, must yield to the most important interests of the world revolutionary movement and the struggle of the peoples against the imperialists, which, as we see it, is the basic question. And, undoubtedly, the breaking away of Czechoslovakia and its falling into the arms of imperialism would have been a rude blow, an even harder blow to the interests of the worldwide revolutionary movement.

We must learn to analyze the reality and determine when one interest must give way before other interests in order not to fall into romantic or idealistic positions that are out of touch with reality.

We are against all those bourgeois liberal reforms within Czechoslovakia. But we are also against the liberal economic reforms that were taking place in other countries of the socialist camp, as well.

Naturally, we uphold the position that we should not tell them how to carry out the construction of socialism. But we can analyze what they have done -- a series of reforms that increasingly tended to accentuate commodity relations within a socialist society: personal gain, profit, all those things.

An article published in the newspaper Pravda pointed out the following fact in regard to Czechoslovakia.

It reads as follows: "The CPSU is constantly perfecting the style, the forms and the methods of constructing the party and the state. This same work is being carried out in other socialist countries in a tranquil process based on the fundamentals of the socialist system."

This statement is very interesting. It says: "Unfortunately, discussions concerning economic reform in Czechoslovakia developed on another basis. That discussion centered, on the one hand, around an all-encompassing criticism of all previous development of the socialist economy and, on the other, around the proposal to replace the principles of planning with spontaneous market relations, granting a broad field of activity to private capital."

Does this, by chance, mean that the Soviet Union is also going to curb certain currents of economic thought that are in favor of putting increasing emphasis on market relations and on the

free play of economic laws in those relations, those currents which have even been defending the desirability of the market and the beneficial effect of prices based on the market? Does it mean that the Soviet Union is becoming aware of the need to halt those currents? More than one article in the imperialist press has referred jubilantly to those currents that also exist within the Soviet Union.

And when we read these declarations, we ask ourselves if this means that they have become aware of this problem.

In any event, we consider it very interesting that this has been pointed out in this Pravda editorial.

There is a series of questions that disturb us. It disturbs us that, so far, there has been no direct charge against Yankee imperialism in any of the statements made by the countries that sent their divisions to Czechoslovakia, or in the explanation of the events.

We have been informed exhaustively concerning all the preceding events, all the facts, all the deviations, all about this or that rightist group, all about this or that liberal group; we have been informed of their activities. The activities of the imperialists and the intrigues of the imperialists are well known, and we are disturbed to see that neither the Communist party nor the government of the Soviet Union, nor the governments of the other countries that sent their troops to Czechoslovakia, have made any direct accusation against Yankee imperialism for its responsibility in the events in Czechoslovakia.

Certain vague references to world imperialism, to world imperialist circles, and some more concrete statements concerning the imperialist circles of West Germany have been made. But who doesn't know that West Germany is simply a pawn of Yankee imperialism in Europe, the most aggressive, the most prominent pawn -- that it is a pawn of the CIA, a pawn of the Pentagon and a pawn of the imperialist government of the United States? And, certainly, we wish to express our concern over the fact that in none of the statements is a direct charge made against Yankee imperialism, which is the principal culprit in the world plot and conspiracy against the socialist camp. And it is obvious that we should express this concern.

The events in Czechoslovakia only confirm the correctness of the positions and the theses which our revolution and our party have upheld; our positions at the Tricontinental conference, our positions in the OLAS and our positions on all international problems.

A series of facts confirms this

point of view.

It is well known, for example, that one of the factors which has explained, which explains, that has been a constant source of irritation in our relations with many countries in the socialist camp and with many Communist parties is the problem of Yugoslavia. Some may have wondered at the reasons for Cuba's attitude of constantly pointing to the role that the League of Yugoslav Communists plays in the world, the role of instrument of imperialism that this party plays in the world.

At this very moment, in relation to the events in Czechoslovakia, the principal promoter of that whole policy of bourgeois liberalism, its principal defender, was the organization of the so-called Yugoslav Communists.

They enthusiastically applauded all the liberal reforms, the concept of the party ceasing to be the instrument of revolutionary power -- that the exercise of power cease to be a function of the party -- because this is very closely bound up with the whole concept of the League of Yugoslav Communists. All of those ideas of a political nature that completely depart from Marxism, all of those economic concepts, are closely tied to the ideology of the League of Yugoslav Communists.

And our country has been a constant accuser of that organization.

Nevertheless, as you know, in recent times, many Communist parties, and among them the Communist parties of the Warsaw Pact, began to forget the role and the nature of the League of Yugoslav Communists.

Yugoslavia began to be called a Communist country, the League of Yugoslav Communists began to be called a Communist party and to be invited to meetings of socialist countries, to meetings of mass organizations and of the Communist parties. And this is what gave rise to our constant opposition, our constant disagreement, our constant objection -- expressed on a number of occasions. And these are facts.

As the agent of imperialism that it is, this organization was one of the principal promoters of the deformations of Czechoslovakia's political process. Some will say I am exaggerating, but I am going to prove this with facts.

Tito was received as a hero in Prague just a few weeks ago. And why was this? Because of ideological softening, of a political weakening in the consciousness of the masses.

And we asked ourselves: How could this be? What are we coming to when this well-known revisionist element condemned historically by the revolutionary movement -- a man who has served as an agent of imperialism -- could be received by a people practically as a hero?

Now, of course, Tito is one of the noisiest in attacking the involvement of the Warsaw Pact countries in Czechoslovakia. I was saying that some people may wonder why we have been so persistent in our statements against the League of Yugoslav Communists.

I want to relate a very important incident that took place at the beginning of the revolution in our relations with Yugoslavia. It was in 1959, at a time when the first laws in our country had already been drawn up, when our nation had already made laws such as the Agrarian Reform law, which brought us to a face-to-face confrontation with imperialism, when the United States had already begun to hatch its first conspiracies against us.

At that time we did not have diplomatic relations with the USSR or with any other countries of the socialist countries. We had to buy our first arms in Belgium and in Italy.

Because of imperialist pressure -- in fact at first not pressure but CIA conspiracies -- one of the ships which arrived from Belgium was blown up at the cost of some eighty lives. Later, the Belgian government, under pressure from the U.S. government, stopped selling us weapons. While the United States trained the mercenaries that would be sent against us, it also pursued a policy of blocking our arms purchases.

At that time the United States also pressured Italy. I recall that we were purchasing sixteen howitzers -- sixteen howitzers -- in Italy. We had received just four and the ammunition for the other twelve.

As a result of the Yankee imperialist pressure they didn't sell us the other twelve howitzers. That left us with just the four howitzers and ammunition for more, but without the other twelve pieces.

In view of this situation, we turned to the government of Yugoslavia in an attempt to buy weapons. We even attempted to see whether they might sell us the twelve howitzers, some 120 mm. mortars and certain other arms. And here is the report from the comrade who was assigned this mission, Major José R. Fernandez Alvarez.

Here we see the question in a nutshell. That is why I am going to read this

report. It states: "In 1959, following the defeat of the Batista tyranny, the need to acquire military equipment was posed. This equipment was urgently needed so as to defend the revolution, which, because of the laws and measures that were being drawn up, would have to face the hatred of its natural enemies, those who would attempt to destroy the revolution.

"Following orders, we approached the ambassador of the Republic of Yugoslavia at the end of 1959 or the beginning of 1960 in a very informal way. Later, Major Raúl Castro and I paid a visit to the Yugoslav embassy, located at 42nd Street and Third Avenue in Miramar.

"During that visit the minister of the revolutionary armed forces informed the Yugoslav ambassador of Cuba's interest in acquiring arms and equipment -- especially light infantry weapons, rifles, machine guns, rocket launchers, mortars -- and ammunition for these arms.

"The ambassador was quite evasive and when the minister raised the question of payments, he stated that in regard to weapons special arrangements were made concerning payment, without going into the particulars. The minister told the ambassador that I would keep in touch with him in order to be informed as to prices and the arms available, and to carry out negotiations in this matter.

"This mission was extremely difficult to carry out, since the lists were delayed, evasive excuses were constantly made and it was claimed that the weapons were not available, that they had to be manufactured, that information on prices had not arrived. And when I finally did get the price lists, which listed mostly small-caliber ammunitions, the prices were exorbitant even when compared with those on the world market.

"Both before and after this time other comrades traveled to Yugoslavia, where other requests were made concerning the purchase of weapons, and the results were similar, since additional obstacles were raised.

"I can state that no transaction whatsoever could be closed, despite our requests and great need, because Yugoslavia's representatives there and here in Cuba did not make it feasible.

"The conclusion we must draw from all this is that the attitude of Yugoslavia was definitely opportunistic, since they insisted on payment in cash -- in dollars -- and at a black market price for the few items offered.

"They stated that the amount of the transaction did not justify the difficulties they would run into with the

United States for having sold weapons to us. They stalled in providing both lists and price quotations and proposed that transactions be carried on through an individual business enterprise in Yugoslavia so that it would not appear as a business transaction with that country.

"In general they appeared, on the one hand, not only unwilling to cooperate but even anxious not to close the transaction and, moreover, opportunistic, or at least inclined toward dissuading us through the terms they set for the transaction."

This was the attitude of that socialist country, that Communist, revolutionary country, when our country, faced with the first threats of imperialist aggression, wished to purchase arms. And that is why there is hardly a single Yugoslav bullet here.

And imagine our surprise a few months later -- one day while looking through the files of the Batista government -- when we found this document which I am going to read. It states:

"From the military attaché of the Cuban embassy, Mexico City, D.F.; December 13, 1958. General in Chief Francisco Tabernilla Dolz, Ciudad Militar, Marianao.

