

Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 6, No. 32

© 1968 Intercontinental Press.

September 30, 1968

50c



Campaign Mounts to Free Huey Newton

Violent Clashes in Mexico on Eve of Olympic Games

CAMPAIGN BROADENS TO REVERSE CONVICTION OF HUEY P. NEWTON

Telegrams, letters and petitions protesting the unjust conviction of Black Panther party leader Huey P. Newton on a charge of "voluntary manslaughter" in Oakland, California, September 8, are being sent to Oakland authorities from throughout the United States. The many supporters of the black liberation fighter are demanding that Judge Monroe Friedman order a retrial when sentencing takes place September 27, and that he release Newton on bail during his appeal.

Newton was accused of murder, kidnapping, and assault in the death of an Oakland policeman last October 28. In the course of the trial the kidnapping charge was thrown out, and the jury found him not guilty of assault. The "voluntary manslaughter" charge was the least serious of three possible guilty verdicts, which included first-degree murder, carrying the death penalty. Newton may still be sentenced to as much as fifteen years in prison.

The day after the verdict Paul Boutelle, Socialist Workers party candidate for vice-president, held a press conference in San Francisco where he demanded the immediate release of Huey Newton.

"The conviction of Black Panther Party minister of defense Huey P. Newton in Oakland, Calif.," Boutelle declared, "was a racist decision by a racist court."

"Huey P. Newton has been brutalized, wounded and now falsely convicted of manslaughter for one reason and one reason alone -- because he is a leader of the Black Panther Party and a revolutionary fighter for black liberation. The authorities wanted to get Newton, and by getting him, hurt the movement he represents."

"Their attempt must be turned around. The entire movement for human rights -- black and white -- must now develop a powerful campaign to win freedom for Huey P. Newton. Thousands of people should be enlisted in a massive national and international defense effort."

Boutelle had visited Huey Newton in jail while the jury was in session.

The same day, September 9, a press conference was held at the Berkeley, California, offices of the Young Socialist Alliance. Chairman of the Black Panther party Bobby Seale, and Peter Camejo, Berkeley student leader and Socialist Workers party candidate for U.S. senator, called for action in Newton's defense.

The following morning two Oakland

cops fired twelve shots into the plate-glass window of the national headquarters of the Black Panther party. Under heavy pressure, the police chief fired the pair, but only minor charges were brought against them and other police expressed sympathy for their racist action.

The week following Newton's conviction Judge Friedman victimized an important defense witness in the trial by sentencing him to six months in jail for "contempt of court." James McKinney had testified during the trial that he had been a passenger in Newton's car last October 28 when it was stopped by two Oakland cops, one of whom was killed in the incident that followed. McKinney refused to testify, under the constitutional guarantee against self-incrimination, when asked if he had shot the cop.

An important point in the defense's call for a new trial is the now admitted misunderstanding by the judge and jury of a key section in the testimony of the central prosecution witness.

Henry Grier, a bus driver, claimed to have witnessed the shooting from his bus window. The transcript of a statement of his to police was originally presented to the court reading, "I did get a clear view of his [Newton's] face." While the jury was deliberating, the defense amplified the sounds from the original recording and proved that Grier had actually said, "I didn't get a clear view of his face."

The corrected version of the testimony was sent to the jury, but they were not told that a change had been made.

Huey Newton, in an interview that was reported in the September 27 issue of The Militant, said, "My first reaction to the verdict was that it was a racist sell-out, and that the jury did not have the guts to decide the case on its evidentiary merits. After I got this information that the jury did not receive all of the evidence...this mitigated my feelings toward them. I still believe that it was a compromise verdict. I believe that some people on the jury wanted to be fair and just and acquit me. I believe that others on the jury held a racist attitude and wanted a conviction of first degree murder...The verdict doesn't reflect the evidence at all."

Messages of support and demands for Huey Newton's freedom can be sent to Judge Monroe Friedman, Superior Court, Oakland, California. Copies should be sent to the Huey Newton Defense Fund, P.O.Box 318, Berkeley, California.

VIOLENT CLASHES IN MEXICO ON EVE OF OLYMPIC GAMES

On the eve of the Olympic Games, scheduled to open October 12 in Mexico City, civil strife in the nation's capital has flared into street fighting in a number of neighborhoods.

The immediate cause of the flare-up was a decision by the Díaz Ordaz government to use all the military force necessary to put an end to the student movement that has been building up since the end of July around the central slogan, "Free Mexico's Political Prisoners!"

The government hopes by massive police action to repress the movement so quickly and so thoroughly as to definitively eliminate its potential threat to the success of the Olympic Games as a lucrative commercial venture for Mexican business and a boost for tourism.

Up to now, however, the police violence has served only to broaden the protest movement, to give it fresh dynamism, and thus to intensify the crisis.

The latest turn began September 13 when the students staged another march to publicize the six demands they have been fighting for since the end of July. The demands are: (1) The freeing of all political prisoners. (2) Repeal of the law designating "social dissolution" as a crime. (3) Removal of the main heads of the police in the federal district. (4) Dissolution of the granaderos as a repressive police. (5) The payment of indemnities to the families of persons killed in the July 26 repression and in other assaults mounted by the police. (6) Fixing the responsibility of the public officials involved in the repression.

The government had attempted to convert the September 13 march into a fizzle by dropping millions of leaflets over the city from planes and helicopters warning parents to keep their children from participating in the parade because the army intended to keep order.

But about 120,000 students from the university level on down assembled at the Museum of Anthropology. They staged a "silent" march down the Paseo de la Reforma to the Zócalo. There they were greeted by a crowd estimated at 125,000. The demonstration was completely orderly and no violence occurred.

Three speakers at the Zócalo rally urged the huge throng to continue the movement.

This was the same day that Presi-

dent Gustavo Díaz Ordaz inaugurated seven sites of the 1968 Olympic Games. Two days later when he appeared at a balcony of the National Palace facing the Zócalo as part of the ritual celebrating Mexico's Independence Day, he was booed by the crowd.

Javier Barros Sierra, the rector of the National University, had appealed to the students to end the strike they had been conducting since the end of July and return to their classes by September 17. The government sought to strengthen the rector's appeal through leafletting via helicopters. The leaflet said that the majority of the students wanted to go back to their classes. Furthermore, they could resume their movement, if they wanted to -- but after the Olympic Games. Besides that, they ought to be grateful to the Mexican people for their great sacrifices, since they "are paying for the greater part of your education."

The leaflet was discussed at general assemblies of teachers, students, and parents at the university. It was then voted on. The outcome was overwhelmingly in favor of continuing the movement for the six demands.

Following this round of psychological warfare, Díaz Ordaz opened the next phase of counterinsurgency. On September 18, thousands of troops, trucks, and armored cars moved onto the campus of the University of Mexico.

The invasion was in flagrant violation of the Mexican constitution which guarantees campus autonomy. Rector Javier Barros Sierra at once denounced the military occupation as uncalled for and as an "excessive act of force." With the judiciousness proper to his office, however, he also denounced the striking students for using university buildings for "political purposes."

Sweeping arrests were made on the campus, hundreds of students and teachers being compelled to lie down and be frisked before being hauled off to jails already overcrowded with political prisoners.

The military assault on the campus precipitated a major political crisis in Mexico.

The first effect of the occupation was to revitalize the student movement and to give it a still more militant temper.

On the following day, student

groups sought three times to retake the campus, only to be defeated by the soldiers.

At the National Polytechnic Institute, the students made preparations to resist what they were sure to be the next step -- the military occupation of their campus.

By September 20, the press admitted that more than 1,000 arrests had been made. Special riot police were battling students in many areas and a number of injuries were reported.

The National Strike Committee, a broad body organized by the students, said that the struggle would continue and that it was sending student groups throughout the city to organize protest meetings. They painted dozens of buses with slogans defending their demands and denouncing the Díaz Ordaz regime. They intensified their appeals to the workers and to the peasants in the federal district.

The strife widened the following day. In one area students battled police for seven hours before troops were called in. The students replied with stones and bottles, sometimes filled with gasoline, to the tear-gas grenades used by the police.

In an exchange of gunfire in one district, a policeman was killed.

The populace sided with the students in scenes reminiscent of the night of the barricades last May in Paris. Pursued by police, students took refuge in apartments in the neighborhood. From the windows, tenants shouted imprecations at the police and hurled missiles.

A firebomb splattered a plate-glass window of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Rocks finished almost all the rest.

On September 22 tension built up to a fresh high, as students staged a rally at the school near the ministry. Parents and children joined in.

Police continued to make mass arrests on an indiscriminate scale throughout the city. Being young and near the scene of a battle was considered sufficient cause for arrest on suspicion.

Strikes in solidarity with the Mexico City students were reported at schools in Monterrey, Cuernavaca, Chihuahua, Villa Hermosa, Culicán and Mérida. The government was said to have begun to put up roadblocks to stop carloads of students on their way to make appeals

for solidarity.

Meanwhile the government obstinately went ahead with the preparations for the Olympic Games. Athletic teams, sports officials and newsmen were received with pomp and ceremony. At the Olympic Stadium doves of peace were released in a dress rehearsal for the opening ceremony.

The National Strike Committee issued a statement in the form of a paid advertisement in the newspaper El Día September 21. The text was as follows:

"To the People and Students of Mexico:

"In ordering the army occupation of the university, the Mexican government committed a very serious political error. The responsibility for this grave measure falls on the authorities who have shown themselves incapable of understanding the historic significance of our movement and that it cannot be suppressed.

"This attack upon the autonomy of the university and upon all of the students and people of Mexico is genuine subversion of the constitution -- and the attack immediately called forth an energetic, democratic reply.

"The students have again won the right to use the streets. The students are very far from being intimidated by the illegal presence of the army in their education centers and by the brutal repression of which they have been the victims. In face of the presence of the army, the students have redoubled their militancy, created new and higher forms of combat, and raised their level of political consciousness. The National Strike Committee does not consist of isolated individuals, and thus it is able to understand the blindness of the bourgeoisie in power and all those around them. The committee consists of representatives with special, direct power bestowed on them by the rank-and-file students, whose initiative is the main driving force of the movement. Therefore, even in the event that the repression eliminates the present National Strike Committee, out of the ranks of the student community there will always emerge a leadership, according to circumstances, able to win all of the demands voiced in our petition.

