

# Massive Arrests in Mexico

Can Humphrey  
Pull a 'Truman'?

Hugo Blanco  
Denounces Murders  
in El Fronton



Carlos Sevilla Gonzalez (see page 833)

***Czechoslovakia: First Balance Sheet, First Lessons***

WHY THE MEXICAN GOVERNMENT ORDERED OUT THE TROOPS

By Ricardo Ochoa

Mexico City

SEPTEMBER 22 -- We saw it coming. From the start of its conflict with the students, the government was ready to resort to extreme measures to put down the "agitation." On July 30, when it ordered the army to invade National Preparatory School No. 3, it violated the autonomy of the university, which had not been violated since 1929, the year it was granted -- not even in the worst periods of the crisis in the thirties.

Military intervention in the Ciudad Universitaria [the campus of the University of Mexico], where most of the schools and colleges of UNAM [Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Mexico -- Autonomous National University of Mexico] are located, was presaged in President Díaz Ordaz's fourth annual report to Congress on September 1.

Amid angry denunciations, the political head of the ruling bourgeoisie implied that he would resort to extreme measures to preserve "the principle of state authority."

Despite everything, however, the invasion and military occupation of the Ciudad Universitaria by 10,000 assault troops (paratroopers, presidential guards, etc.) shocked the Mexican people. What surprised them the most was the abruptness of the action.

The presidential report had shown the lengths to which the regime was ready to go. Not only had the student struggle with all its dynamism and militancy caught the bourgeoisie off guard, but it had enraged it. It could not, its leaders felt, give in to these insolent youth without setting off a chain reaction of social and economic demands by other more important and numerous sectors of the population, especially the workers. The bourgeois leaders had drawn their own balance sheet of the events in France.

The Mexican working class does not have at its head a Communist party able to keep the Mexican workers within the framework of purely economic demands once they get going.

The Confederación de Trabajadores de México [Mexican Labor Confederation] is the most important union federation in the country and, after thirty years of enriching themselves at the expense of the workers' interests, the leaders at its head have fallen into total disrepute. The mob of gangsters represented by Fidel Velázquez, which preys on the unions,

maintains itself solely by government support, by police provocation, and if necessary by bayonets. There could be no brake on the Mexican working class in motion such as that represented by the French CP. Furthermore, the weakness of debt-burdened Mexican capitalism itself prevents concessions as great as those made in France in May. Mexican capitalism could not tolerate a massive wage increase comparable to the one granted in France.

There is another circumstance paralleling the French situation in May. The student revolt in Paris occurred in the shadow of the "peace" talks between Washington and Hanoi. In Mexico the Olympic Games are scheduled for October 12.

In his presidential report, Díaz Ordaz referred to the parallel in his own way. According to him, these two cases, as well as the Italian student revolt which "occurred at the same time as the Venice Festival," showed the existence of some kind of international plot to disrupt "internationally important functions."

In reply to this "plot," he said that his government would not submit to blackmail. The Olympics would not make him grant any concessions infringing Mexico's "national sovereignty." It was clear as crystal. He would not yield an inch.

This report served to put new life in the student movement which had sagged somewhat in previous days. It began to build up real steam as preparations were made for a meeting September 7 in the Plaza de las Tres Culturas. The ingenious tactics of the CNH [Consejo Nacional de Huelga -- National Strike Committee] led to a very judicious decision. In order to strip the government once and for all of its arguments that the students' demonstrations were unpatriotic and extremist, the CNH proposed a "Great Silent Demonstration" on September 13.

This became a test of strength between the two contending forces. The government expected a small demonstration, which, in comparison with the previous demonstrations, especially those of August 13 and 27, each of which had brought out a half million demonstrators, would prove that the movement was declining. For the students, on the other hand, this demonstration would show the extent of popular support their struggle had won and the impact made by their counterpropaganda campaign.

September 13 was a triumphal day for the students' cause. This imposing

silent demonstration was as big as the previous ones and, significantly, the non-student contingent was much larger than on the earlier occasions. It was decided in this demonstration not to give the press a single pretext for attacking the students. All the pictures of Che and all the red flags were eliminated. Pictures of Juárez, Zapata, Morelos, Hidalgo, and Villa abounded. The demonstration was marked by its display of Mexican flags and its perfect order.

Without getting involved in sterile polemics it can be justly said that this measure, despite its unpopularity among the students, brought great tactical advantages. There is no doubt that it gained the most popular support of all the demonstrations. In any case, those who criticize this measure as opportunist must take into consideration the enormous backwardness in the political consciousness of the Mexican people, their strong nationalism, and the tremendous campaign waged by the press against the symbols of "communism," which has unfortunately had an effect on the backward sectors of the population.