"My Dear Friend: Enclosed find a number of photographs which were turned over to me by the ambassador of Yugoslavia in this country, a great friend of mine.

"On one occasion I spoke to him after I was instructed to obtain information from him personally on the possibility of purchasing weapons. He informed me that they could supply us with several types of the arms we might need, such as 30.06 rifles, ammunition, etc. He also spoke of the type of PT boats which appear in the photographs, which could be very useful to us.

"He said that they could supply us with ample quantities of these boats and that we would find them a great bargain, since they (the Yugoslavs) employ cheap labor and have the best shipyards in the world nowadays, next to those of Great Britain.

"These torpedo boats can do better than forty kilometers per hour and are equipped with two antiaircraft machine guns and one antiaircraft cannon as well as torpedo tubes. They have plenty of torpedoes, which are low priced.

"I explained to him that all orders for the purchase of any type of armament had been suspended for the moment, since a sufficient supply had been acquired from other sources, but he told me that, in any event, he would furnish me with the exact

specifications, selling price, delivery date and freight charges to our ports.

"As soon as I receive this information, I will forward it to you immediately." He then continued writing about other matters. "Signed: Lt. Col. (G.T.) A.P. Chaumont, military attaché."

Those who have read the story of the Moncada attack know this Chaumont as precisely the army officer who perpetrated dozens of murders at the Moncada garrison after the attack. He was the most criminal of all the army officers there. He murdered dozens of prisoners, and later was sent to Mexico. He was a great friend of the Yugoslav ambassador, a man who only eighteen days before the triumph of the revolution, in December 1958, after thousands upon thousands of Cubans had been murdered in the course of the two years that we had been fighting -- on behalf of the Yugoslav government and following consultation, offered him all types of weapons -- including torpedo boats, etc., on advantageous terms.

You may imagine our indignation and surprise when we came across this document and saw the signature it bears. And our indignation was all the greater because when we needed weapons to defend ourselves from the imperialists the Yugoslav government raised every kind of obstacle and did not sell us a single weapon. Yet it had offered weapons to Batista

when our war was nearing its end.

How could we have any but the worst opinion of the role played by that party, considering that when Batista could no longer get weapons even from the imperialists -- by then even the Yankees would not sell him weapons -- these gentlemen were offering him good weapons on economical terms?

The Communist movement ostracized that party -- and justly so -- for many years. Countless newspaper articles have been published by every party against that organization, denouncing and criticizing it. Later, of course, some parties forgot all about that, and their friends, followers and devotees also began to forget, in view of all the political preaching in favor of ideological softening in the revolutionary movement that has led to the present painful situation.

And we ask ourselves if this bitter experience in Czechoslovakia may not lead to correcting these mistakes and to rejecting the League of Yugoslav Communists as a Communist party, as a revolutionary party, and to excluding it from the meetings of the mass organizations and political organizations of the socialist camp.

[To be continued.]

#### BERTRAND RUSSELL OPPOSES VIOLATION OF RIGHTS OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

[The following letter from Bertrand Russell, who initiated the International War Crimes Tribunal which found the United States guilty of war crimes in Vietnam, appeared in the London Guardian of August 26.]

\* \* \*

Sir, -- Many British people must feel themselves helpless spectators of the Soviet suppression of elementary liberties in Czechoslovakia. What can be done? Parliament has been recalled to debate the situation, and no doubt to repeat at Westminster the condemnations at the United Nations. But how many parliamentarians have clean hands?

Those who temporarily interrupt their applause for the American bombardment of Vietnam to discover and assert the rights of small nations are allies that must embarrass the Czechoslovaks and play into the hands of the Soviet Union. Only the refusal to renew the NATO treaty next year would remove the last Soviet alibi for a threat to the East and ensure that the Czechoslovak and other de-

mands for liberty were insuperable.

Such a solution would transfer power from bureaucrats to people, and must terrify governments which wish to divide the world into spheres of influence and control. Those in Britain who wish to see the Soviet Empire fall to pieces, and the nations of Eastern Europe establish an independent socialist humanism, must work for the removal of NATO from the heart of British foreign policy.

By committing ourselves to every American invasion and to the division of Europe, we increase enormously the price that independent socialists in Eastern Europe pay for proclaiming basic liberties. And we know the price paid by Imre Nagy.

Yours faithfully,

Bertrand Russell

Plas Benrhyn,  
Penrhyndeudraeth  
Merioneth

REVOLUTIONARY FRENCH YOUTH LEADERS SUPPORT PEOPLE OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

[The following statement on the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia was issued by eight former members of the JCR (Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire -- Revolutionary Communist Youth) on their provisional release from prison August 23. The eight are awaiting trial on a charge of reconstituting the JCR which was dissolved by a decree of the Gaullist government on June 12. Seven, including the leader of the JCR, Alain Krivine, were arrested on July 10; another was arrested July 31. All eight had been denied bail since their arrest.]

\* \* \*

On leaving prison, we the undersigned consider it necessary to make our position clear in regard to Czechoslovakia at this time when an antisocialist campaign is developing in France and throughout the world.

We condemn the criminal aggression of Warsaw pact troops against the people of Czechoslovakia. After usurping power in the USSR and eradicating workers democracy there, the Stalinist bureaucracy today finds itself confronted with a growing revolt among the workers and students against its repressive regime, against its regime which has broken with the Bolshevik tradition of Lenin and Trotsky and is only a caricature of socialism.

In the present phase of acute crisis in this system, the national bureaucracies have striven to channel the discontent of the masses into a nationalist and right-wing framework. Those most responsible for this state of affairs are to be found not in Prague or Belgrade but in Moscow. Fearing that the example of democratization in Czechoslovakia would spread to the USSR, the Soviet leaders have struck out to defend themselves.

In these circumstances, the undersigned fully support the heroic resistance of the people of Czechoslovakia.

The Soviet aggression has dealt a blow to the entire international workers movement. It has encouraged the imperialists to step up their aggressive policy throughout the world and especially in Vietnam. It has given ammunition to the French bourgeoisie which pretends to believe that the May movement wanted to establish a bureaucratic dictatorship in France, although the May revolutionists are in solidarity with the Czechoslovak workers as they were with the Polish students.

The socialism we want assumes total democracy for the workers and students. It is with this aspiration that

tens of thousands of young people have entered into struggle today. The fact that in many capitals demonstrations of support for the Czechoslovak people have marched behind red flags to the tune of the "Internationale" testifies to this. But we will never add our voices to those who support Johnson and Franco.

We also reject the tactical position which the CP has adopted. This position does not demand withdrawal of the occupation troops\* and makes no move toward joint action by the Communist parties to achieve this end; it limits itself to Platonic disapproval.

Furthermore, militants who have supported the Cuban and Vietnamese revolutions cannot accept the positions which the leaders of these revolutions have taken in regard to the Soviet aggression in Czechoslovakia. Their positions show a lack of understanding of the essential roots of the conflict. This does not lessen our solidarity with these revolutions. But as revolutionists we consider it our duty to speak with complete frankness in a situation like this, inasmuch as the positions which these leaders have taken are a detriment to the exemplary struggle of these peoples and to the current of sympathy which their struggle has aroused among revolutionists.

The May events and the crisis of Stalinism, today in its bloodiest phase, makes more than ever necessary the creation of revolutionary Marxist organizations to fight for the victory of a socialist revolution in which workers power would not be an empty word. The youth by the tens of thousands have entered a struggle which continues today.

Alain Krivine	Gérard Prim
Pierre Rousset	Claude Gac
Isaac Joshua	Paul Hugues
Pierrette Chenet	François Carpentier

---

\* After the JCR leaders issued their statement, the Political Bureau of the French Communist party issued a press release declaring that they stood for the withdrawal of the troops -- but without indicating how soon. As the Political Bureau put it: "By positive solution, the Political Bureau understands an agreement leading to the normalization of the situation in Czechoslovakia in harmony with the sovereignty of the Czechoslovak government and the Czechoslovak Communist party as well as their international obligations -- which entails the withdrawal of the interventionist forces." The CP statement appeared in the same issue of Le Monde as the JCR leaders' declaration and above it. -- I.P.

WHY MOSCOW DECIDED NOT TO STRANGLE DUBCEK

By Joseph Hansen

SEPTEMBER 3 -- Having escalated the number of troops occupying Czechoslovakia to 650,000 -- thus beating Johnson's record in Vietnam both in the size of the forces of aggression as well as in the speed of escalation -- the Kremlin is seeking to smother the resistance of the Czechoslovak people and their desire for socialist democracy.

According to the latest reports, Moscow decided to withdraw the East German contingent, apparently coming to the conclusion that it had been a mistake to set a precedent that could be used by the West German government as justification for sending its troops outside the country's borders on a future occasion. Some 50,000 soldiers were said to have been involved in this, but they may have been replaced by other forces.

Fresh details are coming to light each day on how the Kremlin treated the top figures of the Czechoslovak government after they were seized.

For instance, Dubček was put in handcuffs and seated on the metal floor of the Soviet plane that flew him out of Prague. He was not permitted to change clothes while he was held, food given him was meager, and he was subjected to great mental, if not physical, stress.

In short, the Soviet secret police handled the Czechoslovak government leaders whom they succeeded in capturing the way police all over the world handle suspects who have already been condemned in their eyes.

Dubček and his friends had good reason to fear for their lives.