"In face of an ever more reactionary and discredited public power, there will be a continuous, ever more determined and popular struggle."

The embattled Mexican students may now very well begin to receive substantial expressions of solidarity from students in other countries.

An indication was the statement issued in New York September 23 by the Students for a Democratic Society and the Assembly of International Students which convened at Columbia University September 18-25.

"The eyes of the world are now on Mexico," said the statement. "The Mexican Army has invaded the University of Mexico...During the last six weeks, students have suffered over 75 dead and hundreds wounded and jailed in attacks by this same army.

"The International Students assembled at Columbia University join in solidarity with the students in Mexico -- as well as all other victims of a growing police repression of the world student movement -- from Berkeley to Chicago to Columbia to Paris and Nanterre...and to Mexico City! And we call upon all supporters of freedom to join our protest.

"Behind the Olympic façade of new paint, flowers, beautiful buildings, stadiums and fountains there lies a barricade of barbed wire, guns and tanks to hide from the world the truth about the

conditions of the Mexican people. These facts can no longer be concealed because of the heroic action of hundreds of thousands of Mexican students who have succeeded in ripping away the mask of lies."

Backing the six demands of the Mexican student movement, the statement calls for a boycott of the Olympic Games. It is now clear "that for every death, by bayonet and bazooka, for every student jailed, the oppressive state and its imperialist backers must pay. For this reason, it is necessary that the Olympics be boycotted in Solidarity with the struggle of the heroic Mexican students."

The statement ends as follows:

"We call upon students, workers and all supporters of freedom to:

"Protest the police repression -- in Mexico and everywhere!

"Protest the attack upon political and academic freedoms!

"Boycott the Olympics!"

UKRAINIAN WRITERS DEFEND CZECHOSLOVAKS AGAINST THE KREMLIN

[The following article from the Czech Writers Union weekly Literarni Listy of August 15 -- one week before the Soviet intervention -- indicates an important reason why the Kremlin leaders could not tolerate the development of socialist democracy in Czechoslovakia, why they felt compelled above all to impose censorship of the press.

[The Kremlin was afraid, among other things, of the contagious example the steps taken in Czechoslovakia toward socialist democracy would set for peoples inside the Soviet Union such as the Ukrainians.

[The article summarizes an open letter, addressed by the Ukrainian writers in Czechoslovakia to their comrades in the Soviet Ukraine, defending the moves toward socialist democracy in Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovakia has a fairly large Ukrainian minority of 100,000, who could not fail to note the similarity between the violations of the national rights of the Slovaks under Novotny and the national oppression of the Ukrainian people under Stalin and his successors.

[In appealing to their colleagues in the Soviet Union to reject the Kremlin slanders against the new freedoms in Czechoslovakia, the Czechoslovak Ukrain-

ian writers touch on some very sore points in Soviet history and political life. Also many of the points they score against Great Russian national oppression of the Ukrainians have an especially sharp ring now in the light of the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia.

[The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

* * *

In the last few days, the Ukrainian Writers Group in Czechoslovakia sent an open letter to the Board of the Ukrainian Writers Union [in the Soviet Union] and to all Soviet Ukrainian writers. In an extensive text, it told the Ukrainian writers the truth about the misstatements of the Soviet press in its campaign against Czechoslovakia.

The letter began by noting the uneven historical development of the peoples of central and eastern Europe. It pointed out that the Czech and Slovak people inherited fully developed bourgeois-liberal freedoms from the previous period [before the establishment of the Czechoslovak workers state in February 1948] and could not stop halfway in the struggle for socialist democracy. It drew the Ukrainian writers' attention to

the fact that the old political model [of the Novotny-Stalinist period] established unequal status for the Slovak people in the Czechoslovak state as the Marxist solution of the national problem.

It was no accident that the Ukrainian writers gave their primary attention to the national question. They understand this question in its widest political ramifications. By citing this example, they wanted to show their Soviet colleagues how profoundly tragic our situation has become.

They reminded them of their own experiences with Stalinism. "Many of your friends, or your relatives, intimates, and the writers you loved since your youth fell victim to socialist courts, or rather judicial injustice. They were imprisoned and perished in the criminal labor camps at Solovetsky Ostrov, Komi, Karaganda, and elsewhere, where they were sent on the basis of unjust trials, or even without the pretense of a trial.

"Some of the writers and cultural workers committed suicide to avoid sentences worse than death (Mykola Chvylovy, Mykola Skrypnyk, and others). You members of the older generation of writers certainly know more than one Ukrainian poet, writer, dramatist, critic, or literary historian who was driven to a tragic suicide.

"Those of you, esteemed comrades, who virtually rose from the dead, returning unexpectedly from the death camps -- as for example Antonenko Davydkovych Borys (born 1899) and Mysyk Vasyl' (born 1907) -- may be able to tell from your own experiences the final tragic fate of other victims of cultural terror and a primitivistic concept of class struggle.

"It is worth naming these losses to Ukrainian literature, although we cannot give a remotely complete list. We do this only so that we will never forget this national tragedy and so that it will make us alert to any violation of human rights in socialist society."

The letter then lists 112 Ukrainian writers, most of whom perished between 1937 and 1943. It is a difficult task to determine the year the other modern Ukrainian literary figures died, almost impossible to tell the month of their death, and a utopian task to tell the exact date.

"No one can tell, for example, where the graves are of hundreds of imprisoned writers who have been rehabilitated today (or have not been rehabilitated). Every textbook, encyclopedia, and scholarly work will transmit to future generations (as long as humanity shall

last) this shocking lack of biographical data on the fate of contemporary Ukrainian literature (and not just the literature)...We must greatly regret the fact that the socialist movement in the twentieth century could not proceed in a less bloody and purer way.

"At the same time, all of this brings us closer to the real meaning of the Czechoslovak democratization. This democratization is important for the entire modern history of socialism. This is especially true because it means a re-emergence of conditions in which men can recover their full human worth."

The open letter of the Ukrainian writers living in Czechoslovakia compares some Czechoslovak experiences of the still recent past with the tragic experiences of the Soviet Ukrainian writers and the catalogue of their national wrongs in the Stalin period. These experiences, they point out, "were also a very bad page in the history of the Slovak people." The letter points to the trials of the Slovak "bourgeois nationalists," who just like the Ukrainian "bourgeois nationalists" wanted nothing more for their people than the sovereignty which, for example, our brother Russian people enjoy in the USSR.

The Ukrainian literary writers said that the rebirth in Czechoslovakia was a rebirth of socialism. They said that the democratization was the cause of the entire people, with the Communist party and its Central Committee at its head. The conditions are being created, they said, which will enable men to recover their individual freedom and creative initiative. They conceded, however, that political leaders would find life more difficult than before. "New questions will present them with new tasks which they will not be able to meet with simple diktats but for which they will need to show political talent, maturity, tact, and special qualities...Just why should we make the work of political leaders easier by closing our eyes to dictatorial ambitions? The new conditions will produce a new kind of political leader which we can scarcely do without."

The Ukrainian writers closed their letter with the phrase from Marx, "Ignorance is a devilish force and I fear that it will yet be the cause of more than one tragedy." This shows why the Czechoslovak Ukrainian writers sent their Soviet colleagues this long open letter of explanation.

The letter was signed by Eva Byssova, Vasyl' Datsei, Shtefan Hostinyak, Iva Hryts-Duba, Orest Zyllynskyi, Ivan Matsinsky, Miroslov Németh, Jozef Shelepets, Mikhal Shmaida.

TUNISIAN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS SENTENCED TO LONG PRISON TERMS

The regime of Habib Bourguiba in Tunisia, considered in the West to be liberal, meted out long prison sentences September 16 to a number of leaders of the anti-imperialist movement at the University of Tunis.

Charges of "subversion" were placed against these leaders during a widespread government witch-hunt following the protest demonstrations of March 15. These demonstrations, chiefly at the University of Tunis, protested a twenty-year prison term given to the young student Ben Jennet in connection with the anti-imperialist demonstrations in Tunis at the time of the June 1967 Arab-Israeli war.

The repression, which culminated in the trial and sentencing of the Tunis university leaders, was aimed against two groups: the organization publishing the magazine Perspectives, which the prosecution characterized as "pro-Chinese"; and the Communist party group around the magazine Espoir [Hope].

The Perspectives group came in for the harshest sentences. Nouredinne Ben Khadder, an assistant professor at the Economics Institute of the University of Tunis, was given fourteen and one-half years and a fine of 600 dinars [0.525 dinars = US\$1]. Nakache, an agronomic engineer, got the same sentence. Brahim Razgallah, a medical student, was sentenced to fourteen years; Tahar Mahfoud, an assistant professor in the School of Law, and Mohamed Bellalouna, a professor of history, to eleven and one-half years; Salah Othman, ten years and one month; Abdellaziz Krichene, an economics student, nine years; Hacine Ben Othman nine and one-half years. Khemais Chemari was sentenced to four and one-half, being acquitted on a charge of plotting against internal state security.

Heavy sentences were also given to Abdelwahal Mejdoub, four years; Hafed Senthom, three; and Ahmed Baoundi, Salah Gharbi, Ahmed Semaoui, and Hachim Troudi, each two years.

The sentences handed down against the Communist defendants were lighter, though still severe. Salah Zeghidi, an assistant professor at the School of Letters, was given two years and forty-five days; Abdelhamid Mustapha, a lawyer, six months; Belkacem Ben Ahmed Chabbi, six months.

The prestigious Paris daily Le Monde commented coldly in reporting the sentences September 18: "The verdict would appear less severe if the hearings had been more convincing and if certain

police methods had not been used in the repressive phase which preceded the trial."