By agreeing not to carry Che's picture or red flags, the students did something that any real vanguard must do -- avoid getting too far ahead of the people's level of understanding in order not to run the risk of facing capitalist repression alone.

After the great and impressive success of September 13, the movement experienced a powerful new upsurge. This could be seen clearly on September 15, the anniversary of Father Hidalgo's "declaration of independence" [the Mexican independence day]. Following the line of restoring the revolutionary values of the Mexican tradition, the students did not let the opportunity pass to hold great Mexican patriotic celebrations.

They announced that a new "declaration of independence" would be made in four places in Mexico City: in the Ciudad Universitaria, in the Zacatenco Polytechnic School, in the Casco de Santo Tomás at the Polytechnic Institute, and in the Plaza de las Tres Culturas in the downtown area. A similar celebration was also announced for the village of Topilejo. The ceremonies in these various places brought out more than 150,000 people. This was a new real success because those attending the official ceremony in the Zócalo hardly numbered more.

On September 17, after the national celebrations, everyone knew that the CNH would have no difficulty dissuading those few students who wanted to return to classes. Indeed, on that day assembly after assembly decided unanimously to continue the strike.

The government found itself in a very difficult situation. It was losing ground politically. The students' skillful strategy was producing surprising results. The Consejo Nacional de Huelga, which had now moved to the Ciudad Universitaria, was becoming a real rival to the government. It was the embryo of a counter-power to the government which it had vanquished in the student sector. Moreover, behind the students, more massive contingents were beginning to take an interest in these events -- certain sectors of the working class.

Which factor precipitated the hasty military invasion of the Ciudad Universitaria? More than one factor was responsible. The most immediate was the closeness of the Olympics. Although the Mexican bourgeoisie has already resigned itself to not seeing the great commercial success which they hoped for before the student movement was touched off on July 26, it still has stakes in the "sports epic" which it cannot abandon.

With the eyes of the whole world on it, it cannot give the bad impression that a student government exists right next to Olympic City and the Olympic Stadium (which is nothing more than the university stadium decked out for this purpose).

Moreover, the university pool is to be the site of the Olympic competition in water polo. What would the world say about Olympic games played in the midst of a striking university struggling against the government?

There were deeper reasons for the decision to send troops to take over the Ciudad Universitaria. Up to now, despite the extreme radicalism of the student movement in practice and all its success in uniting thousands and thousands of new students, only a vanguard, the political teams, have begun to understand the necessity of a Marxist program, of a strategy going beyond the present demands.

This situation has produced a bourgeois-democratic majority in the leadership of the CNH which, although sometimes loyally expressing the interests of the rank and file, is far in arrears of the real needs of the movement. Tendencies toward overcoming this state of affairs began to develop precisely between the silent demonstration and September 18. The CNH's move from the Polytechnic Institute to the Ciudad Universitaria greatly promoted this development.

The CNH is made up of one delegate from each of the eighty-six striking schools and colleges. The revolutionary Marxist fraction (Trotskyists, Maoists, pro-Cubans) among these delegates is in a distinct minority. Stalinist-type re-

formism, with very pronounced liberal overtones, is dominant within the CNH. But most of the delegates are not locked into this phase.

The majority of students participating in the movement have been politically active for no more than two months. It is logical that the PCM's [Partido Comunista Mexicano -- Mexican Communist party] quite backward notions would suit their freshly awakened consciousness. However, consciousness is not static, although the Stalinist dogmas slow down the mental processes of many unfortunates.

The past two months of struggle have taught this new generation much; and the move the CNH made to the political center represented by the Ciudad Universitaria accelerated this process. Especially contact with schools and colleges of the humanities wing, the traditional fortresses of the revolutionary Marxists, started infusing authentic revolutionary Marxist principles into the movement and not merely the majority of the present leaders.

This was a result, moreover, not of the plans of the Trotskyists, Maoists, or Guevarists. The rank and file first, and later the leaders, were compelled by the very needs of the movement to see the simple truth that a program had to be presented to the strata of the population to which appeals were being made for help. This gave birth to the draft program, "For a Worker-Peasant-Student Alliance," which contained transitional demands.

Among the points included in this draft program dated September 12 at the Ciudad Universitaria were the following: Maintenance and improvement of the standard of living through immediate wage increases and through further increases commensurate with price increases; halting unemployment by cutting the workday; workers control to assure an equitable division of the profits; winning trade-union independence and democracy through the formation of struggle committees elected directly by the workers; a union federation based on these struggle committees; organization of peasant struggle committees to fight for cheap credit available when needed, etc.