The top Moscow bureaucrats, it would appear, had projected following the pattern of the infamous purges organized by Stalin in the East European countries in 1949-50 when indigenous Communist leaders, suspected by the paranoiac dictator of harboring independent ideas, were framed up and hanged as "counterrevolutionaries."

The present ruling clique are thoroughly familiar with that crackdown since they participated in it as Stalin's hand-picked agents.

What caused the Kremlin to suddenly reverse engines? The Western press credits President Svoboda, stating that he refused to talk about making a deal unless Dubček and the others were released. This may have been a factor but

only in the context of something much more important, for the Soviet leaders certainly had no respect for Svoboda and could have liquidated him as easily as the other victims if they wished to.

The real reason was the depth and breadth of the resistance of the Czechoslovak people. This was so powerful that no significant public figure dared to play the role of Quisling.

Moscow was caught without a regime it could present with the least plausibility as a substitute for the Dubček regime -- and without any kind of displays by the people that could be pictured as a welcome to the Big Brother and his dwarf helpers, who had come to help them resist a "counterrevolution."

Still worse, with Dubček removed from the scene, the popular thrust toward socialist democracy visibly deepened each hour. The potentiality of the resistance was to be seen in the performance of the clandestine radio and TV stations, in the participation of the workers in holding an emergency congress of the Communist party, in the fraternization with the invading troops, in the way the people as a whole responded to suggestions and directives from the vanguard.

Out of all this, a leadership much to the left of Dubček could arise very rapidly. The whole process would greatly accelerate the tendency in all the East European countries and the Soviet Union itself to throw off the hated rule of the bureaucracy and to establish proletarian democracy.

The outcome of the invasion was clearly a political disaster for the Moscow bureaucracy.

Dubček now began to appear to the Kremlin as a lesser evil. After all, he had not instigated the democratization movement, he had only conceded to its pressure. Restored to office, he could be bent the other way.

In all likelihood this was the general line of reasoning in Moscow behind the decision not to strangle Dubček but to restore him to office.

The "agreement" reached with Dubček is not worth the paper it is written on so far as its legality is concerned. It was extracted under duress. Moscow understands this to perfection and that is why its principal clause is acquiescence in maintaining Soviet troops in the country.

MEXICAN GOVERNMENT USES TROOPS TO END ITS OWN DEMONSTRATION

Mexico City

Mexican officials received an unpleasant surprise August 28 when a rally called to "vindicate" the national educational system and express support for the government was transformed into a protest against the authorities.

During the giant demonstration in the Zócalo [the site of the government offices], a red and black strike banner was hoisted up on the flagpole in front of the national education department.

Through its servile trade-union leaders, the government herded departmental clerks and municipal workers to a demonstration in the Zócalo to protest the presence of this banner. Many were forced to attend by the threat that they would not be paid if they didn't.

By noon, 50,000 persons had gathered in the square. Orators expressed their indignation at the "profanation" of the flagpole by the red and black banner which flew there for eighteen hours.

There was also a "humble worker," or so he was introduced, who gave an elegant, touching, and quite professional address.

After the speeches, the red and black banner was hauled down and burned, and the tricolor [the official Mexican flag] was raised in its stead.

Although the Zócalo was ringed with granaderos [elite security troops] to keep students out, some managed to get through and began shouting slogans against the university authorities and the government.

At this point the crowd began to join in the protests voiced by the students. A considerable number of demonstrators gathered in front of the presidential

palace, shouting against Diaz Ordaz and calling for him to resign.

When the phoney labor leaders saw that the demonstration was turning against the government, they tried to silence the shouts of sympathy with the students, pistols in hand. In their frustration, they fired into the air, causing consternation among the crowd.

Shortly thereafter, the authorities decided to break up the demonstration, in view of the unexpected turn. They announced that the rally was over and the square had to be cleared.

This warning was repeated twice. In a few minutes the army moved in to clear out those who still remained. The gates of the presidential palace opened and several columns of soldiers charged out, bayonets fixed. This set off a stampede causing many injuries.

After clearing the square, the soldiers continued chasing fleeing demonstrators, mostly students, through the streets leading off the Zócalo, firing on them and killing and wounding a number.

The shocked people who witnessed this brutality from their homes hurled bottles, flowerpots, and other missiles at the soldiers.

The total number of wounded and dead is not known. Many of them were picked up by the students and taken to the medical schools.

This new outrage by the government has aggravated the unrest in the country. Although the bourgeois press tried to make it appear that only the students were to blame, it could not explain why the government workers and clerks who had gone to the demonstrations were attacked.

REGIS DEBRAY DECLARES HUNGER STRIKE

Régis Debray has gone on a hunger strike in his prison at Camiri 750 miles southeast of the Bolivian capital of La Paz, according to a report in the La Paz daily El Diario of August 30.

Debray, an internationally known left-wing French journalist, was sentenced to thirty years in prison this year by a Bolivian military tribunal on charges that he was the "political commissar" of the guerrillas led by Che Guevara. Two other foreign journalists were arrested

along with him and sentenced on similar charges. Both before and after Debray was sentenced, there have been reports in the international press that he has suffered persecution from the Bolivian authorities.

El Diario quoted Debray's wife Elizabeth that her husband began his strike because the authorities allowed her only ten-minute visits. The government was reported as refusing either to confirm or deny the report of Debray's hunger strike.

WHY THE STUDENTS AT TOKYO UNIVERSITY WENT ON STRIKE

By Fred Halstead

[The following article was written by the presidential candidate of the Socialist Workers party on August 10 while visiting Japan in connection with the observance of Hiroshima Memorial Day.]

\* \* \*

Today Barry Sheppard [the editor of The Militant] and I interviewed student strikers at Tokyo University. There is no real equivalent in the U.S., but in academic standing it might be called the Harvard of Japan. Its influence on Japanese education and society in general, however, is much weightier than that of Harvard in the U.S.

Noted for training many administrators for the government as well as leaders in other fields, it has about 15,000 students, one-fifth of whom are graduates. It has many departments -- medicine, law, economics, literature, the natural sciences, engineering, etc.

Tokyo University is concentrated on two traditional campuses: Konaba for the first two years of undergraduate studies, and Hongo for the last two years. This interview took place on the Hongo campus where the administration building, Yasuda Kodo (Yasuda Hall) is located. It is occupied by student strikers, and it was there that the interview with the strike committee (called Zen Toren) took place.

As we approached the large brick building through the tree-lined lanes of the campus, it was raining and few students were to be seen. The road was blocked by large signs explaining the strike. To the side, on grassy areas outside the hall, several tents were set up, with slogans painted on their sides. At the alcove of the main entrance a few students dressed in white shirts and dark slacks sat about a small table. They checked us out and ushered us inside. But this was a problem for me.

The entrance was packed solid with layers of tall, heavy steel cabinets. Only a very narrow passageway remained, with several sharp turns, like a maze. Even Barry Sheppard had difficulty, but for a person of my size it was almost impossible. I lost a button on the first turn, and the students laughed.

Inside, the maze opened on an Ivy League interior. But furniture was piled in front of windows and stairways. A few panes were broken.

We entered a large conference room.

Along one side of the room several students slept on blankets. On top of a coat rack were piled helmets of various colors. About ten members of the Zen Toren sat around a broad hardwood table stacked with printed leaflets. On a wall overlooking the scene was a single picture -- Che Guevara.

A young woman graduate student translated. We spoke mainly to Mr. Suzuki and Mr. Makino, but others commented from time to time.

\* \* \*

Question: When did the strike begin?

Answer: On January 29 this year, the medical department was struck by medical students and interns. The reasons were very concrete. They demanded liquidation of the system of internship, which is very oppressive in Japan. (As they described it, it sounded very similar to that in the U.S.)

After graduation, young doctors must work for little or nothing, for very long hours, for at least a year. They cannot support themselves, and this means that youngsters without money are discouraged from becoming doctors.

They demanded better pay and better working and living conditions for interns.

There was something broader involved which came to the fore as the struggle developed. The Japanese university hospital is a very important part of the whole medical system. Large hospitals, which can build training facilities, use many young doctors without wages, or very low stipends, to cut costs.

The students say this makes young doctors commercial workhorses instead of young scholars of medical science, and that the financial strain makes them businessmen afterward, instead of researchers and servants of humanity.

Q: How did the university administration respond?

A: They punished the students, subjecting seventeen of them to unreasonable punishment -- suspensions, expulsions, and so on. But students in other departments responded. Meetings were held and solidarity offered. Students in other departments raised their own concrete demands and began their own struggle. Then, on June 15, the medical students occupied

parts of the university. And on June 17 the police came in and expelled the medical students.

There was fighting and the students were greatly angered at the university administration for calling in the police and using violence on the students.

The administration refused to recognize or to bargain with the medical students' committee. The strike spread and on June 27 other departments were occupied by student sit-ins. On July 2 we occupied this hall. On the Hongo campus now there are sit-ins in the classrooms in several faculties, and also at Komba.

Q: Do you expect another police attack?

A: Yes, of course. But we don't know just when. The administration is supposed to present an answer to us any day now. Until then an attack is not likely. They would rather get us out by some deal, but they are not likely to grant our demands. At present it is summer vacation. And not many students are here anyway. But that will be over the end of August, and by then something will happen.

Q: I notice that here, unlike at the Zengakuren demonstrations I have attended, no one seems to be wearing helmets and carrying sticks. What preparations have you made against attack?

A: Oh, our materials are close at hand. There is no point showing them off. We have hundreds of activists ready to fight, and even if the police take a building, masses of students will respond and take it back. Only two or three hundred students are actively opposed to the strike. The great majority are sympathetic. To a meeting we get 3,000 activists.