The French bourgeois paper expressed strong doubt about the basis of the charges, noting: "At the outcome of a trial which offered nothing beyond the accusations previously made in the White Paper issued by the Destourian Socialist party [the government party in the Tunisian one-party state], the greatest doubt remains as to the validity of the charges against the defendants. Unless the distribution of literature, publishing opposition papers, and holding unauthorized meetings is called a 'plot' and criticism and propaganda are considered a violation of state security."

The sentences were evidently intended by the regime to counter the growing radicalization evident among the Tunisian students and intellectuals. The revolt in the universities was touched off in 1966 when the Bourguiba government revoked the suspension of sentences against six students for "illegal assembly" and drafted them into the army.

Even before sentence was passed, the conduct of the government had drawn international condemnation. One hundred and sixty persons were held virtually incommunicado for more than six weeks after the March demonstrations without being charged. A lawyer who saw some of them, reported in the May 8 issue of Le Monde that they showed signs of torture.

As for those finally indicted, their defense was made difficult by the fact that all the lawyers who had defended the students in the previous cases had been arrested. Tunisian lawyers who agreed to defend the March victims were disbarred. And on July 29, two French lawyers, Beauvillard and Lafué-Véron, who came to Tunis to serve as counsel, were deported without even being allowed to see the head of the Tunis bar or the French ambassador.

All these facts, plus the obvious political nature of the charges and the witch-hunt which the ruling Destourian Socialist party engaged in against the defendants, prompted the Fédération Internationale des Droits de l'Homme [International Human Rights Federation] to sharply condemn the Tunisian authorities even before the court's decision was made public. Le Monde of September 18 quoted the federation as saying:

"Neither freedom of opinion nor freedom of expression are tolerated in Tunisia at this time. Citizens apparently need only disagree with the ruling government's views to be accused of plotting against the state security, to be jailed for long months awaiting trial and even tortured during

their detention. They need only do this, furthermore, to be deprived of legal defense, since their counsel, prevented from carrying out their legal functions normally, have had to abandon their responsibilities and sometimes even leave Tunisia where they felt their personal security was no longer assured.

"These facts represent such an

evident defiance of law and humanity that in conformity with its responsibility the Fédération Internationale des Droits de l'Homme finds itself compelled to inform the United Nations of this matter and call for an investigation of the way the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is being respected and applied in Tunisia on the twentieth anniversary of this document."

MAJORITY OF THE DOMINICAN LEFT DENOUNCE SOVIET INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Santo Domingo

The left groups and progressive personalities here have condemned the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, the sole exception being the PSP [Partido Socialista Popular -- People's Socialist party], a small grouping of old Stalinists.

The PCD [Partido Comunista Dominicano -- Dominican Communist party], which follows an independent, though pro-Soviet and pro-Cuban line, protested against the intervention. It also condemned the use of force to settle differences between the socialist countries.

The rector and the vice-rector of the Universidad Autónoma de Santo Domingo came out against the Russian military intervention. The two university officials agreed on the need to respect the right of nations to self-determination.

The rector, Engineer Andrés María Aybar Nicolás, said, "As a citizen of a small country which has suffered military interventions by powerful countries, I naturally react against any act of force which violates the self-determination of peoples."

The vice-rector, Doctor Hugo Tolentino Dipp, said, "It is inexplicable that measures should be resorted to, in settling differences among countries joined in the same economic and political framework, which contradict the economic and political principles that have united them."

The Partido Revolucionario Dominicano [Dominican Revolutionary party], the party of ex-President Juan Bosch, which adheres to a Social Democratic line, declared: "The Soviet intervention offends the pride and national feeling of a people which has a noble tradition of defending its fatherland. Any intervention by great powers trying to divide up the world as in the old days of imperial domination is condemned to universal repudiation."

"The right of national self-determination cannot be made subject to the caprice of the great powers. There is no

right to intervene. Intervention is nothing more than an act of force, a kind of international law of the jungle that the great aggressor powers want to impose on the nations of the world."

The Maoist formations -- the Movimiento 14 de Junio [June 14 Movement], Pacoredo, and the MPD [Movimiento Popular Dominicano -- Dominican People's Movement] -- repudiated the attack.

The 14 de Junio interpreted the intervention as the "culmination of a whole process of cultural, ideological, and political degeneration in the state apparatuses and Communist parties of both countries." For the Pacoredo the intervention was "a confrontation between two revisionist forces."

The MPD held that the reason for the intervention was an attempt by "the Soviet bourgeoisie to prevent the Czech revisionist bourgeoisie from moving the country back into the orbit of Western imperialism." But it condemned the act, labeling it the "monstrous and stupid Soviet aggression against Czechoslovakia."

According to the PSP, it was necessary for the USSR to send military forces to keep the Czechoslovak counterrevolutionaries and imperialism from regaining power in the country and stripping the working class of its revolutionary conquests.

The PSP claimed that this intervention had a meaning completely different from the aggressive intrusions of imperialism "such as the one perpetrated by Yankee troops on April 28, 1965, against the Dominican Republic."

"That intrusion [the one of April 28] was an antipopular invasion to crush the democratic revolution. The troops of the socialist countries, in contrast, went to Czechoslovakia to help the people, to defeat that country's Wessins and Trujillos, to save the socialist revolution and preserve the conquests of the working class."

In comparing Svoboda, Smrkovsky, Dubček and the rest to General Wessin y

Wessin -- one of the generals who backed the American invasion of Santo Domingo on April 28, 1968 -- and to the Trujillos, the old Stalinists of the PSP were engaging in acrobatics to justify the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia.

They are the only ones who have

had the gall to justify this act.

The PCD said that it "condemns the use of troops and force to settle differences among socialist states and as a means of settling disputes among Communist parties over the methods to be employed in building socialism."

THE IMMEDIATE TASKS FACING THE REVOLUTIONISTS IN FRANCE

By Alain Krivine

[The following article has been translated from the first issue (September 1) of Rouge (Red), a "journal of Communist action," which has just appeared in Paris.

[According to the September 20 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde, the 12-page newspaper is to appear twice a month with a circulation of about 25,000 copies.

["It was founded," continues Le Monde, "by a group of militants who took an active part in the May events, particularly those who belonged to the former Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire, a movement dissolved by the decree of June 13. Its aim, according to those publishing it, is 'to rally the layer of militants who mobilized in May to the left of the Communist party' in order 'to create a revolutionary organization.'"]

[A subscription to Rouge is 25 francs for one year (about US\$5) and the address is "Rouge," Boîte Postale 201, Paris 19, France.

[The author, Alain Krivine, a leader of the former Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire, was recently released from prison where he had been held by the de Gaulle regime in reprisal for his outstanding role in the May-June events. Trial on the trumped-up charges is still pending. Meanwhile Krivine has been drafted into the army.]

* * *

Throughout the summer, the right-wing press, getting its tips from the government, waged a systematic witch-hunt campaign. The grouplets are everywhere, the JCR [Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire] above all. Practicing the nefarious tactic of "entrism," it is insinuating itself everywhere; the CP [Communist party], the mass organizations, and the vacation camps in Corsica are infiltrated. France-soir, Paris-Presse, Minute, every paper is preoccupied with its plotting. Not to mention the CVN [Comité National Vietnam -- National Vietnam Committee] camp in Cuba where 500 youth are being trained in the use of arms, to the great

indignation of Baumele.

This campaign has a purpose -- to make repression a recognized, self-justifying feature of society, to create a climate of all-embracing repression against the conspirators. Because the bourgeoisie was afraid in May, it felt its power tottering. Before May, it was unaware of the vanguard groups or it underestimated them. Now it overestimates them; it sees their hand in everything.

But from one standpoint, if it overestimates their present strength, it is not overestimating the potential danger they represent as a force which threatens the machinery of integration into bourgeois society and which rejects the parliamentary dialogue by which the bourgeois government and the bureaucracy communicate smoothly. For the bourgeoisie, repression is a rational need, which on this occasion has taken on a fury that is a measure of the fears, the humiliations, and the powerlessness it experienced in May.

Some are trying now to distinguish "tendencies" in the government -- a liberal tendency represented by Edgar Faure and a "cop" tendency represented by Marcellin.* In fact, the policies of these two differ only in their assessment of the balance of forces. Edgar Faure understands that starting in with fists clenched could set off a resurgence of the student mobilization of May. Offering his hand first, he hopes that the reformists, or the "serious students," who see "participation" [a demagogic Gaulist slogan pledging involvement of the students and workers in running the country] as a continuation of May, will take it. Once the "incorrigible wildmen" are isolated, Edgar-the-liberal will turn over the reins to Marcellin-the-club; it's a scientific division of labor.

As for us, while we try to exploit any margin for maneuver offered by divisions of this sort, we consider that all revolutionists worthy of the name are con-

* Appointed Minister of the Interior on May 30.

stantly menaced by bourgeois society because they are constantly in conflict with it. It is fine to take full advantage of periods of legality but there should be no illusions about their durability. They are truces, not a normal situation to get used to. This legality will last only as long as no one threatens the established order. The respectable left, including the CP, is trying to obliterate this lesson. But we must revive the consciousness of the temporary nature of this situation.

We prepare ourselves for repression but not by turning inward, by practicing an ostrich-like policy. To the contrary, in opposition to the official repression of the police, vanguard militants must arouse mass responses, broadening the movement. In opposition to the progovernment repression of the secret police and the CDR's [Comités de Défense de la République -- Committees for the Defense of the Republic -- Gaullist and fascist bands] they must develop mass self-defense.

The economic situation of French capitalism will not be catastrophic in the coming months. The buying power inherited from May is stimulating demand. And since the capitalists took advantage of the aborted crisis to make their readjustments, a period of economic expansion is in the offing for the immediate future.

But the effect of price increases for such things as cigarettes, railway fares, gas, electricity, food can be out of proportion to their real economic importance. The workers went back to work in perplexity after May, disillusioned but not crushed. Naturally they are not ready for a general strike every two months. But they realize that the bourgeoisie is trying to take back what it had to concede through a speedup and price increases, and they feel swindled and cheated. Since the wage increases were proportionally larger for low-wage workers than for the well paid, there may be sharp struggles in sectors like chemicals or metals.