The "Draft Program" adds this comment: "We know that the ruling classes will raise a hue and cry and make all sorts of accusations against us. That is of no importance to us. If the government, if the employers and the good Christians, those self-proclaimed patriots, really want to serve the country, that is, the great majority of the Mexican people, let them adopt this program in reality and not in words."

And the "Draft Program" ends on

this final prophetic note: "If tomorrow our educational centers are crushed under the military boot, we will go onto the national political battleground with this program in hand and we will not stop no matter what happens or who falls."

This clear conception of revolutionary and popular struggle sketched in the "draft program" of the CNH must have stirred fear in government circles. This is the only way to explain why they decided to run the great risk entailed in a military occupation of the Ciudad Universitaria.

The political consequences of the occupation were in fact catastrophic. The Consejo Nacional de Huelga described it as such in a leaflet published in El Día on September 21. [For text of leaflet see Intercontinental Press, September 30, p. 804.]

The 10,000 soldiers who occupied the UNAM arrested more than 1,000 persons whom they hauled away to different places. Armored cars and tanks surrounded the grounds of the Ciudad Universitaria. The military even seized parents who were holding an assembly at the time to discuss what attitude to take toward the movement in which their children were participating.

Men and women who just happened to be passing by the Ciudad Universitaria were treated like criminals by the army. A director of the Escuela Nacional de Economía [National School of Economics] was hauled into the police van with the students as she left her office. Finally, dozens of maintenance workers at the university were arrested on the job. The night of September 18 marked the virtual abrogation of civil rights.

The student reaction was not long in coming. There were several clashes between students and granaderos [military riot troops] at the Zacatenco Polytechnic School on September 19. In the afternoon of that day, there were full-scale battles in the center of the city between granaderos and students trying to carry out a protest demonstration. On September 20 clashes continued at Zacatenco and at Vocational School No. 5 in Ciudadela in the very center of the city. In the morning of the same day there were terrorist attacks against Vocational School No. 7 and the Colegio de México [College of Mexico]. The buildings of these two schools were machine-gunned by unknown persons who sped away. An atmosphere of violence gripped the city.

On Saturday, September 21, a bloody battle broke out again between students and the police in the Tlatelolco district, "in the Olympic center of the city," where Vocational School No. 7 is located. The battle lasted from 6:00 in the afternoon

until dawn when the police proved unable to take the school building and once more had to turn the job of suppressing the students over to the army.

There were various attempts to start fires in the course of this battle, one being in the Secretariat of Foreign Affairs where a meeting of the Olympics officials was in progress. Elsewhere, police, who lost their head, fired wildly, wounding a three-year-old girl. Two granaderos were killed and many were wounded.

The Tlatelolco district is a vast residential complex with buildings running as high as twenty stories. Of more than 10,000 families living there, the majority took the side of the students. The residents of these buildings threw buckets of boiling water, stones, and the most diverse items at the granaderos. The desperate police replied by firing gas grenades indiscriminately. A full-fledged battle developed in one of the city's most central areas.

The commotion in the bourgeois communications media was just as frantic. The press published hundreds of different paid advertisements supporting the government. But the reaction was not unanimous. Not all gave unconditional support to the government's extreme steps. Journals linked to the educational system and to Mexico's most important daily, Excelsior, sided with the university rector Javier Barros Sierra, and expressed serious doubts as to the wisdom of such violent measures.

The university rector's words, "The university did not deserve this" and "it was lamentable whether or not it was necessary," indicate the tone of opinion in these bourgeois circles.

In the person of their most prominent spokesman, Barros Sierra, they came under heavy attack. The opposing faction, which is dominant in the government, singled out Barros Sierra for attacks in Congress, in the papers, in the various associations, etc.

The deputies likewise fell into dissension in spite of the monopolistic control the government has over them. The Partido de Acción Nacional [National Action party], a bourgeois liberal party, condemned the intrusion of troops into the Ciudad Universitaria and demanded their immediate withdrawal. The discontent with the government's measure was so great that even the servile Partido Popular Socialista [People's Socialist party -- originally a split to the right from the Communist party] of Lombardo Toledano declared itself against the military occupation, and, not without first demanding "an investigation of the CIA provocateurs," also called for the withdrawal of

the troops.

But most surprising was the reaction of some PRI [Partido Revolucionario Institucional -- Institutional Revolutionary party -- the government party] deputies. Despite the extremely violent tone the speakers took against the students, one PRI deputy said he supported the rector, Barros Sierra, although the line set by the other deputies had been to make him the scapegoat for the unpopular action. However, the deputy who had so freely exercised his right to think for himself was called to order and the following day he rectified his previous stand.