Q: What are the demands of the students not in the medical department?

A: It varies from faculty to faculty. But in general the full professors have a monopoly, with the administration of the curriculum, hiring of teachers, deciding what young scholars shall specialize in and so on. They abuse this power in many ways. We want a complete change in this. This power must be shared by undergraduate students, graduate students, teaching assistants, assistant professors, and even staff, as well as full professors. But we want a whole change in the entire system.

(At this point, one student interjected: "This is a total battle; we must simply confront the university authorities.")

Q: What do you want the university to be?

A: Eventually, after capitalism is overthrown, it should be a place for all the people, a place of real freedom and real learning for common people as well as intellectuals. But we know that cannot be now. Now we want the university to be a training ground for revolution. It should be devoted to the people's struggle against oppression, against the war, against capitalism. It should be an engine of revolution.

Q: Did this strike at Tokyo University begin the present wave of strikes in the universities? (More than fifty universities are now on strike in Japan.)

A: No. These strikes have occurred more or less spontaneously in various places. Other universities were on strike before this one began. But this is a very important place, and people watch it.

Q: Who leads this strike?

A: At first different political factions of Zengakuren led struggles at various faculties, and they are still involved. But this committee, Zen Toren, is a united front, and many people on it are "nonpolitical radicals," as the saying goes. (I interjected: "You mean nonaffiliated politicals." "Yes, exactly," several said, and laughed.) This committee is made up of just graduate students and is in charge of occupying this hall. It is affiliated to a broader committee which has representatives from the various strike committees in different parts of the university. That is called the Tokyo U. Zenga Ku Kyoto Kaigi (All Student Struggle Congress of Tokyo U.).

Q: Where do the various Zengakurens stand on this strike?

A: Well, this university was largely dominated before the strike by MINSEI Zengakuren, which is controlled by the Japan Communist party. But they did not support the strike. They opposed the occupations. They lost much of their influence. Some individuals of the JCP, who have broken with their line, are involved, but MINSEI is simply not involved in the strike. They are probably off somewhere trying to arrange a deal which the strikers will pay no attention to. The other Zengakurens support the strike.

Q: What is the position of the Japan Socialist party toward the strike?

A: No clear position.

Q: Do any of the faculty support your strike?

A: Some individuals, but no organized group. The professors in the law, science, and medical departments are the worst. Those in the cultural department

are closer to the students than others. But their power is small compared to other faculties. Privately, they support us, but publicly they don't make their attitude clear.

Q: You say you expect an answer from the administration shortly. An answer to what?

A: To the immediate struggle demands. These are (1) Stop unreasonable punishment in the medical department. (2) Stop police interference in the university. The university authorities must admit they were wrong to have police enter the university. (3) Recognize the Young Doctors Association (which includes students as well as interns) for negotiations. (4) Rescind the unreasonable punishment of students in the literature department. (5) University authorities must stop helping police search for students. (6) No unreasonable punishment after the occupation ends. Rescind all punishment imposed since January 29. (7) The administration must meet with a mass meeting of students and retire all persons responsible for punishments since January 29, especially Mr. Okouchi, the president of Tokyo University, and Mr. Ueda, president of the medical department, and others.

\* \* \*

As they were explaining these demands, a student entered the room with a mimeographed sheet which he threw on the table, saying: "The administration proclamation just came out."

The students gathered around, reading it. We had a hard time getting the translator to pay any attention to us. But she explained: "No concrete concessions except to establish a special committee to review the punishments for eleven students. They don't say who will be on the committee, probably no students. They don't say which eleven students. The authorities say they want us out of this hall. They say they will begin classes in the medical school. They say they will send this statement to all students of Tokyo University to stop our struggle. They say the students are illegal and violent. We will say no to this. Now we must occupy the trainee part of the hospital."

We managed to get in one final question before being ushered out.

Q: When we report this to American students what should we ask them to do for you?

A: Develop their own struggle! Of course we would like to receive greetings, but the most important thing is to make their own revolution.

\* \* \*

We squeezed out through the maze and I lost another button.

It had stopped raining and a few students were beginning to appear outdoors. A loudspeaker on the Tasuda Kudo was already announcing the news of the administration proclamation and the preparations of Zen Toren to resist.

#### NEW ZEALAND LABOUR MEMBERS VOICE SOLIDARITY WITH CZECHOSLOVAKIA

In New Zealand, the Fendalton branch of the Labour party sent a message to the Soviet legation at Wellington which read: "We strongly condemn Stalinist invasion of Czechoslovakia and demand immediate withdrawal."

Another telegram was sent to the Czechoslovak legation that read as follows: "Full solidarity with Socialist democracy in Czechoslovakia. We condemn Stalinist invasion."

In Wellington hundreds of callers at the Czech diplomatic office expressed sympathy; while at the Soviet legation demonstrators shouted their opposition to Moscow's move.

Some of the protesters at the Soviet legation sang the following variation to a well-known song:

"Stalin's body lies a mouldering in the grave, but his troops go marching on."

#### RALLIES IN EDMONTON BACK CZECHOSLOVAK PEOPLE

Edmonton, Canada

At a rally August 22 sponsored by the Young Socialists and the League for Socialist Action some 300 persons protested the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. Slogans included: "Away from Stalin, Back

to Lenin"; "Support Czech Struggle for Communist Democracy"; "All Foreign Troops Out of Czechoslovakia." This action was followed up by a similar rally August 24. Speakers coupled support of Czechoslovakia with denunciation of the U.S. role in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic.

LONDON DEMONSTRATORS SUPPORT CZECHOSLOVAK PEOPLE

By Alan Harris

London

Within hours after Soviet tanks rolled into Prague August 21, some 1,500 demonstrators gathered outside the Soviet embassy in Kensington Palace Gardens to voice their protest.

The mainly youthful crowd chanted, "Russian Troops Out -- Workers Control In"; "Dubček, Dubček, Dubček"; "Stalinism -- Out, Out, Out."

Some placards read simply: "Don't Shoot Comrades."

With four lanes of traffic backed up to Hyde Park, the crowd eventually moved off to Earls Court where the USSR is holding a trade exhibition.

Spontaneous to a large extent, the demonstration was supported by most of the left tendencies. Many of the participants had followed events on transistor radios during the day, and they went to the embassy after work.

The Guardian sourly reported the following day that while liberals wept and right-wingers fumed, only the radical left proved capable of mobilizing so many persons in such a short time. The author of the article quite correctly ascribed most of the credit for the degree of organization that did exist to Tariq Ali and his friends.

As tension mounted over the invasion in the next few days, the left prepared for a massive mobilisation on August 25. As soon as the plans became known, the Labour party sponsored a rally for the same day, close to the same time.

However, the Labour party rally turned out to be a fiasco. Despite a battery of high-wattage loudspeakers, government orators George Brown, Jennie Lee, Richard Crossman and Fred Layday of the Trades Union Congress had a hard time making themselves heard above the din.

Protected by police, they were jeered, booed, and pelted with pennies.\*

When Brown lost his temper and called the hecklers "fascists," large sections of the audience chanted back,

"Hypocrites!"; "What About Vietnam?"; "What About Biafra?"

Loud laughter greeted Brown's solemn declaration: "We are in the fight. New ideas are bound to win and Labour pledges to be there when the fight is won."

The response to Brown's cynical pledge indicated the audience's awareness of the record of the Labour party leaders. In violation of official Labour party policy they have not organised a single solitary rally on Vietnam; they have done absolutely nothing in defense of the French workers and students; they apologized for the military takeover in Greece; they did not say a single word in defense of the Dominican Republic against the U.S. invasion; in short, they have not dissociated themselves in the slightest way from U.S. foreign policy -- they are anti-Communist to the core. Yet within five days of Moscow's invasion of Czechoslovakia, they had the gall to speak in support of the communist workers of that country!

As the Labour party rally ended in turmoil, the left tendencies, heading some 10,000 persons, moved off in their own demonstration. Marching from Hyde Park toward the Soviet embassy, they were joined by more along the way.\*

At the embassy an impromptu meeting was held. Speakers included Tariq Ali of the Black Dwarf, a newspaper, Ernest Tate and Connie Harris of the International Marxist group, Ed Guiton of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, Richard Kirkwood of International Socialism, and Peter Cadogan of the Committee of 100. They outlined the views of their respective organisations as to why the intervention took place and what could be done to ensure a victory for the Czech workers and students.

The Communist party of Great Britain neither helped organise the rally nor requested speaking rights. While the CP leaders have deplored the intervention in Czechoslovakia, they are not prepared to go so far as to participate in an anti-Stalinist rally like this one. However, members of the party and the youth did participate on their own.

\* British speakers generally view offerings of pennies from an audience with a bit of apprehension, since in size and weight, if not in value, they are about as formidable as an American fifty-cent piece.

\* The Socialist Labour League appeared at Hyde Park; but, in true ultraleft fashion, these sectarians moved off early in the afternoon to hold a private demonstration. About 500 persons participated under banners calling for withdrawal of Russian troops, the arming of the Czech workers, and against the restoration of capitalism.

CZECHS DEBATE HOW TO ESTABLISH WORKERS DEMOCRACY -- PART II

[This is the second part of an article by Professor Zbyněk Fišer that appeared in the June 24 issue of the Czech left opposition bulletin Informační Materiály. (Part I was printed in the July 29 Intercontinental Press, page 660.) Originally entitled "Workers Self-Management and the Revolutionary Party," this article provides an insight into the revolutionary ideas the Soviet bureaucracy has attempted to crush by military means. The editors of Informační Materiály stated there would be further installments in this series, but we do not know if the bulletin is still being published.