In this connection, the student movement's capacity to block the government's policy in the universities is important. Of course, I do not think that the student movement can play the role of detonator as it did in May. However, the vanguard workers -- those who hope for a "revolutionary resurgence" since the "republican resurgence" Waldeck Rochet called for in the elections did not come off -- will keep their eyes on the movement which was out in front in May, the student movement.

If the students accept Edgar Faure's "participation," if instead of

deepening the concessions they won in May they capitulate to the repression, that would be a blow to the movement as a whole, a blow to the morale of the workers. But if the students block the government's plans for the new school year, reject a return to the old order and preserve the spirit of May, that would give new hope to the movement as a whole.

The student movement's first task is to beat the government on the university front, and the success of this depends partly on us.

But the students must not stay on the campuses; they must explain the meaning of their struggle in the neighborhoods and the factories. They must show that the workers and students are in the fight together against "participation." They must resist all attempts to divert their struggle in order to isolate it. They must expose the other face of "participation." They must support and publicize all struggles opened up by the working class.

After May the students cannot any longer go out to fight alone; that would mean entrapping the movement in the same impotence. The first task of the moment is to rally the existing workers vanguard, which appeared in May both inside and outside the unions and the CP. With the Czechoslovak crisis aggravating the postelection malaise in the CP, it is possible today through attractive slogans and a militant style to draw together the nucleus of a workers vanguard. The arena of this regroupment must be the Action Committees and the workers committees where the most conscious workers are coming in search of something different than a rehash of the CGT's [Confédération Générale du Travail] economic themes, where they hope to find political underpinnings for their activity.

This slow, patient, stubborn work is the fundamental task. But parallel to this, we must counter all the attempts by the government, the reactionaries, and apolitical types to organize the youth in movements such as the Mouvements Universitaires pour la Réforme [University Reform Movements] and the Conseil Etudiant de France [Student Council of France] and the Union pour la Coordination des Etudiants en Médecine [Medical Students Coordinating Committee]. Against these attempts we must create a vast revolutionary movement of the university and high-school youth based on the Comités d'Action Lycéens [High-School Action Committees], the Comités d'Action Enseignement Technique [Technical High-School Action Committees], UNEF [Union Nationale des Etudiants Français -- French National Student Union], and the student Action Committees. The best guarantee against any danger of a fascist development is to organize the youth.

To set long-term perspectives, it

is also necessary to develop the means for carrying them through, for keeping them from being diverted, for imposing them by a favorable balance of forces. In order to achieve this, the vanguard must be strengthened, educated, and rid of its organizational opportunism and its petty-bourgeois habits which are bound up as much with its field of work as its particular social origins. But these faults cannot be eliminated simply by willing it mentally. Only more varied social composition, increased recruitment in working-class strata, and the diversification of areas of work can achieve this.

The goal this vanguard must set itself is to formulate transitional slogans, to bring the transitional program up to date. Such slogans were cruelly lacking in May. The only thing the militants knew how to do was repeat the list of CGT demands in a different order or to reaffirm their fidelity to socialism. While the Action Committees or factory strike committees created embryonic organs of

dual power and broke down the old barrier between trade-union action and political action, the militants remained imprisoned in the framework inherited from the Social Democracy and Stalinism, going from the minimum program to the maximum program and vice versa, without hitting on transitional demands which would educate the masses and meet their aspirations.

The militants above all must not turn inward in the work of developing this transitional program. For the themes selected to have any value, the masses must identify with them, become imbued with them, make them theirs. To accomplish this, the vanguard militants must set in motion a vast program of research into the concrete conditions of the exploitation of the workers, promote collective formulation of slogans, and urge that they be tested in practice. This work must be done so that at the next crisis, enriched by this preparatory work, the spontaneity of the masses will be on a still higher level than it was in May.

GEORGE WALLACE -- SPAWN OF THE CRISIS IN AMERICAN POLITICS

By Les Evans

The third-party presidential campaign of Alabama racist George Wallace is a sharp indicator of the deep political crisis affecting the capitalist two-party system in the United States.

One of the outcomes of the Republican and Democratic conventions was that neither party yielded to the immense anger among the American people over continuation of the Vietnam war. The two political machines closed ranks so tightly on this issue that not even the sector of the capitalist class that considered it an error in the first place to escalate the war, and a blunder of historic proportions to persist in it, was granted the concession of having one of the two parties run a "peace" candidate, even as vice-president.

The result was that the two parties, to a degree never before seen, now appear to tens of millions of Americans to be exactly what they are -- identical, and not representative of their interests or responsive to their feelings.

The choice of Nixon and Humphrey as the standard-bearers of the two major parties only personalizes in an almost perfect way for these tens of millions of Americans the image of the two identical parties, campaigning on two identical programs, neither of which touches any of the real problems that face the country.

When George Wallace shouts,

"There's not a dime's worth of difference between them!" he is touching a sensitive spot in the consciousness of millions of people. His demagogy has met with ominous success.

Wallace began as a sectional, racist, small-time politician in Alabama. When he became governor of the state in 1963 he began to consolidate a base of white Southern segregationists, with his eventual aim being to build a national movement. Today he commands the support of the racist South, the traditional right-wing groups and sectors, and most of the supporters of 1964 Republican presidential candidate Barry Goldwater.

Wallace differs from Goldwater in that he is more openly racist and, more significantly, is a skillful demagogue who consciously uses left-sounding phraseology to appeal to sectors of the lower middle class and even the working class.

Feeding on the widespread discontent with the system among white voters, and capitalizing on the absence of any mass working-class alternative on the left, Wallace has succeeded in becoming the first third-party Southern politician since the Civil War to create a national movement. The impact of this reactionary phenomenon is clear in every aspect of the general election campaign.

It was discovered after the spectacles of the Republican and Democratic

conventions that Wallace drew crowds as large, if not larger, than Humphrey and Nixon -- even in the North.

The capitalist press, at first inclined to brush off Wallace as an embarrassing clown, has had to change its tone.

For instance, the New York Times, spokesman of the long-dominant capitalist sectors in the East and the most influential voice of the ruling class as a whole, sounded the alarm in a lengthy lead editorial September 22.

"This lurid threat [to murder any demonstrator who lies down in front of his car] which is part of Mr. Wallace's standard speech epitomizes his call to violence. He speaks of law and order, but it is the lawless order which the vigilante imposes with his rope and the Ku Klux Klansman with his bullwhip. Mr. Wallace does not attack Negroes by name, but he promises, in effect, to curb radical students and hairy Yippies and liberal government officials with the same harsh physical force which the white South once inflicted upon the Negro. He is the political expression of the school burners and the church bombers and the night riders."

The Times reminds the group of capitalists who have chosen to provide financial backing for the loathsome demagogue of a grim historic precedent:

"There are businessmen, the so-called 'fat cats' of Dallas and St. Petersburg and Los Angeles, who have made great fortunes in the last thirty years while the country was under political leadership which they scorned. Some of these men are now contributing to the Wallace campaign. They have to ask themselves whether in their insensate greed and political recklessness they are prepared to imitate the German industrialists of the early thirties and go on financing a demagogue whose ultimate aims they cannot foresee or control."

The Times also notes with alarm the response to Wallace's demagogy among a layer of workers and young people. The evidence shows that the Times is not exaggerating.

Public opinion polls conducted by major newspapers and by professional pollsters show that voter preference for Wallace has risen from 8 percent a year ago, to 12 percent six months ago, to 17 percent in the most recent samplings.

Estimates by the New York Times, Time and Newsweek magazines, and the Harris and Gallup polls showed Wallace carrying more states in November than Hubert Humphrey, although Humphrey, they expect, will capture a larger numerical vote.

A congressional committee had voted to suspend the "equal time" provision of the federal broadcasting code in order to stage a "debate" between Nixon and Humphrey.



GEORGE WALLACE

rely without having to extend equal time to minority parties. The committee reversed its stand September 19 and decided to include Wallace in the show, limiting its exclusion to candidates such as Fred Halstead of the Socialist Workers party.

The reaction of the Democratic and Republican candidates to the Wallace campaign thus far has been to shift in his direction in hope of cutting into his "vote." Wallace himself took note of this in a recent speech in Dallas. After a round of his customary ranting about "anarchists, Communists and pseudointellectuals," he said: "I've been saying for a long time that there's not a dime's worth of difference between the two major parties. Now, on some issues, there's not a dime's worth of difference between what they're saying and what we're saying."

Wallace has a particular appeal among white racist police throughout the country. He never fails to praise them at his meetings, declaring that he is in

favor of a "police state" for "folks who burn the cities down."

In Brooklyn, New York, September 4, a group of 200 off-duty cops attacked a small group of Black Panther party members in the halls of a public court building. One of the most telltale notes in this incident was the fact that many of these cops engaging in this "extraparliamentary" action wore "Wallace for President" buttons.

Even more ominous is the small but significant support for the racist demagogue developing inside the organized labor movement.

The 6,000-member Flint, Michigan, local of the United Automobile Workers union recently voted at a membership meeting attended by 200 workers to endorse George Wallace for president. This was a considerable shock for the whole bureaucracy of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations -- not because Wallace's racism offended their sensibilities, but because they are deeply entrenched in the machine of the Democratic party and are, therefore, committed to Hubert Humphrey.

According to a September 17 Harris poll, approximately 16 percent of all union members in Northern states would vote for Wallace. His impact among unorganized workers and Northern poor whites is significantly less than this. (As might be expected, 99 percent of all Wallace's supporters are white.)

A conclusion that seems apparent from these figures is that where Wallace has made inroads into the labor movement it is among the older, more skilled, higher-paid -- and more conservatized -- unionized workers. This is the layer of the working class that Lenin called the "aristocracy of labor."

In judging the significance of this penetration, it is necessary to fix the blame first and foremost on the case-hardened bureaucrats that rule the unions. They have failed utterly to separate themselves in any way from the most reactionary policies of American imperialism. If anything, AFL-CIO president George Meany stands to the right of many Democratic

party politicians.