Among the people, repudiation of the government's action was virtually unanimous. However, the terror unleashed by the military action forced the population into silence for the time being.

In the working class, condemnation was expressed only indirectly through a group of independent trade unionists. These workers met September 20 at the UNAM to discuss what action to take.

Most of the hundreds arrested have been released. Some 300 remain who must be either released or indicted. To date the following students and teachers have been formally charged: Francisco Gorillo Moguel, Escuela Nacional de Economía [National School of Economics]; Jorge Tamayo, a professor at the ENE; Romeo González Medrano, chairman of the executive committee of the College of Political and Social Sciences; Julio Boltvinik, of the Colegio de México; and Raúl Arenas Estrada, Salvador Bermúdez Castro, Luis Haro Guzman, Víctor G. Montes Sánchez, Salvador Pérez Macías, and Sergio Estanislao Sáenz Nevarez from other schools and colleges. Thus, ten more political prisoners have been added to the already long list of those confined in Lecumberri.

Besides these, the former editor of the defunct magazine Política, Engineer Manuel Marcué Pardiñas, was arrested in the clashes of September 19. He had been "exposed" by the reactionary press as the "investigator" of the "disturbances." It seems likely that Marcué Pardiñas, who both by age and politics has nothing in common with the student rebellion, is paying for his "crime" of having been the editor of one of the most important revolutionary opposition magazines in contemporary Mexico.

In the same situation as Marcué is the famous professor and former rector of the Nicolaíta de Morelia University (invaded by the army in 1966), Elí de Gortari. It is probable that along with Salomón de Swann, a professor of architecture, and the Guatemalan painter Rina Lazo, he will be formally charged at any moment.

Another who will surely be formally

charged is Lieutenant Benjamín Uriza Barrón. During the fighting in the Tlatelolco district on September 21, he became incensed at the way the granaderos were beating up the students, and shot at three of them, killing one. He will probably be tried by a military court.

And finally, I must conclude this by saying that there are dozens being held whose names have not been released.

\* \* \*

The events that began on July 26 are of great importance. They abruptly changed the political picture, showing unmistakably that the bourgeois theses on the "exceptional character" of the Mexican capitalist system only masked the reality. Mexico is included in the crisis that has blighted the Latin-American continent since the end of World War II. A series of reforms instituted in the thirties did mitigate the effects of this crisis in Mexico to a large extent. That is undeniable.

But once the full crisis caught up with Mexico, the previous lag made it all the more virulent, persistent, and dynamic in its consequences.

If any general conclusion is to be drawn from these events, it is this: The swift tempo with which the crisis has escalated attests to the maturity of the social conditions in the country, of their ripeness for change. The Mexican people, now represented by the student vanguard, have shot ahead, revealing their revolutionary potential.

The Mexican people have made several revolutions in a little more than 150 years, always showing their awareness of the vanguard role they have played in the struggle against Latin America's common enemy. Now this social experience, which prevented the Mexican government from being an open accomplice in imperialism's crimes against socialist Cuba, has emerged to the surface.

In 1968 a new revolutionary epic of the Mexican people looms on the horizon. It is easy to understand the bourgeoisie's panic. The people that it saw in the person of the students is not the tame and amorphous subject of exploitation which the masses were for the last ten years.

Now these masses are more like the mestizo and Indian rebels who fought for independence with Hidalgo and Morelos, against nascent imperialism with Juárez, and with Zapata and Villa for the first modern revolution on the continent. Popular struggles, which may be set off by episodic events, in reality announce the advent of crucial historical stages.

This struggle is beginning where the one in 1958 left off -- in a confrontation with the bourgeois and proimperialist government. But although on the national level the present struggle is starting from where the workers and popular struggle left off in 1958, this struggle, pre-saged by the masses of rebel students, comes in a completely different international context.

The struggle beginning today in Mexico may prove to be the first clarion call of the socialist revolution.

#### THE MILITARY OCCUPATION OF MEXICO'S POLYTECHNICAL INSTITUTE

Mexico City

SEPTEMBER 25 -- In a predawn strike yesterday, federal troops occupied both the Zacatenco and Casco de Santo Tomás units of the Instituto Politécnico Nacional [National Polytechnic Institute].

The military occupation came after the police forces, including both granaderos [militarily armed and trained security troops] and mounted units, proved incapable of suppressing the student protest.

It was the fiercest encounter since July 26 when the Mexican government aroused the ire of the student youth in the capital city by smashing a protest demonstration moving toward the Zócalo [the square where the government palaces are located].