[The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

Socialist democracy must be effective; it cannot remain on paper. Paper, formal socialist democracy has no value or meaning. Bourgeois democracy was like that; although on paper it guaranteed people's power, it never allowed it in the real world. No one who is concerned about the interests of all the people in our country can want to return to those forms.

What is needed for socialist democracy is not a liberal [bourgeois] system of political parties that compete for votes in election campaigns but behind the scenes, or after the elections, divide up power among themselves in such a way that the people's demands are frustrated. The requirements for socialist democracy are of a different order. Socialist democracy requires two things primarily: Democracy in the society as a whole must be based on "self-governing organs of the producers themselves" (Marx); political power in the society must be in the hands of a revolutionary party of the working class. These two basic premises of socialist democracy formulated by Marx and further refined and verified by Lenin have by no means become outdated since their time. To the contrary, everywhere people work to achieve socialist democracy it has been confirmed that socialist democracy cannot be developed and still less maintained if these two conditions are not met, if they are not adhered to, or if their role is impaired.

These two prerequisites or demands form a unity which cannot be broken with impunity. If the political power in the society is not firmly in the hands of a revolutionary party of the working class, then "self-management" organs or organizations will be unable to develop or will degenerate.

This can be seen both in the classical bourgeois state and the modern bour-

geois state (which is developing toward state capitalism, toward a structure where there is only one monopolistic owner of the means of production and thus only one monopolistic exploiter -- the state -- with respect to which the overwhelming majority of the population stands as an exploited object). In bourgeois states of both the classical and modern type, organizations formed to defend the workers' economic interests quickly become undemocratic structures because the political power in the society is not in the hands of the working class, which alone has an interest in assuring the unimpeded progress of democracy.

Furthermore, if after winning political power the revolutionary party of the working class neglects to build democratic organs at the primary levels, that is in the factories, then the party itself can easily degenerate. Its leadership and practical political activity come into greater and greater contradiction with the workers' elementary interests and demands, more and more systematically violate the principles of democracy both in the overall society and within the party itself.

Individuals and a bureaucratized apparatus come to prevail in the leadership and work of the party. This bureaucratic apparatus seeks important material privileges far in excess of the living standards of the majority of the workers. On the basis of the positions it wins in the society, the bureaucracy then defends its privileges against all demands from the people for revolutionary renewal in the social sphere.

If we realize that this disastrous process has perhaps appeared not solely in our country, we must see clearly that it did not arise by chance but must be the result of some regular process. Its cause does not lie in the bad personality traits of individuals; it does not lie in any incapacity of the working class to create a social order better in every respect and freer than anything preceding it; it does not lie obviously either in any failings of our theory but simply in a failure to observe Marxist and Leninist principles and the prerequisites for socialist democracy -- from a failure to maintain the unity, the absolutely inviolable unity, of the two elements of which we have been speaking. Both must go hand in hand; they must be developed simultaneously and in a coordinated manner. One must not be neglected for the other. Only thus can there be any real guarantee that socialist democracy will be operative.

In the relationships which prevail

in capitalist society, the basis of democracy is simple formal equality before the law. In bourgeois society, democracy is realized only in "ceremonial" acts, in elections to delegated bodies over which the ordinary people exercise a minimum of effective direct control. And this democracy does not extend at all to on-the-job relationships.

Under socialism, however, the basis of democracy is democracy in the shops and factories, thus in the sphere of the "producers themselves" (workers, technicians, intellectual workers, etc.), in the area of real daily life and activity of the people, where they are most concretely associated and where their needs, interests, and demands are actually generated and achieved. That is why Marx called this fundamental democratization under socialism the law of "the self-realization of the working class," self-realization decisive in the political sphere at least.

We cannot do without this basic element of socialist democracy, constituted by the self-governing democratic organs in the factories, if we are to have a guarantee that socialist democracy will really be maintained. This basic element of socialist democracy is in fact its central component. The democratic rights of the self-governing organizations cannot be pruned.

If the power in society is really in the hands of a revolutionary party, these rights must not be curbed either, under any pretext that they interfere with efficiency in running a complex modern economy and its undertakings, or with overall social needs. Workers self-management, as the foundation of democratic organization of the society, cannot come into fundamental conflict with the party. The party's interest is precisely this: to advance and defend a democratic order through democratic structuring of the society.

The socialist democratic order or structure has, of course, distinctive features. It has nothing in common with the structure of bourgeois democracy for example. While bourgeois democracy created complicated transfer mechanisms and the most diverse legal subterfuges to get the administration of society and all checks on it out of the hands of the real producers, socialist democracy logically must work for the exact opposite, insofar as it is adhered to.

The machinery and structure of socialist democracy and of all organizations founded on and run according to the principle of socialist democracy cannot and must not be too complex or incomprehensible. They must, as Marx said, be "transparent" to all workers. Otherwise, as

simple experience teaches us, the producers themselves will have difficulty in using them.

What needs to be done is to remove all excess, hypertrophied institutionalization. Instead of serving democracy, as it might seem at first glance, these excess institutions burden it down and make it a mere formality. What needs to be done is to introduce the purest forms of direct workers democracy. This old demand voiced by Marx is today again the center of attention for the Marxist left, for example in the present class struggle in West Europe.

From the standpoint of the principles of socialist democracy two types of organization are possible which we can characterize as vertical and horizontal.

The vertical type is laid out primarily along the lines of an ascending order of levels. There is the level of the lowest organizational entities, the departmental, district, regional levels and so on up to the Central Committee. The heads or committees of the separate organizations on the different levels are elected in accordance with the principles of democratic centralism. In practice, however, despite formal observance of democratic centralism, it is easy in this type of organization for the cadres themselves to be transformed into a mere paid apparatus directed by a narrow circle in the leadership, becoming at last a tool in the hands of individual leaders who act without consulting the membership.

The chance of the membership's losing control over such an organization grows in direct proportion to the complexity of the apparatus. Such an organization is in constant danger of losing its real socialist character if the bureaucratic activity of the apparatus exceeds the initiative and control of the membership.

At the same time, moreover, an organization of this type harbors a tendency to discourage the initiative of the membership, to curb it, and ultimately suppress it. Indeed, there is an underlying danger in a vertical-type organization that priority will be given to the work of the anonymous paid apparatus over the activity and unfettered participation of all the members in the administration and conduct of the organization's work. This occurs in the interest of simplifying the organization's internal workings, to facilitate its smooth functioning, and simply because it is more comfortable that way and the highest measure of responsibility is not required.

The prevailing practice in organizations of the vertical type leads very

often to suffusing an atmosphere among the ranks of passivity, unconcern, inactivity, lack of initiative, and apathetic obedience in all circumstances.

The most important consequence of this, of course, is that such an organization loses its capacity for keeping a check on itself and correcting its style of work effectively and in time. Nothing but a democratically active membership (and democratic organization not just on paper) can assure the self-supervision and self-government of the organization on a continuing basis.

At the same time, vertical-type organization, precisely as a result of its hierarchical structure in which the higher-ranking elements ascend continually to ever greater heights and "importance," can easily lead to the party's top becoming detached from its base. It can easily lead to the disappearance of the highest meaning of the organization on the "lowest" but most fundamental level -- primarily the organization in the factories, in the places of concrete everyday work -- and thus to forgetting the interests and needs of the producers themselves.

With a vertical-type organization, the interests and positions of the upper levels -- the district, regional, and, of course, central levels -- gain an unjustified primacy. Under these circumstances it is more than easy for the principle of democratic centralism to be violated, to the complete disadvantage of democracy. At the same time, in the name of the higher echelons, a simple paid apparatus of functionaries operates in place even of the district, regional, or central plenums.

The reality which develops in vertical organizations also results in a disagreeable and in fact dangerous suppression of ideological knowledge, ideological life, and intellectual growth and activity among the widest circles of the membership. The overwhelming majority of the most diverse "ideological" campaigns are conducted in such a way that totally

predigested ideological lessons are sent down from above. This brand of party education is marked by ideological passivity both on the part of those who "transmit" these lessons and those who receive them.

The apparatus looks with disfavor on all initiative among the members because it represents a deviation from the comfortable conventions. Initiative by the membership would create work for the apparatus in which it might be shown -- God forbid! -- that the leadership was inadequate and might therefore have to be reshuffled or completely removed. Such an apparatus always wants all ideological education to resemble a welter of sentences and phrases already known by heart from which it recommends that no one deviate. Indeed, it strives to bring this about.

If such "ideological" work continues over a period of years, the only result possible is unrelieved apathy in the repetition of the letter of the ideology, distrust of ideology and theory, and exchanging empty and dreary chatter for ideology and theory. In this way, one of the most basic, most important, and most effective weapons of the revolutionary working class and its organization is disarmed.

The conditions governing the day-to-day work of this bureaucratized apparatus thus lead only to weakening this organization's capacity for work and self-defense. Then, if the apparatus complains about an apathetic and passive membership, it is only like a thief in flight, calling "Stop thief!"

All this -- and much more known to us from reality -- is a danger. We have already had considerable experience in this. And now we have more than just cause to consider a type of organization whose internal structure would offer more substantial guarantees that the party will not rise above all socialist democracy, above all possibility for criticism and correction by the ranks of the membership.

#### CZECH CP NEWSPAPER FAVORED REHABILITATING TROTSKYIST HISTORIAN

[The following article, dealing with one of Stalin's victims, executed in 1950 as a Trotskyist, appeared in Rudé Právo on June 9.