In response to the self-evident decay of capitalist society, the leadership of the labor movement has nothing better to propose than "more of the same." And in their attitude toward the young radicals, there is little to distinguish them from George Wallace.

One of Wallace's favorite lines is, "If any demonstrator ever lays down in front of my car, it'll be the last one he ever lays down in front of..." George Meany, in defending the brutal clubbing of young demonstrators by Chicago cops during the Democratic party convention, said to a meeting of the machinists union, "I know what you'd do with that dirty-necked, dirty-mouthed group."

Now Meany -- and Walter Reuther of the UAW -- is launching an "anti-Wallace" campaign inside the union movement. Yet the only alternative they can propose is a Humphrey. It is small wonder that many politically backward workers, disenchanted with the Democrats and Republicans, and seeing no hope in their own class organizations, become easy prey for Wallace.

It is high time that the American labor movement dropped its suicidal alliance with the Democratic machine. To serve as a vote-collecting agency for the Humphreys, the Kennedys -- and the McCarthys -- means in the final analysis to pave the way for sinister demagogues like George Wallace.

To meet that threat, it is necessary to organize a pole of attraction in the political arena that stands for the complete opposite of what Wallace stands for. That means building a labor party -- a labor party that can open up a socialist perspective for America.

This is one of the planks in the platform on which Fred Halstead and Paul Boutelle are running as the presidential and vice-presidential candidates of the Socialist Workers party.

Campaigning for this slate in the most vigorous possible way is the most effective action that can be taken against Wallace between now and election day.

VOTE TO DISSOLVE COMMITTEE OF 100

The Committee of 100, the British pacifist organization in the news for nearly ten years with its "ban-the-bomb" demonstrations, voted to dissolve at a meeting in London September 14. The committee's secretary, Peter Cadogan, told the press, "The situation is now so

changed that some other kind of organization is called for." In recent years anti-war sentiment has deepened against U.S. aggression in Vietnam, and has found expression in the growth of organizations concerned with opposing this specific war, such as the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign.

HUGO BLANCO COMMENTS ON UNREST AMONG PERUVIAN PEASANTS

[Hugo Blanco date lined the following interview, "The Prison Island of El Frontón -- May 19, 1968." The Peruvian peasant leader is at present serving a sentence of twenty-five years on the barren island in the harbor of Lima because of his role in organizing peasant unions that carried out land seizures.

[The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

* * *

Question: What is your view of the peasant movement today?

Answer: The situation on the land did not change substantially with the rise of the Belaúnde [Hector Belaúnde Terry -- the current president of Peru, who was elected June 9, 1963] reformists to power. Most of the land is still in the hands of the big ranchers, and the peasants are still the same exploited serfs that they always were. The celebrated Agrarian Reform Law which the peasants looked forward to so hopefully has served fundamentally as an instrument of the landowners.

The ranches "expropriated" as a result of this law were ones which the peasants had recovered through their militant mobilization in preceding years. The government "intervened" with the aim of making the peasants pay for the land that had already been recovered by them. By giving legal sanction to the peasants' possession of these lands, the government was trying to check the mass struggle, maintain respect for bourgeois "law," and save the landlords' money. It attempted this primarily in La Convención (Cuzco) and Cerro de Pasco, regions in which the peasantry had shown great militancy and determination not to give up their recovered lands.

In part, the government achieved its aims. It succeeded in blocking the peasant upsurge temporarily and in moderating the mood in the most militant regions.

However, today things are changing. Ever widening sectors of the peasantry are coming to understand that Belaúnde's reformism and the Agrarian Reform Law are just another farce. This disenchantment was shown by great numbers of peasants in the Department of Puno (in southern Peru) a few months ago and in Ancash (in northern Peru) in recent days, as well as by the persistent combativity of the peasantry in Yauyos (in central Peru).

Even in those areas where the peasants' possession of the land was "legal-

ized" in return for "payment on an installment basis," the contradictions are again sharpening. The landlords want to get the land back and the peasants are refusing to pay for it.

Unfortunately there is no conscious vanguard which could properly channel the peasants' indignation and unite their struggles. The mobilizations in Puno and Ancash show that the peasants, who have not been mobilized on the land question, take advantage of mobilizations on other issues to demonstrate their anger.

In Puno, the essential force in the protest against "the government's neglect of Puno's problems" was the peasants who irrupted into this mobilization, denouncing the agrarian reform farce and using militant methods.

In Ancash, the mobilization was to appeal for "the creation of a university." Nine peasants accused of wrecking a bridge were arrested; and this provoked an assault by the people on the police station and the freeing of these peasants. In addition, the headquarters of the Agrarian Reform administration was stoned.

These events show that the agricultural workers are ready to accomplish great deeds; and it is the obligation of revolutionists to go and join the peasants to lead the struggle for their demands. Revolutionists must organize and centralize this struggle and continually raise its political level and effectiveness.

Q: And what about the workers movement?

A: We must never lose sight of the fact that the proletariat is the only class that can assure that our revolution will continue to deepen into a socialist revolution.

The militancy that we see among the peasantry must not make us forget that their most pressing need, land, although it is a revolutionary incentive, is not a socialist one, and that the enemy can maneuver in such a way as to divert it, as happened in Cerro de Pasco and La Convención. This shows not only the need for uniting the peasant movement but also that there must be a real link between this movement and the workers movement.

The Peruvian workers are ready for struggle. We have seen this in innumerable scattered and isolated strikes. We saw this in the great mobilization that occurred when our currency was brutally

devalued. We saw it as well in Puno and Ancash.

The trouble is there is no union federation which could unify these struggles. The CTP [Confederación de Trabajadores del Perú -- the Peruvian Workers Federation] has completely exposed itself as a company union. And the various attempts the workers have made to form a new labor federation have been blocked and boycotted by the opportunists and reformists.

Many sectors agree on the need for a new federation and hope to see the formation of an apparatus which would be large and strong from the start. But it must be understood that while the Aprista* bureaucracy is betraying the workers from its position inside the CTP, the non-Aprista bureaucracy is betraying them in a more veiled way by verbally supporting the idea of forming an authentic labor federation and blocking it in deed.

I think that the most expeditious way to defeat this bureaucratic maneuver is to begin right now to unite the workers' struggles, without waiting for a bureaucratic apparatus to be formed first. The attempt to unite the struggle will attract and polarize ever more extensive sectors of workers. This is the only way a revolutionary labor federation will be formed -- in struggle -- not in cut-and-dried conferences of bureaucrats who do not want to fight.

Q: It is being said that the students are the vanguard of the Peruvian revolution. What is your opinion about this?

A: There has been a promising radicalization among the students, and the influence of the Cuban revolution has had a lot to do with this. Unfortunately the radicalization of the students has been accompanied by false illusions about what vanguard role this stratum can play. There has been a very prevalent attitude of underrating the workers and peasants mass movements. Cherishing illusions about guerrilla "focos," the students have neglected the daily struggle of the

workers; however, in Peru this struggle offers the shortest and surest road to armed insurrection.

The students, who are the most advanced sector of society in education, who are the ones that have understood the vital need for a socialist revolution, can play a key role if they devote all their abilities in the service of the workers and peasants movements. Unfortunately, their separation from these movements has rebounded against them, promoting interne-cine battles and resulting in their getting bogged down. This has weakened the student radicalization.

Q: Has the existence of a party ceased to be vital for the Peruvian revolution?

A: A revolutionary party, or whatever you call an initial nucleus to unify and coordinate all revolutionary work, now more than ever is indispensable in Peru. Nothing can develop positively without it. And this is true not only for the mass movement. The so-called "focos" and their supporting network cannot exist if there is not at least a small nucleus which has been tested beforehand in less sensitive activities.

There have always been and there will always be traitors, informers, defectors, those who become tired in the revolutionary movement. If the revolution advances, it is not because they do not exist but in spite of their presence. The revolutionary process filters them out; it is almost a process of "natural selection" in which all these elements leave, are eliminated, or are exposed, so that those who reach the armed struggle have passed through a filter. That revolutionists can be improvised directly for the opening of a "foco" is a naive notion that has cost the lives of many precious genuine revolutionists.

Intervening in the day-to-day struggles of the workers is an irreplaceable school for revolutionary cadres. The fundamental weakness of the guerrilla struggle in which I took part, and of the succeeding ones, was that it was not backed up by a party rooted in the masses on a national scale. I cannot complain of a lack of popular support for our armed action in 1962. There was no lack of popular support. But there was a lack of means for channeling this support, of transmission belts, of a party. Our great mistake was that we did not give fundamental importance to the factor of the party. Now we have learned this lesson. Unfortunately many have still not learned it and continue blaming their failures on a traitor, an informer, or some other imponderable. I think that Marxists must be more serious than that. They must see

* From APRA [Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana -- People's Revolutionary Alliance of Latin America], the party of Víctor Haya de la Torre, famous in the thirties for its radicalism and its claim to have found a road to socialism peculiarly appropriate to Latin-American countries where a large proportion of the population is Indian. Haya de la Torre himself even flirted with the Communist International. Today the APRA is allied with the Odríista militarists against the reformist government of Belaunde-Terry.
-- I.P.

the deeper reasons and not take as sufficient cause episodic factors that can serve to excuse their failures.

A revolutionary party is indispensable; it will be forged in the heat of the day-to-day class struggle.

THE STUDENTS CHANGE THE POLITICAL SCENE IN BRAZIL

By Ruy Mauro Marini

[The following article has been translated by Intercontinental Press from the August 2 issue of the Mexico City daily El Día.]

* * *

There is a strong tendency to analyze today's student movements in terms of a conflict between generations. The Brazilian student movement offers one of the clearest examples of how misleading this approach is. This movement can in fact only be understood in the context of the political struggles that have shaken Brazil in recent years and, more precisely, in relation to the particular development of the left organizations in this country.