The incidents which culminated yes-

terday in bloodshed at the IPN came after a series of violent clashes between the repressive forces and the students provoked by the army occupation of the University of Mexico campus on September 18.

In the Casco de Santo Tomás district, for the first time in the present conflict, the students resorted to armed self-defense, firing back at the police and even the army.

The same day as the clash in Santo Tomás, "unknown individuals" machine-gunned Preparatory School No. 9 and Vocational School No. 5, wounding several students. Others were savagely beaten when they tried to follow the assailants' car.

This is how La Prensa described the night of September 23-24: "In the most violent brawl since the conflict began, armed students, barricaded in the

Casco de Santo Tomás district, opened fire on the police. Later a barrage of gunfire covered an extensive area of Santo Tomás, whose streets were the scene of burning buses set afire by the students, Molotov cocktails falling on avenues and houses, youth fighting with granaderos, police and civilians wounded by high-powered weapons, and the explosive sounds of rifles and improvised bazookas made by the students."

The fierceness of this struggle is easily explained by the class character of the Instituto Politécnico Nacional. This institution was founded in the thirties by the government of President Cárdenas to turn out the technicians it needed after it had expropriated the petroleum industry and the railroads. It was planned along the lines of the Soviet technical schools for students from worker or peasant backgrounds.

Thus, in contrast to the UNAM [Universitaria Nacional Autónoma de México -- Autonomous National University of Mexico] where most of the students are of petty-bourgeois origin, the IPN has much closer links with the working class and the peasantry. And in accordance with their origin and connections, the students at the Polytechnic, although more backward politically than the students at UNAM, are more radical in action.

The highly technical nature of the courses at the IPN enabled the students there to produce weapons for self-defense. While it is an exaggeration to call them bazookas, they were sufficient to surprise the police with their tear gas, bayonets and clubs.

The students also managed to get some M-1 rifles. According to La Prensa, "members of the armed forces gave them these guns."

La Prensa cited a case:

"For example, the second lieutenant of the First Infantry Battalion, Francisco Rodríguez Villarreal, was arrested at midnight trying to transport arms on a Datsun truck, license number ES-126. These arms included a 45-caliber pistol and an M-1."

The main missiles used by the students in defending themselves, however, were stones; and the granaderos advanced through these to finally make arrests. As is the custom with police in other countries, when they captured students they showered them with club blows.

The battle began at 8 p.m. on September 23 and lasted until the army arrived. The forces of "law and order" included 2,000 soldiers, 13 armored cars, 60 police patrols, and a swarm of judicial and secret agents.

The Polytechnic students had blocked off the Casco de Santo Tomás district with barricades made out of buses, the greatest number being in the Avenida de los Maestros.

At 9:00 a short circuit caused by burning buses threw this vast area into darkness. Dozens of arrests were made. The papers reported four dead, three students and one granadero, though the real figure is unquestionably much higher than the official one.

Yesterday afternoon the Polytechnic students held a meeting in the Plaza de las Tres Culturas in Tlatelolco, the site of Saturday's battle. They then tried to stage a march to the center of the city, but the granaderos dispersed them.

Today, in face of an announcement that a mass demonstration would follow the same route as the two previous ones, that is the principal avenue of the city -- the Paseo de la Reforma -- and the Avenida Juárez, thousands of granaderos and troops blocked traffic throughout this broad section of downtown Mexico City where they supposed the demonstration would pass.

Unable to assemble for the march, groups of students staged lightning meetings throughout the downtown area, setting off a still greater mobilization of the repressive forces.

For a week rumors have persisted that the October Olympic games will be postponed. These rumors may lack substance, but it is a fact that the repression being carried on by the military forces has not spared the athletes already in the city.

For example, a group of young Hungarians heading toward the Olympic City which is near the Ciudad Universitaria were stopped by the soldiers occupying the UNAM campus. Not paying any attention to the command to halt, the Hungarians kept going and were chased and manhandled by the soldiers under the impression that they were Mexican students.

104 OF THE POLITICAL PRISONERS IN MEXICO

The following is a list of the political prisoners in Mexico in the Federal District alone. This includes only those who have been sentenced or indicted. Many others are being held for possible indictment.

Most of those arrested from 1966 to the present have never been brought to trial. They are being held without bail.

The first eighty-five names were released by the Student Struggle Committee in Mexico City, August 24.

Imprisoned since March 28, 1959:  
Demetrio Vallejo Martínez (worker).

Imprisoned since September 10, 1959: Valentín Campa Salazar (worker).

Imprisoned since July 20, 1962:  
Fernando Arizpe Díaz (lawyer), José Santos Bárcenas A. (engineer).