[The appearance of an item like this in the official organ of the Czechoslovak Communist party makes it easier to understand why the Kremlin was so violently insistent that the Dubček regime restore censorship of the press, among oth-

er things, or suffer the consequences.]

\* \* \*

In the part of the interview with the writer Jaroslav Seifert printed in our Sunday edition, which dealt with the rehabilitation of writers, it was said that the question of the writer Zaviš Kalandra would be considered. There is no doubt that his name is relatively un-

known, especially to the younger generation. And if anything at all is known about him, it is only that he was condemned in brutal terms.

Kalandra was a first-rank Marxist journalist and historian whose vivid thought had a considerable influence on cultural life in the pre-Munich republic. He was an editor and writer for Communist publications, writing most often for Rudé Právo and Tvorba. He devoted himself to the study of history, and so it was only natural that he was one of the first to begin to recognize the increasing deformation in the Communist movement.

In 1936, together with J. Guttman, he published a pamphlet on the trial of Zinoviev, Kamenev, etc., in which he wrote, among other things, that the Soviet Union had to be defended but defense was necessary against the danger that the trials could compromise the entire socialist movement.

Because of his views he was declared to be a Trotskyist and expelled from the party. In the summer of 1950, along with Dr. M. Horáková, he was sentenced to death for alleged "high treason and espionage" and executed. His books

were removed from the libraries in an attempt to erase his name from memory. We direct our readers who would like to find out something about Zaviš Kalandra to the article by M. Hübl (Dějiny a Součastnost, No. 5, which was the first article submitted to the changed editorial board of this publication -- against which the 1965 administrative measure was directed).

In this article Hübl deals primarily with Kalandra's historical work, in particular pointing up his unknown work on the beginnings of the Czech state as well as on the meaning of the Hussite movement and the position of the Austrian Slavs in the revolution of 1848-49.

Hübl writes: "Like Karel Teige, Kalandra should be restored to the position to which he is entitled. As in the case of Teige, justice must be done to Zaviš Kalandra. A selection of his most valuable works must be published in an appropriate manner. This must be done to honor his memory and to make his work accessible to all who are interested in it. His works must be made accessible to all who want to learn something about the thinking of one of those who have paid the tragic price of their lives because their ideas were ahead of their time."

#### POSADAS BACKS THE INTERVENTION BUT NOT THE OCCUPATION

Under the headline, "The Revolutionary Communist Party (Trotskyist): For the Intervention but Against the Military Occupation," the Paris daily Le Monde of August 27 gave a resumé, with quotations, of the position of a tiny group of French followers of J. Posadas, an Argentine ultraleftist expelled from the Trotskyist movement in 1962.

"The Revolutionary Communist party, the French section of the Fourth International," said Le Monde, "declares that the military intervention in Czechoslovakia 'tends to halt the process of capitalist intervention' fostered by the 'reactionary tendencies' in the Dubček government, but that it has the character of 'preventing the masses fighting against capitalism and bureaucracy from developing revolutionary methods.'"

It is not easy to make sense out of the position taken by J. Posadas on any question. In this instance, the fact that his name was not mentioned and that the statement was ascribed to the Fourth International did not help matters.

On August 30, Le Monde straightened things out by publishing a statement issued by Pierre Frank, a former secretary of Leon Trotsky and one of the founders of the Parti Communiste Internation-

aliste [Internationalist Communist party -- the French section of the Fourth International], making clear the position of the Fourth International on the latest turn in the Czech events:

"The Fourth International has vigorously and unreservedly condemned the intervention of the Soviet Union and its allies as a crime against socialism motivated by the Soviet bureaucracy's fear of growing tendencies which call for socialist democracy even in the Soviet Union itself.

"The latest Moscow accords, made under constraint, have imposed serious concessions. The Fourth International calls on the international working class to assist the Czechoslovak workers to neutralize them. Moreover, in spite of these concessions, the Kremlin leadership has suffered an onerous political defeat because it could not find a team capable of replacing Dubček's, which was the essential objective of the military intervention. The crisis has now been transferred to the Soviet Union and the international workers movement. The Fourth International calls for a resolute struggle to eliminate Stalinism and its vestiges in the workers movement and in the workers states totally and forever. It calls for a 'return to Lenin.'"

THE IMPORTANCE OF ISAAC DEUTSCHER'S WORK

As Seen by a Czechoslovak Intellectual

[The resumption of censorship of the press is one of the primary conditions which Moscow has imposed on the Czechoslovak government under the occupation. The muzzling of the Czechoslovak press once again has been condemned, naturally, by the Western press, which proclaims itself to be a free press. However the monopolists of the wire services and mass circulation journals have offered their readers little in the way of examples of the kind of material that has so frightened and outraged the Kremlin bureaucrats. Perhaps this is because the owners and editors of the Western press are not altogether in favor of publicizing the exact nature of the articles which Moscow finds so objectionable.

[The truth is that the columns of the Czechoslovak press were not opened to proimperialist material -- they were opened to writings that broached Stalinism as a subject for scientific Marxist analysis. Such articles give no comfort to imperialist circles since they do not indicate any trend toward the restoration of capitalism. Quite the contrary; they point in the direction of Trotskyism and the restoration of revolutionary socialism as the leading ideology. One of Trotsky's great contributions, it should be recalled, was precisely to examine Stalinism from the Marxist point of view.

[A good example of the kind of material that caused such alarm in Moscow is the article by Lubomir Sochor which appeared in the May 9 issue of Literární Listy, the weekly newspaper of the Czechoslovak Writers Union, explaining the importance of Isaac Deutscher's writings and why they should be published and distributed in Czechoslovakia.

[Literární Listy followed this up June 13 by publishing the first installment of excerpts from Deutscher's book, The Unfinished Revolution. It was illustrated with a large photograph of Leon Trotsky.

[Below, we are publishing Lubomir Sochor's article on Isaac Deutscher in full. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

Isaac Deutscher's name has only begun to appear in our country in recent years and then in the laconic reports in the daily press on the work of the Russell Tribunal, of which he was a member. When he died suddenly last summer Literární Noviny alone published a brief obituary. In press reports he was mentioned

most often as a leading Sovietologist or "Kremlinologist." In reality, he was always fundamentally distinguished from the bourgeois experts of this category because he was a Marxist and a very strict one. He was a Marxist historian of Communism and a Marxist historian of Marxism, which is a more than rare phenomenon. Understandably, in the conditions which used to prevail in our country, he enjoyed this unofficial reputation only in narrow circles of left Marxist intellectuals. Individual works of his began to appear here only after the middle of the 1950's.

I am not in a position to estimate the breadth of his influence but I know the power of his work on individuals. It planted a seed in ready soil. The fall of Beria in 1953 and subsequent events created at least doubts in Communist intellectuals about previous practice. They began to realize that the development of socialism had run into a blind alley. As in every crisis situation (which at first was latent) the objective and ever new question arose of "what is to be done?" The answer was sought everywhere and naturally also in history.

Deutscher's books offered a totally different picture of the October revolution and the postrevolutionary development than the then still official History of the CPSU. This picture was less sentimental, less triumphant and clear-cut, but the lion claws of Marxism could be seen in it. It was a vivid picture which showed not only the deep historical conflicts and the contradictions and tragic features of the development; it also revealed real alternatives which existed at the historical crossroads which would have permitted solutions other than the Stalinist ones. Here history itself spoke against the Stalinist obscurantism and historical legends.

I judge the influence which Deutscher's works only indirectly exercised by my own experience. At that time, reading Deutscher was still a risky business and was a privilege of a narrow circle of initiates. But I would venture to claim that it substantially advanced the thinking of many Marxist intellectuals and armed them for the struggle against Stalinism. Finally the time came, however, when we could talk openly about Isaac Deutscher's works and even express the wish that they would be published here and made available to all.

Isaac Deutscher came from a Jewish family from what was formerly Austrian Galicia. In his youth he devoted himself

to literature and literary criticism. As a youth of 18 -- that was in the 1920's -- he joined the underground Communist party of Poland from which he was expelled in 1932. The cause of his conflict with the party was his article "The Danger of a New Barbarism in Europe."

In this article he called for common action by the Communists and Social Democrats against Hitlerism in Germany and the Pilsudski dictatorship in Poland. He maintained that if Nazism were victorious, it would wipe out the Communists as well as the Social Democrats and cause a new world war. That was in contradiction to the then official line of the entire Comintern. The Communist movement underestimated the thoroughly destructive dynamic and totalitarian logic of Hitlerism and assumed that Hitler and the so-called "social fascists" (i.e., the Social Democrats) were parallel phenomena and in the end could come to a compromise.

In his article Deutscher appeared as the spokesman of an anti-Stalinist group which warned against underestimating the Nazi danger. He was expelled on the official grounds that he exaggerated the threat of Nazism and spread panic, while also sowing the seeds of defeatism within the workers movement.

After his expulsion from the party he worked for a few years in the Polish independent left as an "unorthodox" Communist. Later after going to England he gave up direct political activity to write for newspapers and periodicals (The London Times, The Listener, The Socialist Register, Partisan Review, Les Temps Modernes, and others). His most important articles and essays have been published in two collections: Heretics and Renegades (1955) and The Irony of History (1966).

These articles gained Deutscher the reputation of an expert on the Communist world whose predictions were often borne out. However, they did not make up the essential part of his work. The core of his work in fact was his great historical studies on the October revolution and the history of Communism which took form as broadly conceived biographies of the outstanding "heroes" of these historical events, figures who represented the various theories of socialism which were put on the order of the day by the socialist revolution.