Students have traditionally been a progressive social force in Brazil. Before the 1964 military coup which ousted the government of President João Goulart, they had a three-tiered organization. At the base, the students in their colleges or schools elected boards that chose state assemblies, which were in turn represented in the national federation, the UNEB [União Nacional dos Estudantes do Brasil -- the National Student Union of Brazil]. Jealously guarding its independence from the state, the UNEB always represented a major political force; although at that time it was more an instrument for pressuring the government than an organization which challenged the legitimacy of the regime outright.

The reason for the student movement's character at that time was the reformist line predominating in the left, headed up by the Partido Comunista Brasileira (PCB) [Brazilian Communist party]. It must be borne in mind that the UNEB leadership always faithfully reflected the constellation of forces on the left. The other groups besides the PCB, which was the majority current, that worked in the UNEB were the Organização Revolucionária Marxista [Revolutionary Marxist Organization, better known under the name POLOP from Politica Operaria (Workers Politics), its newspaper], which took in the Communist far left; and Ação Popular [Popular Action], an originally Catholic movement which was to open a perspective for organization of the noncommunist left.

Following the 1964 coup, the UNEB was outlawed by the military regime and

at the same time fascist bands under the regime's protection set fire to its headquarters. The repression against the students was part of the general witch-hunt unleashed against the left and mass organizations throughout the country. The unions were put in trusteeship, the peasant leagues and unions in effect dissolved, and even the traditional political parties were finally suppressed, being replaced by two formations created by the dictatorship.

Driven underground, the UNEB determined to resist the government's aim of replacing it with a corporative student movement along Francoist lines. In order to do this, it had to revamp its structure to adjust it to the conditions of clandestine struggle and to establish closer bonds with its ranks. It could not do this, however, apart from the process of reorganization which the entire left was going through and still less from the ideological struggle being waged within it.

This ideological struggle was essentially over the interpretation of the military coup and, by extension, over the strategy for opposing the regime it created. While the PCB insisted on regarding the coup as a pure and simple American intervention at odds even with the interests of the national bourgeoisie, POLOP and AP accused the national bourgeoisie of being implicated in the regime and stressed its antipopular character. Consequently, while the PCB projected the line of creating a broad political front for gradual redemocratization of the country, the other organizations -- with different nuances -- put their stress on uniting the popular forces to overthrow the military regime by force.

In the student movement, as in the other mass organizations, these two currents confronted each other in a dogged and systematic struggle for positions. It is notable that this struggle was carried out without detracting from the movement's dynamism, since at the critical moments agreements or accords assured unity in action against the common enemy -- the government. However, repeating what was occurring in all sectors of national life, the revolutionary viewpoints constantly gained ground in a process that ultimately brought the old PCB to impotence and

at last disintegration.

The first test of strength between the students and the government developed over the Twenty-seventh National Congress of the UNEB, its first underground congress, which was held in the last half of 1965. This congress voted to boycott the law by which the government was trying to impose a corporative structure on the student movement and bring it under the tutelage of the minister of education. The failure of the elections the government called for this purpose showed the support UNEB had won throughout the country and confirmed it as the real representative of the students.

The Twenty-eighth Congress in July 1966 represented a step forward in the reorganization of the UNEB and a victory for the revolutionary currents. Since the UNEB had announced the place and the date of the congress beforehand in open defiance of the government, the authorities built up an imposing repressive apparatus at the indicated site (the city of Belo Horizonte). Nonetheless, with the support of the people, the congress took place according to plan and inflicted a very important moral defeat on the military leaders.

Moreover, the revolutionary position gained ground in this congress. The basic point of the strategy adopted was to center the fight on the agreement signed between the Ministry of Education and AID [the Agency for International Development] which was intended as a means for placing higher education back into private hands and making it an instrument of cultural subjugation. It was decided also to turn to street demonstrations, and for this purpose the congress set up a program of developing and training combat groups which could assure the success of these demonstrations in meeting police repression.

The year between this congress and the next marked the resurgence of the student struggle in the streets in direct confrontation with the regime's repressive forces. Starting off from their denunciation of the AID agreement, the students developed an intensive mobilization against American imperialism. They attacked the United States policy of controlling births in Brazil through the massive sterilization of peasant women. They raised the alarm against the occupation of the Amazon region by big international trusts. And they launched a campaign against the Brazilian press's subordination to foreign interests, chiefly the Time-Life group.

This was combined with the fight against the military dictatorship which was already under way in the campaign against the law on corporative student

organization and against the militarization of education involved in the government project to draft medical, veterinary, and pharmacy students to serve in units of the armed forces. Moreover, in the 1966 parliamentary and state gubernatorial elections, the UNEB adopted the slogan advanced by POLOP and the left wing of AP to boycott what was no more than an electoral farce. It rejected the line of the PCB advocating that the left participate in the elections. The success of the boycott call was shown by the eight million blank ballots and abstentions in the final total.

As the month of July 1967 approached, the month in which the students' Twenty-ninth National Congress was to take place, the UNEB repeated its challenge of the previous year. It announced publicly that the congress would be held in São Paulo, thus attracting the regime's repressive machinery to the city of São Paulo, which is the capital of the state of the same name. However, on the scheduled date, 600 student leaders met in a city in the interior of the state of São Paulo, indulging in the luxury of receiving guest delegations from the United States, Argentina, Uruguay, and a few other countries. The new leadership elected at the congress did not include a single PCB member.

This congress showed that reformism was in retreat on all fronts. This was shown most clearly by the splits the PCB suffered in May 1968, in effect liquidating the old party. The opposition which had been developing within it gave birth to two new organizations -- the Partido Comunista Brasileiro Revolucionario [Brazilian Revolutionary Communist party] composed principally of members of leading bodies; and the Partido Operario Comunista [Communist Workers party] resulting from the fusion of the PCB's Fracção Leninista [Leninist Fraction] with POLOP -- both of which advocate armed struggle as the means to defeat the dictatorship and carry out the Brazilian revolution.

The political radicalization expressed in this process is obviously related to the rise of popular struggles beginning in April of this year. The students have played an essential role in these struggles, spearheading the mass movements. The events since then have produced a completely new relationship of forces in the country, putting the military dictatorship on the defensive for the first time since April 1964.

At the end of March 1968, as the commemoration of the military coup approached, the UNEB began to mobilize its forces, raising purely student demands, including lower prices in student cafeterias. This laid a trap for the military leaders and they were not smart enough to avoid it. In the first public demonstrations, the police shot a 17-year-old

youth to death and wounded others, provoking a wave of indignation throughout the country.

From north to south, mass demonstrations -- and now not just student demonstrations -- broke out, forcing the president, Marshal Costa e Silva, who had inaugurated his government a year before by promising to redemocratize the regime, to throw the police and the army against the people. In Rio de Janeiro the funeral of the murdered youth was the occasion for a march of fifty thousand persons, the biggest antigovernment demonstration since the military coup. In São Paulo, Belo Horizonte, Brasilia, Porto Alegre, Salvador, Recife, Fortaleza, in all the big cities of Brazil, street demonstrations expressed the people's repudiation of the dictatorship. The dead and wounded, as well as those arrested, rose in number.

Suddenly, the left groups and the UNEB gave the order to retreat, announcing that they would resume the attack on May 1. The immediate response to the order showed a more impressive organizational strength and discipline even than the demonstrations themselves. The choice of May Day for renewing the struggle was symbolic. The student movement reaffirmed its alliance with the working class in an arduous struggle to build a new Brazil.

The May 1 demonstrations emphasized broad political demands raised by the left forces. The most notable demonstration was set in the economic heart of the country, the city of São Paulo, which alone accounts for almost half the Brazilian industrial workers. There the masses prevented the ceremonies scheduled by the government. They drove away the officials with stones and took over the platform to hold their own meeting. On the signs waved by the demonstrators was the slogan "Workers to Power!"

Since then the mass mobilization against the dictatorship has continued to mount, with the students always in the front rank. The demonstrations of this June under the triple slogan of "Agrarian Reform -- Oust the Dictatorship -- Drive Out Imperialism!" were even more spectacular (almost 100,000 persons in Rio de Janeiro on June 26). Student leaders under prison sentences participated in these demonstrations and the police couldn't lay a hand on them. Alternating with mass mobilizations, the students carried on permanent agitation with lightning meetings organized by small groups of twenty to thirty youth. On one single day, more than two thousand participated in such meetings in Rio de Janeiro.

The advances of the revolutionary movement have not been confined to street demonstrations nor limited to the student

movement. For the student movement, these demonstrations were accompanied by occupations of schools and colleges. In the occupied schools, in collaboration with important sectors of professors, the youth introduced changes in the system of instruction and in academic organization. One of the most important examples, although not the only one, is the case of the College of Philosophy and Letters at the University of São Paulo which has been under student control for several months.

Moreover, a deepgoing reorganization of the workers movement is being carried out on the basis of "shop committees." These rank-and-file bodies substitute for unions, inasmuch as the latter are controlled by the government, either directly or through the intermediary of labor skates. Strikes, which had been suppressed since the military coup, have reappeared in extraordinary strength this year. Most prominent have been the strike in the industrial city of Belo Horizonte in the state of Minas Gerais and the strike of the metal workers in Osasco, one of the municipalities which go to make up "greater São Paulo." In Osasco, in defiance of the line set by the union, the workers staged a strike for a 35 percent wage hike and went as far as occupying the factories.

Finally, parallel to their work in the mass movements, the left forces are carrying on intense underground activity whose most visible effect is the terrorist attacks on military units, right-wing periodicals, American diplomatic or cultural missions, public utilities, and banks. The most sensational one was provoked by a statement of General Carvalho Lisboa, the commander of the Second Army (the most important of the four military sectors into which the country is divided) which is headquartered in São Paulo. He warned the left to "attack from behind, because if you do it face to face you will be crushed." A few days later, on June 26, a truck loaded with more than 100 pounds of dynamite was driven against the general headquarters of the Second Army. The blast blew down most of the front of a building, killing one soldier and wounding five. This was one in a series of actions begun in late 1966, which have centered primarily in São Paulo. To these must be added, besides other terrorist attacks, assaults on military units to obtain arms and explosives and ever more frequent bank "expropriations."