Imprisoned since November 1962: Albino Hernández Haces (professor).

Imprisoned since April 19, 1966:  
Oscar José Fernández Bruno (worker), Teresa Confreta de Fernández (worker), Adolfo Gilly (writer).

Imprisoned since August 12, 1966:  
Víctor Rico Galán (writer), Raúl Ugalde Alvarez (lawyer), Ana María Rico Galán (housewife), Gumersindo Gómez Cuevas (engineer), Rolf Meiners Huebner (doctor), Miguel Cruz Ruiz (doctor) Gilberto Balam Pereira (doctor), Carlos Aguilera Delgadillo (clerk), José Navarro López (peasant), Isaiás Rojas Delgado (professor).

Imprisoned since December 10, 1966:  
Tito Armando Domínguez (doctor), Genaro Jongitud Lara (lawyer).

Imprisoned since January 21, 1967:  
Saul Ornelas Gómez (medical student), Juan Gallardo Moreno (tailor), Margarita Urias Hermosillo (teacher).

Imprisoned since July 13, 1967:  
José Luis Calva Téllez (student), Roberto Iriarte Jiménez (student), Hugo David Uriarte Bonilla (student), Eduardo Fuentes de la Fuente (student), Raúl Contreras Alcántara (student), César Catalán Sanchez (student), Pablo Alvarado Barrera (student), Adán Nieto Castillo (lawyer), Adrián Campos Díaz (peasant), Silvestre Enrique Marengo (clerk), Daniel Camejo Guanche (engineer), Miguel Angel Flores Bernal (worker).

Imprisoned since August 11, 1967:  
Pablo Ramírez Salazar (oil worker), Augusto Danglada Ríos (oil worker), Ramón Sánchez Maza (oil worker), Santiago Sánchez

Bautista (oil worker), Jorge Camacho Avila (oil worker), Alberto Cárdenas Pérez (oil worker), Carlos Esguerra Castro (oil worker), Mario E. Pérez Marín (lawyer).

Imprisoned since November 26, 1967:  
Antonio Gershenson Tafelov (student), Gerardo Peláez Ramos (student), Luis E. Gerardo del Toro (student), Enrique Condes Lara (student), Francisco Luna Leal (student), Fabio Erazo Barbosa Cano (student), Mario Rechi Montiel (student), Justino Juárez Martínez (worker), Miguel A. Reyna de la Cruz (radio announcer).

Imprisoned since July 26, 1968:  
Roberto Gallangos Cruz (student), Arturo Zama Escalante (student), Félix Goded Andreu (student), Rubén Valdespino García (student), Pedro Castillo Salgado (student), César Romero González (clerk), Eduardo de la Vega de A. (clerk), Roberto Miñon Corro (clerk), Fidel Valdovinos Vázquez (clerk), Juan Ferrera Rico (clerk), Luis Aguilar Martínez (worker), David Báez García (worker), Alfredo Sánchez Figueroa (worker), Prisciliano Pérez Anguiano (small businessman), Jesús Guerra Flores (teacher), Arturo Ortiz Marban (engineering student), Gerardo Unzueta Lorenzana (journalist), Joaquín P. Gómez Trujillo (printer), Roberto Alcalá Rosas (printer), Clemente Rivera Martínez (printer), Agustín Montiel Montiel (printer), Rafael González González (printer), José Trujillo Díaz (printer), Leopoldo Velázquez González (printer), Raúl Poblete Sepúlveda (journalist), William Rosado Laporte (artist), Mika Seeger Salter (student).

Imprisoned since July 31, 1968:  
Jessai Díaz Cabrera (student), Salvador Sáenz Nieves (engineer), Mario Hernández Hernández (worker), Adolfo Mejía González (lawyer), Gilberto Rincón Gallardo (lawyer), Fernando Granados Cortes (clerk).

Indicted September 22, 1968, and added to the other political prisoners in Lecumberri:

Carlos Sevilla González (teacher), Manuel Marcué Pardiñas (engineer), Salomón de Swann Oliva (professor), Consuelo Espejel Guerrero (student), Enrique Cárdenas Marín (student), Erasmo Gutiérrez Vargas (student), Adela Salazar Carbajal (lawyer), Jaime Waiss Staider (student), Elí de Gortari (professor), César Nicolás Molina (professor), Armando Castillejos Ortiz (lawyer), Martín Dosal Jottar (professor), Francisco Pérez Rojas (psychologist), José Luis López Rubio (student), Guillermo López Mayo (student), Juan Pablo Fuentes (government clerk), Jaime Goded Andreu (professor), Manuel Vargas Cárdenas (student), and Alfonso González Martínez (student).