The first of these biographies was his political biography of Stalin. It was published in 1949 when J.V. Stalin still stood at the height of his historical fame, steeped in Byzantine adulation. This book was followed by his three-volume biography of Stalin's historical adversary -- L.D. Trotsky. The titles of the separate parts of the trilogy were inspired by

Machiavelli's The Prince: The Prophet Armed (1879-1921); The Prophet Unarmed (1921-29); and The Prophet Outcast (1929-40).

The culmination of this series of biographies was to be a multivolume work on Lenin and Leninism. This work was left unfinished. It was interrupted by his death. The last book he published was a book of lectures entitled The Unfinished Revolution.

Although Isaac Deutscher ceased being a communist in an organizational sense, he never gave up being a Marxist. He remained "stubbornly" and "obstinately" a Marxist who held fast to the Marxist scientific method and theory but did not recognize the authority of the various interpreters of Marxism. He was not a disciple of Stalin nor a follower of Khrushchev or Mao Tse-tung. He was not an uncritical admirer or parrot of Trotsky either, thereby distinguishing himself fundamentally from the sectarian and dogmatic "Trotskyists" of the still-born Fourth International. He subjected the various Marxists to scientific Marxist study, which was as objective as it was mercilessly critical.

Deutscher's point of view makes it easier to understand his study of the makeup of the minds of ex-Communists, in which he sought to discover the distinction between heretics and renegades. Most of the renegades among the ex-Communists are distinguished by their anti-Communism. They are Stalinists turned inside out who still see the world in identical black-and-white terms. The colors have simply been reversed. As Communists they failed to see the difference between the fascists and the Social Democrats and as ex-Communists they lose their ability to see the distinction between fascism and Stalinism.

In this connection, Deutscher pointed up interesting and instructive parallels with the attitudes of "ex-Jacobins" who were disillusioned by Thermidor in the Napoleonic phase of the French revolution. A former admirer of the Jacobins, the poet Coleridge was so obsessed by the "Jacobin danger" that he ended by denouncing a law proposed in the English parliament for the protection of animals as an outgrowth of it.

Deutscher compared the attitudes of Coleridge to those of Jefferson, Goethe, and Shelly. The latter were also disillusioned by the subsequent development of the French revolution and its passage into the Napoleonic epoch. They, however, refused to choose between Bonapartism and the Holy Alliance directed against Napoleon. They remained critical supporters of the original ideals and aims of the revolution, and its negative

consequences did not throw them into the arms of the counterrevolution.

They became in a certain sense "outsiders" in the great historical conflicts; at least they did not play a major role in them. And precisely as a result of this they stuck to their original ideas, because they were outside practical life, and they were able to gain a true understanding of their time -- a better one than the true-believing, captive followers of the two contending sides (revolution and counterrevolution).

It is clear what side Deutscher's sympathies were on. He was no renegade; he wanted only to remain a heretic, that is a man who did not identify with the historical actuality of the movement based on Marxism but criticized it from the standpoint of the theory recognized by the movement itself. As a result, Isaac Deutscher rose above the apologetics and defamation which previous works on the Russian revolution had alternated between.

His biography of Stalin is not a vilification or a denunciation or a scandal story about this important historical figure. He by no means covers up the gruesome facts, and he gives a more complete presentation of them than the official exposures of the "cult of the personality." And he did not cover up the consequences of these facts.

But he distinguished himself from the official exposés in that he did not stick to the "brutal" facts (in both the metaphorical and real meaning of the word) and because he did not waver between moralistic condemnation and Machiavellian justification of the "brutality" of the time. His attitude is not a mixture of righteous indignation and honest or hypocritical admiration. He was not afraid to seek the meaning of these facts in the historical logic of Stalinism as a specific social system.

Therefore, also his account of the life of Stalin's chief enemy, the brilliant and uncompromising thinker L.D. Trotsky, is no mere apology nor finally a myth of an ideal "prince." Both figures are subordinated to the movement of the historical totality; they are the agents of the various real possibilities in the development of the revolution.

None of the heroes in Deutscher's biographies appears as a "deus ex machina" or as a "diabolus ex machina." These personalities are more or less talented spokesman of the currents and factions of the revolutionary movement behind which stand complex and antagonistic social forces. We can say that Deutscher's historical work is concerned more with Stalin as the representative of Stalinism

than with his personality as an individual, and that its subject, his major historic focus, is Stalinism as a system, as an ideology and a social reality.

Its primary concern is the historical and sociological clarification of the emergence, development and for a time almost absolute victory of Stalinism and the causes of its crisis and progressive decay. He is also concerned with its future negation by the socialist forces.

His point of departure for the study of Stalinism is the relationship between a certain type of bureaucratized revolutionist and the bureaucratization of the revolution in a backward country exhausted by the war and the results of foreign intervention. Stalin comes into the foreground here only slowly and gropingly, not at all as the brilliant, sly, and decisive strategist seizing power at a single stroke.

Before he found the forces on which to base himself, these forces found him as their spokesman. He gave the new bureaucracy all the necessary bona fides: the prestige of an old Bolshevik, inflexibility of character, limited intellect unburdened by theoretical principles, the connection with the bureaucratic apparatus which was the source of his personal influence.

The new ruling strata into whose hands control of the masses had fallen set him at its head as the highest authority and arbiter. His final rise to the despotic master of all, even of the new strata which had set him at its head, was the result of the tragic dialectic of monolithism in the postrevolutionary society.

The isolated revolution quickly eliminated from the dictatorship of the proletariat the elements of political pluralism which had characterized its initial stages. The system of several so-called Soviet parties was replaced by the system of one revolutionary party, although this party still had an exceptionally democratic internal life. The inner-party struggle step by step eliminated theoretical and political Marxism from the party, whose various wings offered different conceptions of postrevolutionary socialist development and were crushed in the factional struggle.

The pluralism of the factions was replaced by the pluralism of one faction led by Stalin, which then made itself synonymous with Marxism and the party. The monopoly of this single group and its conception then unavoidably led to the monopoly of a single person, to

Stalin's personal regime and power and all the subsequent moves through which by arbitrariness, corruption, and endless terror Stalin decimated not only his opponents but also his own attendant followers.

Official bureaucratic historians of the revolution have and still do fluctuate between irreconcilable contradictions which are characteristic of a certain kind of bureaucratic mentality. From their standpoint the past appears as predestined necessity. Historic events had to happen as they did. And the complement of this absolutely deterministic bureaucratic attitude toward the past is its exact opposite, a voluntaristic attitude toward the present and future.

It depends on the respective political outlooks of the individual authors whether this "philosophy" of history reveals positive or negative omens. For the Stalinist historians, the Stalinist resolution of the revolution's contradictions was an absolute necessity and victory of Stalinism the revolution's only salvation. For the anti-Communist historian Stalinism is equally a predestined result of violent revolution and all revolutionary violence.

Deutscher however did not employ simplistic schemata. Historical situations are determined but their determination is not one-sided, undeviating, or clear-cut. They always hold certain alternatives. They permit certain narrowly limited but real choices or alternatives. The victory of Stalinism had its historic causes but it was not inevitably determined. He triumphed because the opposition socialist forces failed. They were unable to realize the other real possibilities for development which were present in the revolutionary process.

For Deutscher the history of the emergence of Stalinism is at the same time a roll of tragic failures by its opponents. With an almost naive heedlessness the forces of the anti-Stalinist opposition exhausted themselves in separate waves. The antibureaucratic groups moved in heroic and desperate attacks like military units lacking a unified military plan and a unified command. While one exhausted its strength, the others stayed neutral or helped to defeat their potential ally, after which they were compelled to wage an isolated struggle.

The opponents of the Stalinist bureaucratization were unable to unite. That was the most important reason for their defeat. Revolutionists who possessed and had demonstrated such great intellectual abilities lost to a less talented adversary because they long naively believed that the truth could triumph automatically.

They forgot that they were not standing on the ground of pure science but in the arena of political and social struggle where truth can easily be defeated by force and where therefore nothing remains but to impose the truth with material strength -- if you do not want to remain impotent.

That is one of the great lessons from the history of the revolution which is extremely valuable for the present and the future. The antibureaucratic forces were not defeated only as a result of unfortunate external circumstances. They were defeated also because of subjective mistakes which not only individuals but entire ideological tendencies and currents made, contributing to their own downfall.

Deutscher's books are among the pearls of Marxist historiography. They bear comparison with such outstanding works as Marx's Eighteenth Brumaire, Engels' The Peasant War in Germany, or Mehring's Die Lessinglegende. It is a characteristic feature of these books that they are not only history but at the same time sociology of the revolution, a concrete and yet generalized analysis of its driving forces.

One of the dogmas of Stalinism was the total opposition between socialist and bourgeois revolution. Deutscher as a historian and sociologist of the revolution deliberately contradicted this dogma. Any bourgeois revolution, at least in the demands of its radical wing, goes beyond the narrow bourgeois goals; and any socialist revolution fulfills the uncompleted tasks of the bourgeois revolution, seeking to realize its slogans of liberty and equality.

Despite all their differences, all revolutions have in common that they are revolutions, and that makes it possible to compare them. One revolution mirrors another. And Deutscher systematically followed the principle which in the 1920's he had already -- though not so consistently -- introduced as an important motif in the stormy debates of the Stalinists and anti-Stalinists. He compared the great October revolution to the great French revolution, compared their rising and declining phases, the logic of the struggles of the revolutionary parties and the sources of their strength and the causes of their victories and defeats.