The regime views the growing threat presented by the left nervously and is alarmed by the increasing support it is receiving from the population. The most conservative press is beginning to question the effectiveness of the military leaders; and the ruling classes are divided between undertaking political liberalization or resorting to a more repressive

"hard-line" attitude. In the meantime, the government is giving ground. The agreement with AID was not renewed when it expired in late June, and Marshal Costa e Silva is promising a broad university reform, stepped-up encouragement of economic development, and better wages.

It is too early to say if the left is in a position to oust the present military regime. What seems clear, however, in light of the events of the past three months, is that a new stage has opened in Brazilian politics marked by the success of a part of the left in adapting to clandestine struggle and reemerging as a political force on a national scale. The students seem ready to continue playing the vanguard role in this process, and they understand the implications of this role perfectly.

The best demonstration of this is to be found in the statements of the leader of the Rio branch of the UNEB, Vladimir Palmeira, to Agence France-Presse as well as the interview he granted to the Brazilian magazine Fatos e Fotos, which was published July 17, 1968.

Palmeira, who is twenty-three years old and the son of a senator representing the old oligarchy of the Northeast, clearly defined the student movement's objectives -- the ouster of the dictatorship and the formation of a people's government "which might resemble the Cuban regime in its conceptions." He emphasized also the need to rely on the working class. However, he said, "many years of work will be necessary to organize the working masses to act effectively when the time comes."

Thus it becomes evident that today's student struggles, however explosive they may appear, only make sense within the framework of a long-term strategy and that their objective is not immediate university reform but the total transformation of society. Palmeira himself stressed this when he said, "The student movement draws the students together in struggles not only to solve their special problems but also to solve general problems." He added, "As the students struggle to solve their special problems, they discover that the solution always lies further on. They understand today that the universities are tightly linked to the socioeconomic reality of the country and they recognize that no radical change in the universities can come about except by changing the (economic and social) basis of society."

Palmeira showed how this is translated into practical action, that is, how the student movement fits into the process of class struggle in the country, by

the example of the cut in the university budget and the government's concomitant demand that the students pay for their education:

"Why does the government want to transform the universities into (private) foundations if it has the means to support public education? The answer is simple: (...) private foundations create an instrument of ideological domination superior to what can be achieved with public universities. So, the higher education budget is continually being cut. Every year we have less educational facilities, our schools are not expanding. Why is the budget being cut? Obviously to make it appear that public education is financially unsound. It is being cut because the government considers that education must be profitable in itself, with the students paying annual tuition. The money diverted from education is spent on other activities which do not contribute to the development of the country. Therefore, in fighting against tuition the students are fighting to keep the universities from falling into private hands and from declining. Students, already an economic elite, become an intellectual elite. The social stratum that can enter the universities is continually shrinking. The workers have no chance and now even the middle class is beginning to be excluded. The students are struggling against tuition in order to gain admission to the universities for representatives of other sectors of society, thus guaranteeing that the universities will remain public. What is important is not the twenty-eight cruzeiros [2.715 = US\$1] more that students have to pay now. These extra cruzeiros are only the first step toward total reintroduction of private schools. We conceive the struggle against tuition as a political struggle, not as an economic one."

These statements by one of its most representative leaders give a good indication of the maturity attained by the student movement in Brazil. This movement is the spearhead of a political struggle focused fundamentally on mobilizing the working class to transform society. It does not pretend to assume the responsibilities of the proletariat nor does it attempt to work at a level of consciousness accessible only to the vanguard elements. Its tactic consists precisely in basing itself on the demands of the great mass of students and developing a systematic struggle which constantly brings this mass into conflict with the regime in order to expose the economic and social structure which prevents the satisfaction of these demands. This is also how the students assert themselves as an independent force in the class struggles being waged in the country and serve as a catalyst in these struggles.

As I write this, Marshal Costa e Silva is meeting with his Conselho de Segurança Nacional [National Security Council] to discuss the student problem; the repressive forces are mobilizing to prevent the holding of the Thirtieth Congress of the UNEB; and the government has called on all the sectors which support it and primarily on the press to isolate and demoralize the students. But a regime propped up by bayonets is trembling be-

fore a handful of youth who, armed only with valor, consciousness, and organization, have succeeded in isolating the government and throwing it into dismay before the masses of the people. A battle has been won, but not the war. The youth know this but they view the road ahead of them with the confidence and serenity of those who have their whole life ahead of them and are determined to live it fully.

AN INTERVIEW WITH YUGOSLAV STUDENT REBELS

An important interview with participants in the Yugoslav student rebellion of last June appeared in the September 27 issue of the U.S. socialist weekly The Militant. The interview was obtained by the paper's editor, Barry Sheppard, who was in Belgrade the first week in September while accompanying Fred Halstead, Socialist Workers party candidate for U.S. president, on a world political tour.

Sheppard went to the department of philosophy building of the University of Belgrade, which had been a center of the student movement in June. There he met a group of students who had taken part in the actions. Two of these, Milan Nikolic and Svetlana Vidakovic, spoke in English and discussed their movement with the American socialist journalist.

The first major student action, they said, took place in December 1966 and was a protest of several thousand students against U.S. aggression in Vietnam. The demonstration was attacked by police. Nikolic told Sheppard, "We saw that our police is not a true militia, the armed people, but a repressive force."

This June, demonstrations began when police broke up a crowd of students in front of an outdoor show. The struggle quickly escalated as the students adopted the style and methods of their counterparts in France. Action Committees were formed in the university, and general social demands were raised as well as proposals for university reform.

One demand of the students was a ban on the growth of small capitalists -- "shopkeepers, shoemakers, those engaged in aspects of the tourist industry, etc." because they contributed to the growth of social inequality.

"Another source of inequality," Sheppard writes, "is the wide range of salaries. 'Administrators of factories receive a guaranteed fixed wage, plus a bonus if the factory does well. If the factory does not show a profit, however, they never fall below their guaranteed

wage,' Svetlana said. 'But the workers in the same factory will get much less than their official wage if the factory does poorly, down to the national minimum wage....'"

The student struggles succeeded in winning a significant increase in the national minimum wage.

The students were highly critical of government economic reforms that introduced "market mechanisms" into the economy. Nikolic said, "When people objected to the reform, they were accused of being Stalinist. But there is a third way different from either bureaucratic centralism or the free-market arrangement between individual enterprises, and that is genuine self-management of the whole society...."

"What we are for is self-management of the whole economy, a centrally planned, socialist society with the whole working class participating in planning the economy through a 'parliament of workers' representatives.'"

Nikolic also criticized the Yugoslav government's relationships with the dictatorships of Latin America:

"We know of the existence of the guerrilla movement in that country [Colombia] which is fighting that dictatorship and we are on the side of the guerrilla fighters. We are opposed to this pragmatism in the government's foreign policy."

The revolutionary students sharply condemned the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. Nikolic declared, "The process which had begun in Czechoslovakia had made it the foremost socialist country and showed the way to the future. But I am afraid the Soviet aggression has halted this process, although resistance can and must continue."

Svetlana Vidakovic added, "They are now attacking those who are most radical, most left, in Czechoslovakia."

THE ECONOMIST OPTS FOR HOSES INSTEAD OF HORSES

Even Britain's authoritative financial weekly, The Economist, has gotten worried about the anti-Vietnam-war demonstration set for London, October 27. With a cover photo showing mounted police attacking an earlier demonstration, its lead editorial September 14 is entitled, "A Violent Autumn?"

They blame it all essentially on "a tiny minority in the United States" and on British television. Because British TV viewers watched Mayor Daley's cops in action in Chicago a few weeks ago, The Economist argues, the forthcoming demonstration in London could turn into a "violent American-style action by a small minority against the whole system of democratic government -- most probably under cover of, and at the same time as, a peaceful mass demonstration."

What to do about it? First off, the TV cameramen "have a special responsibility." Instead of showing "mob scenes that build audiences," they should concentrate on -- if they can find them --

the "20 demonstrators...resolved to break up a meeting."

But "by far the hardest task falls to the police." The Economist pleads for "patience and discipline" but it recognizes that even a London policeman will break when he is "either frightened or angry."

And that being the case, the financial experts have a few suggestions on dispersing the mob. The police "may need to change some of their techniques: for example, horses are ideal for moving football crowds, but may be too vulnerable to really hostile militants. The argument is growing for using water power to supplement manpower as a crowd disperser."

Are the policemen's tactical methods unimportant questions? Not according to The Economist. "What is at stake is the continuance of peaceful democratic government..."

HEALY PROVES A POINT

By Joseph Hansen

An almost perfect example of the polemical methods used by Gerry Healy's Socialist Labour League, a group in Britain that claims to be "Trotskyist," is to be found in the September 14 issue of their official newspaper, The Newsletter.

The sect happens to be confronted with a difficulty. The British bourgeois press has opened a witch-hunt against a mass mobilization scheduled by the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign for October 27 to protest the imperialist aggression in Vietnam and to express solidarity with the heroic resistance of the Vietnamese people.

The Healyites oppose the demonstration inasmuch as it was called by people they disapprove of politically. In accordance with their sectarian views, they refuse to join in the demonstration even though they have the right to carry their own banners in it.

That's hard enough for them to explain. Still worse is the witch-hunt in the bourgeois press. If the Socialist Labour League should rally in any genuine way in defense of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, what happens to the dyed-in-the-wool differences with that group? But if you abstain and say little or nothing, how do you explain that?

Fortunately, from the point of view of the Socialist Labour League, one of the bourgeois papers made it possible to turn the uncomfortable situation into its opposite.

The Guardian, making a show of the "fairness" that is worn almost like a national costume by the hypocritical British bourgeois press, noted that the October 27 demonstration will carry twin slogans, "Russians out of Czechoslovakia -- Americans out of Vietnam." Therefore it would not be right to charge that the organizers of the demonstration are agents of Moscow, unmindful of the crimes of Stalinism.