MASSIVE ARRESTS IN MEXICO

Around 2,000 people have been arrested in Mexico City, according to the Paris daily Le Monde (September 27). Many of these have been released, but an unknown number have been detained. The arrests are completely arbitrary in most instances. Thus, when the troops occupied the University of Mexico, the police seized even building maintenance employees and people who happened to be on the campus to do research work in the library.

The government has now begun to indict many of those arrested. The indictments are as arbitrary as the arrests, one of the main grounds on which the police are proceeding being association, past or present, with any of the known militant radical tendencies.

Infractions of the law are charged on various counts so that, if proved, the victim would be subject to a long prison term. Because of the severity of the possible sentence, the defendant is then denied bail.

However, no time is set for trial.

The defendant may sit in prison for years without being given his day in court. This is the situation with most of the political prisoners and is one of the reasons for the insistent demand of the students that all of them be freed at once.

A typical case is the one involving Carlos Sevilla González [see front cover]. A member of the staff of the National Polytechnical Institute and the Popular Preparatory School, he was seized along with hundreds of others when the troops invaded the campus.

According to a report we have received from Mexico, he has been accused of a formidable list of charges that cannot possibly stand up in court. The real reason why he was indicted appears to be merely that he is well known in university circles as a leading Trotskyist.

Le Monde reports that demonstrations in solidarity with Mexico's political prisoners have already occurred in Paris and Stockholm. Undoubtedly similar demonstrations will occur in other cities around the world.

MEXICAN POLITICAL PRISONERS VOICE THANKS FOR SOLIDARITY

[The letter below, dated September 25, was signed by seventeen political prisoners held in Lecumberri prison in Mexico City. The appeal, in our opinion, deserves the widest possible circulation.]

\* \* \*

From the Lecumberri prison in Mexico City, we the undersigned, who are among the political prisoners of various tendencies confined here, wish to send you our fraternal greetings. We salute your solidarity with the struggles of the Mexican students and the Mexican people

The government of President Díaz Ordaz has systematically violated the democratic rights of the people.

During the past few weeks, there have been huge peaceful demonstrations of as many as 700,000 persons in front of the Presidential Palace.

The Mexican government's answer to these demonstrations has been violent repression. The jails and military camps of Mexico are crowded with political prisoners.

Under these circumstances, the people of Mexico are defending themselves by

all means necessary. This struggle promotes the development of a revolutionary vanguard of our people.

In this context, international solidarity is of great importance for our struggle, which is an integral part of the Latin-American revolution.

Long live the international solidarity of the working people!

Down with Yankee imperialism!

Long live the unbreakable unity of the peoples of the USA and Mexico!

Miguel Cruz Rúa  
Daniel Camejo Guanche  
Jesús Guerra Flores  
Jessai Díaz Cabrera  
Adrian Campos Díaz  
Mario Rechi Montiel  
Alejandro Pérez  
Pablo Alvarado Barrera  
Miguel Angel Flores  
Carlos Sevilla González  
Roberto Miñon Corro  
Isaías Rojas Delgado  
César Catalán  
Alfredo Sánchez Figueroa  
Raúl Ugalde  
Raúl Contreras Alcántara  
Gilberto Balam Pereira

From the Czechoslovak Press

SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY AND INTERNATIONALISM

By Ilios Jannakakis

[One of the principal objectives sought by the Kremlin in the occupation of Czechoslovakia was to end freedom of the socialist press. And one of the main targets under fire was Literární Listy, which provided a forum for critical thought.

[When Literární Listy went underground after the invasion, the Soviet occupiers continued their relentless effort to track down its editors. Pravda, for instance, on September 1 described the weekly newspaper as a "vipers' nest" and said that it was "continuing to play its evil role as one of the chief ideological centers of the counterrevolution" and "carrying on just as though nothing had happened."

["The sooner the nest is wiped out, the better for the Czechoslovak people and intellectuals whose minds it is poisoning," Pravda continued.

["It is plain to every sensible person that this game cannot go on. The counterrevolutionary forces must be curbed, and curbed they shall be."

[As an example of the kind of material that was appearing in Literární Listy and that was so obnoxious in the eyes of the Moscow bureaucracy, we are publishing below an article which appeared in the June 18 issue. Those who believe that there must have been some substance to all the Kremlin's frenetic propaganda about a "counterrevolutionary" danger in Czechoslovakia are invited to study the article with careful attention.