From a psychological standpoint, it is natural and understandable that a society which was too long in the school of the History of the CPSU and had thus relied fundamentally on it, should have a powerful desire to find another school, or avoid school altogether. That is very tempting but also very dubious.

It does not hurt anyone to have gone to school. The decisive question is simple: To what school, one that was a real fount of education and enlightenment, or one that was a den of obscurantism and historical and historical falsification.

In my opinion we really do need to study seriously the history of the October revolution and there is no sense avoiding this study. What is most of all necessary is to change the textbooks and the method of teaching. Those who want to free themselves from historical obscurantism must return to the sources. Deutscher's books show them the path to the sources and open up the way. They must be

translated and published in their entirety.

The ban against political and social thinkers who are part of the history of the revolution and were themselves its creators must be lifted. Socialist society is unthinkable without freedom for Marxism. This freedom of Marxist thought is now limited only by an invisible but strict gendarme that men have within themselves. It is called self-censorship. It arises simply from the internalizing of the "great Stalin's fatherly authority." The living are held fast in the grip of the dead and they must be set free from this invisible grip.

### ROGER GARAUDY DEMANDS RESIGNATION OF SOVIET LEADERS

The Waldeck Rochet leadership of the French Communist party has had its first brush with party members outraged at the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. A bitter public condemnation of the Soviet action by the leading French CP intellectual, Roger Garaudy, was disavowed and condemned by the Political Bureau hours after it appeared in the August 28 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde.

Although the French CP has officially disapproved of the invasion, Garaudy, in an interview with the Czech news agency CTK, went much further.

"One can only be gratified by the firmness of the Czechoslovak negotiators, backed up by the justice of their cause and the unanimous support of their people," he said. "The only solution is unconditional withdrawal of the troops now occupying Czechoslovakia...."

"This intervention threatens to kill a great hope. It was totally unjustified and unjustifiable. The pretext that there was a danger of counterrevolution does not hold water. While reactionary elements profited from the democratization to make noise, they were incapable of any but verbal violence. The government, the Communist party, and its head, Alexander Dubček, held the confidence and support of the vast majority of the people while stressing firmly the principles of socialism. This is proved by the fact that no element was willing to collaborate with the occupier to replace the country's duly constituted leadership...."

"The exemplary resistance and cool-headedness of the Czechoslovak people united around their leaders have compelled the admiration and gratitude of Communists and all friend of socialism and liberty...."

"Nothing could more benefit coun-

terrevolution in Czechoslovakia and throughout the world than giving socialism an image so contrary to the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism...."

"What is in question is the reversion to Stalinism in theory and practice by leaders wanting to turn the page of the Twentieth Congress over too quickly. As Communists we say flatly to these leaders: 'To restore the honor of your party and the real image of the international movement, resign!'"

"It is the responsibility of the Communists in the Soviet Union to draw the full lessons of this event so that their party can again become worthy of the mantle of the party of Lenin. And no Communist anywhere can forget the lesson of the experience which revealed the extent of the evil...Next, to prevent a repetition of such situations, the vestiges of Stalinism must be destroyed."

In a public statement of their own, the French CP leadership gave Garaudy the back of the hand. "A number of newspapers today published the text of an interview granted by Roger Garaudy to the CTK agency."

"The Political Bureau of the French Communist party considers it necessary to make clear that this interview commits no one but the one who gave it. Some of Roger Garaudy's assessments diverge from those of the party's Central Committee and its Political Bureau which were adopted unanimously in their resolutions and declarations. Garaudy's judgments constitute an inadmissible interference in the internal affairs of sister parties."

"Consequently, the Political Bureau disapproves Roger Garaudy's interview."

BRITISH COMMUNIST PARTY DEPLORES INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

[The following article appeared in the August 26 issue of the Morning Star, the official newspaper of the British Communist party. It contains the text of the statement issued by that party deploring the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. The document is of unusual interest in view of the record of the British Communist party leadership in tailing after the Kremlin in all its twists and turns in past decades, including the invasion of Hungary in 1956.]

\* \* \*

After its weekend meeting in London, the Communist Party's executive committee issued a statement saying it "deeply deplores the military intervention in Czechoslovakia by troops of the Soviet Union, Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria and the German Democratic Republic."

The statement continued:

We endorse the statement issued by the political committee on August 21 to this effect, which was in accordance with the position adopted at the July meeting of the executive committee. We then expressed our solidarity with the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and said that:

"...any actual intervention would only play into the hands of anti-Socialists and anti-Soviet forces in Czechoslovakia and give them the opportunity to play on nationalist feelings so as to stir up opposition to the leadership of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and to the Soviet Union."

The military intervention which took place had no support from any leading body in the Czechoslovak Communist Party or State and is opposed by them. No grounds have been brought forward that can justify this violation of the national sovereignty of the Czechoslovak people and Government.

Equally deplorable is the intervention from outside the country to remove some of the leaders of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and to prevent them carrying out their duties, less than three weeks before the Party congress was due to open on September 9. This is a gross violation of the democratic rights of the Czechoslovak Communists.

All Communists and other progressive people are deeply concerned about the security of the Socialist countries, and the permanent threat which they face from the imperialist Powers, and know how justified are their fears.

The Soviet Union lost 20 million

of its peoples in the war against fascism and carries the major burden of defence of the Socialist system against the growing threat of West German imperialism and U.S. aggression throughout the world.

But the prerequisite for the defence of the Socialist system against the imperialists is voluntary and mutual co-operation between Socialist States and Communist Parties, based on national sovereignty and the independence of each Party and Government.

The Czechoslovak Communist Party faced difficult tasks in the process of correcting the wrong policies of the past and in carrying through the Action Programme adopted by its central committee in March. They were aware of the dangers from forces hostile to Socialism and Conservative elements and were taking steps to deal with them.

If any of the Parties who took part in the Bratislava meeting, only 17 days before the military intervention, were not satisfied with the steps being taken by the Czechoslovak Communist Party, or saw new dangers arising, there should have been further discussion and not military intervention. If such dangers had arisen, this was a matter for the Czechoslovak Party to decide what to do.

The Tories, Right Wing Labour leaders and reactionaries throughout the world are using this situation to stoke up the cold war, justify military expenditure and to strengthen Nato.

We Communists completely reject this campaign and will fight against all efforts to whip up the cold war.

We approach the question of the events in Czechoslovakia on the basis of Communist principles and the need to defend and extend the Socialist system. It is from this standpoint we regard the military intervention as a tragic error.

The Communist Party of Great Britain reaffirms its solidarity with the Czechoslovak Communist Party. It will continue to promote working class internationalism and the closest fraternal relations with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Communist Parties of other Socialist countries and those in the capitalist and developing countries.

These relations must be based on the principles of equality, sovereignty, non-interference and the discussion of differences. Interference by a Socialist country in the internal affairs of an-

other Socialist country cannot be justified.

It is absolutely essential that agreement is reached for the immediate withdrawal of the troops from Czechoslovakia and we call upon the five Governments concerned to act at once to ensure that this is done.

All restrictions on the elected leaders of the Czechoslovak Communist

Party and Government must be ended immediately so that they can carry out their normal responsibilities.

We ask district committees and branches of the Communist Party to organize public meetings and sales of the Morning Star to explain the situation and to intensify our campaigns to end U.S. aggression in Vietnam, against the wage freeze and on other issues affecting the lives of the people.

SARTRE CHARACTERIZES SOVIET ACTION AS "WAR CRIME"

The world-renowned philosopher and playwright Jean-Paul Sartre, who was one of the central figures in the International War Crimes Tribunal initiated by Bertrand Russell that found the United States government guilty of war crimes in Vietnam, denounced the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia as a war crime under international law.

In a statement which he issued August 25 while vacationing in Rome, Sartre declared:

"In whose interest and to what advantage can a socialist country take such an attitude? I consider it pure aggression, such as is defined in terms of international law as a war crime."

Sartre nevertheless made a distinction concerning the depths reached by the two powers in their aggression. The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, he said, could not be compared with the actions of the Johnson administration which he characterized as "ignoble genocide."

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
DRAWING: Richard Nixon .....	713
DRAWING: Hubert Humphrey .....	713
What the Democrats Revealed at Their Chicago Show .....	714
Venezuela Prepares for the December Elections .....	716
Hanoi Position on Czechoslovak Events Remains Unclassified .....	719
Fidel Castro's Speech on the Soviet Occupation of Czechoslovakia -- Part II .....	720
Bertrand Russell Opposes Violation of Rights of Czechoslovakia .....	726
Revolutionary French Youth Leaders Support People of Czechoslovakia .....	727
Why Moscow Decided Not to Strangle Dubček -- by Joseph Hansen .....	728
Mexican Government Uses Troops to End Its Own Demonstration .....	729
Régis Debray Declares Hunger Strike .....	729
Why the Students at Tokyo University Went on Strike -- by Fred Halstead .....	730
New Zealand Labour Members Voice Solidarity with Czechoslovakia .....	732
Rallies in Edmonton Back Czechoslovak People .....	732
London Demonstrators Support Czechoslovak People -- by Alan Harris .....	733
Czechs Debate How to Establish Workers Democracy -- Part II .....	734
Czech CP Newspaper Favored Rehabilitating Trotskyist Historian .....	736
Posadas Backs the Intervention But Not the Occupation .....	737
The Importance of Isaac Deutscher's Work -- As Seen by a Czechoslovak Intellectual .....	738
Roger Garaudy Demands Resignation of Soviet Leaders .....	742
Document:	
British Communist Party Deplores Invasion of Czechoslovakia .....	743
Sartre Characterizes Soviet Actions as "War Crime" .....	744