The September 14 issue of Healy's Newsletter finds a deep lesson in this.

"These 'twin slogans' represent exactly the class position of the 'left' groups now being attended to by 'The Guardian'. They represent a political horizon beyond which the middle class cannot go."

Thus, to believe The Newsletter, "no matter how 'left' the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign and International Socialism think they are, they come out politically precisely in such a way as to chan-

nel all 'protest' back into the 'democratic' capitalist camp."

To bolster this assertion, the anonymous author (could it be Healy who is something of a specialist in this field?) refers his readers to the American political scene.

"As in the USA this camp -- the 'liberal' wing of the Democratic Party -- will endorse both 'twin demands' of the October 27 demonstration."

This argument is hardly strengthened by the fact that it is presented in the form of a prediction. But let it go. The prophetic powers of this polemicist will receive the acid test soon enough.

The argument continues:

"That is why we warned the Socialist Workers' Party (USA) that its anti-war campaigning, if deprived of the class content of a fight to organize the workers' movement against imperialist war and to build a Labour Party in the United States, would lead back into the Democratic camp.

"And this was exactly confirmed: The SWP's 'Militant' carried the twin slogans, against Russian troops in Czechoslovakia, US troops in Vietnam, on August 30, week of the Democratic Convention!" [Emphasis in original.]

!!

As usual with The Newsletter, its reporting was not exactly what ought to be called exact. The August 30 issue of The Militant carried the following headline: "Soviet troops, go home! U.S., get out of Vietnam!"

This was the headline over a statement by Fred Halstead, presidential candidate of the Socialist Workers party, issued exactly on August 21, which was exactly the day following the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia.

It is true that this issue of The Militant was sold in Chicago that week, as it is every week in the year, and not only in Chicago but other cities in the U.S. and abroad. The Chicago supporters of The Militant, however, did not sell it at the Democratic convention -- who would have bought it there even if the police, national guard, and federal troops had let them through the barbed wire?

They sold The Militant, besides other places, among those demonstrating against the Democratic convention and its support of the Vietnam war and its pleasure over Moscow's invasion of Czechoslovakia which was such a windfall to the Democratic machine in its apologies for Johnson's escalation of the war in Vietnam. The sales of The Militant, we may add, were brisk.

Now we come to what Healy himself will no doubt concede is the "payoff."

The August 27 issue of The Newsletter ("the week of the Democratic Convention!"), carried the following headline: "WITHDRAW SOVIET TROOPS NOW!"

Not a "twin" headline, but a "single" headline.

What is this supposed to confirm exactly? That the Socialist Labour League has given up its opposition to the war in Vietnam completely? Or that it just went soft for that one week in order to improve sales at the Democratic convention in Chicago?

Drawing the moral to it all, our anonymous SLL spokesman says: "This is an invaluable experience for the Marxist movement."

We can agree. Stalinist methods of polemic can destroy those that resort to them.

VIETNAM ANTIWAR MARCH PLANNED OCTOBER 26 IN TORONTO

Toronto

A regional conference of the Vietnam Mobilization Committee discussed plans September 14 for a major mobilization against the war on October 26.

Some 125 antiwar activists, representing about thirty organizations, unanimously adopted a proposal to march down the main street in Toronto and hold a rally at City Hall Square.

Howard Petrick, a member of the Student Mobilization Committee in the United States, was a guest speaker. His observations on the growing antiwar sentiment among the GI's drew a warm response.

The conference decided to make support of the GI antiwar struggle an important theme of the October 26 action.

The mobilization will be centered

on three main slogans: "Withdraw U.S. Troops Now"; "End Canadian Complicity"; and "Vietnam for the Vietnamese."

Preparations for similar actions across Canada on October 26 are already under way.

The Canadian Union of Students, the overall organization of English-speaking Canadian students, has voted support. The Ontario Young New Democrats, youth section of Canada's labor party, the New Democratic party, have also voted support. They will send a representative to the Vietnam Mobilization Committee.

HOWARD PETRICK DISCUSSES ANTIWAR SENTIMENT IN U.S. ARMED FORCES

By Paul Swift

Toronto

"Anti-Vietnam-war dissent among American GI's is so great that now, for the first time, the U.S. antiwar movement has a genuine perspective of being able to end the war," Howard Petrick, a former private in the U.S. armed forces, told a conference of the Vietnam Mobilization Committee in this city September 14.

Some 125 persons attended the gathering which decided on plans for participating in an International Day of Protest against the war October 26.

"The student-based antiwar movement can't end the war by itself," said Petrick; "it must reach out to involve the thousands of soldiers who are opposed to the war and who can put a stop to it."

Petrick, who was discharged from the U.S. army for his antiwar views, predicted that an unprecedented number of GI's on active duty would participate in the antiwar activities at the end of October.

He described how easily young draftees come to rebel against the barrage of crude propaganda they are subjected to in the army. They are shown racist "training films" designed to establish the fiendish nature of the Vietnamese guerrillas; they are given lectures on "Know Your Enemy, the Viet Cong." But, Petrick said, "as soon as the guys start to ask searching questions, the classes are canceled."

Evidently the officers want to take no chances on having army policies opened to critical evaluation by the ranks.

Petrick told about a chaplain who was describing the "chain of command" structure to new inductees. Starting with

the privates, the chaplain traced the chain of command all the way up to Johnson, and from there -- where else but to God himself. When the questions started flying, "Does that mean it's a sin to refuse to go to Vietnam?" "Can I disobey an order if I don't believe in God?" the talk came to an abrupt close.

Antiwar groups are inviting GI's to be guest speakers at public meetings and rallies, as well as leafleting bases and selling literature to the troops.

When Petrick did this on his own base, he reported, one antiwar pamphlet or newspaper would be read by fifteen to twenty men.

GI papers against the war are springing up all over the country, he said. Task Force, in the San Francisco-Berkeley area, circulated 8,000 copies in one week.

Other papers, with names like Strike Back, Fatigue Press, Pawn's Pawn, and Fun, Travel and Adventure, are very popular with the GI's.

Army regulations restrict freedom of speech and assembly for the GI's, although this is guaranteed by the constitution. Nevertheless, said Petrick, the army brass is reluctant to court-martial a GI on such issues (like the right to receive antiwar literature in the mail). So they seek to involve the GI in a situation where they can prosecute him for some violation of the regulations.

He cited the case of Pvt. Andy Stapp, who stood on his constitutional rights by refusing an order to open his footlocker, in which he had antiwar literature. They smashed open his locker, confiscated his literature, and then court-martialed him for having a broken footlocker.

LUIS TARUC PARDONED BY PRESIDENT MARCOS

Luis Taruc, former commander of the Huk guerrilla movement in the Philippines, was pardoned by President Marcos

September 11 after he had served 11 years of a 12-year prison sentence. Taruc visited Marcos to thank him for the pardon.

CZECH EVENTS HURT CP IN SWEDISH ELECTIONS

The first test of the repercussions which the Czechoslovak events may have on the West European political balance came in the Swedish elections of September 16. In the vote, which gave the ruling Social Democrats a major victory, reversing the trend in recent years toward the right in Scandinavia, the biggest losers were the Communists and the Liberals.

According to the first tally, the new lineup in parliament is as follows:

- Liberals 33 seats (-10)
- Communists 3 (-5)
- Social Democrats 125 (+12)
- Center 39 (+4)
- Right 32 (-1)
- Other rightists 1 (no change)

The Communists suffered the greatest proportional losses. This is ascribed to the public reaction in Sweden to Moscow's invasion of Czechoslovakia, although Carl-Henrik Hermansson, the party's leader, condemned the Soviet intervention.

Another factor in the CP's defeat

was the division in the party due to the resistance of the old guard around the paper Norrskensflamman to Hermansson's position on the Soviet intervention.*

The Social Democrats seem to have gained as much or more at the expense of the Liberals as at the expense of the CP, but for opposite reasons. The Liberals tried to use the Czech events to whoop up Cold War hysteria, accusing the Social Democrats of taking a soft attitude toward the Soviet intervention.

The Swedish voters apparently were not moved by this demagoguery. Instead, they indicated their approval of the sharply critical stand which the Swedish government has taken against the policy of the Johnson administration in Vietnam.

* An attack by Neues Deutschland, the organ of the East German Communist party, on Hermansson, whom it described as a "typical bourgeois with an unscientific imagination" and a representative of an "anti-Soviet" and "opportunist" tendency, did not promote comradely relations between the two factions in the Swedish CP.

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
DRAWING: Huey P. Newton	801
Campaign Broadens to Reverse Conviction of Huey P. Newton	802
Violent Clashes in Mexico on Eve of Olympic Games	803
Ukrainian Writers Defend Czechoslovaks Against the Kremlin	805
Tunisian University Students Sentenced to Long Prison Terms	807
Majority of the Dominican Left Denounce Soviet Invasion of Czechoslovakia	808
The Immediate Tasks Facing the Revolutionists in France -- by Alain Krivine	809
George Wallace -- Spawn of the Crisis in American Politics -- by Les Evans	811
DRAWING: George Wallace	812
Vote to Dissolve Committee of 100	813
Hugo Blanco Comments on Unrest Among Peruvian Peasants	814
The Students Change the Political Scene in Brazil -- by Ruy Mauro Marini	816
An Interview with Yugoslav Student Rebels	820
The Economist Opts for Hoses Instead of Horses	821
Healy Proves a Point -- by Joseph Hansen	821
Vietnam Antiwar March Planned October 26 in Toronto	822
Howard Petrick Discusses Antiwar Sentiment in U.S. Armed Forces	823
Luis Taruc Pardoned by President Marcos	823
Czech Events Hurt CP in Swedish Elections	824

INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS,

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

New York, N. Y. 10010



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

Martin, Paris 10, France. INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS specializes in political analysis and interpretation of events of particular interest to the labor, socialist, colonial independence, and black liberation movements. Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of Intercontinental Press. Insofar as it reflects editorial opinion, unsigned material expresses the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. Copyright © 1968 by Intercontinental Press.