[The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

One of the most serious consequences of the so-called period of deformations was the debasement of "proletarian internationalism" among the masses to a meaningless slogan, to opportune and opportunistic propaganda. This reduction of internationalism as action, involvement, and a moral value to a conventional "pose" established by directives and devoid of initiative helped in large measure to produce a total stagnation of political life.

This process of the abasement of proletarian internationalism has its origins in the Stalinist policy toward the individual Communist movements. An unalterable principle of this policy can be

expressed this way: in serving the immediate interests of the Soviet Union, you serve the long-term interests of the world proletariat.

This principle took the form of a dogma excluding any consideration of the interests of the other Communist movements. Unquestioning subordination of the world movement to a single center (the Comintern and later the Cominform) meant that the Communist parties were sacrificed. The Communists in foreign countries were placed in a dilemma. They had to defend a policy often in contradiction to their own tactical objectives.

Total fusion of parties and states in a series of countries make it virtually impossible for Communists to take any position of their own in regard to international events. In a broader sense, the solidarity of various layers of the population with this or that development was only an expression of diplomatic relations among states, not a demonstration of any real moral or other involvement in concrete struggles of democrats in other countries.

It is one of the most tragic paradoxes in the socialist world that neither Communists nor other citizens receive accurate, objective information about what is going on in other revolutionary movements. What is worse, they get "tendentious" information totally out of line with reality. This lack of information combined with the almost complete indifference of a people enmeshed in primitive "economism," whose indifference is magnified by a feeling of absolute helplessness with regard to changing anything in their country -- all these factors nourished a narrow blind nationalism of the worst variety and made an anti-internationalist of socialist man.

Another important manifestation of this distortion of proletarian internationalism should also be stressed -- mistrust. The terrible heritage of Stalinism has caused more damage to the Communist movement than all the direct attacks of the class enemy.

The fate of the foreign Communists who took refuge in the USSR before the war is still shrouded in tragic mystery. A foreign Communist was immediately doubly suspicious, as a foreigner and as a Communist. This is a further paradox which should be explained to the socialist public. This distrust also extended to the other socialist countries. As a result

visits by "unofficial" foreign Communists, that is those not officially recommended by their respective parties, were limited as much as possible.

These obviously are only some of the more superficial manifestations of the debasement of internationalism. The deeper cause of this policy of "directives" which deformed all expressions of solidarity and aid -- which "rectified" whole lectures and resolutions and, most importantly, ignored the intellectuals and students (two of the most active social strata in the West) -- was the great gap between the words and deeds of the Communist parties which had achieved power.

On the other hand, it cannot be forgotten that the socialist world has helped the great postwar revolutionary movement materially and politically and is continuing to do so. Such help, however, is often given not only to real progressive movements but to openly anti-socialist states and governments as well. All this is "justified" by economic or diplomatic considerations.

Such justification, however, further confuses and discredits the concept of proletarian internationalism; it deprives it of its ethic. And this is all the more true because there is often an attempt to suppress everything that does not conform strictly to the line being advanced. Sapped by its contradictions, this deformed concept of internationalism becomes a mere meaningless slogan in the minds of the masses, which often merely covers up the expedients of an immoral policy.

There are many examples of this. Let us mention only the most outrageous. Except for one good article by J. Boučka in Plamen (1963) and a short note in Rudé Právo, not a single word has ever been said about the fate of the Egyptian Communists under Nasser, about the terrible concentration camps in the desert, or about the use of torture in questioning, or about the Egyptian police being directed by Nazi war criminals. Nor was anything said about the fate of the Syrian Communists at the height of the Egyptian-Syrian union.

Reports smuggled out of the Egyptian prisons, statements exposing the arbitrary actions of the military government, and, of course, resolutions of illegal organizations received no notice in the socialist world. Even in the case of Ben Bella and the Algerian Communists, there was not one "guideline" to arouse public opinion, not one committee went to work to determine what was going on or to appeal for justice in behalf of the political prisoners.

The situation was all the more senseless because the official propaganda of the socialist countries praised governments which the Arab Communists sharply criticized. Instead of public analysis of the complex problem of the regimes in those countries, myths were fostered. No one should be surprised that these myths had to be paid for dearly later on.

There is also the case of Vietnam. And here in this concrete case we must make a comparison with the situation in the West. If any event has aroused public opinion in the West, it has been that war. We find Vietnam everywhere, on the street corners, in the newspapers, in meetings. This subject stands out in all discussions. The public is provided with detailed information on all aspects of the war. The West is involved in this war and demonstrations of solidarity there are not gestures but means of applying real pressure.

The lofty calm that reigns in the rest of Europe [the East] on this subject contrasts starkly. It must be stated that socialist public opinion has remained outside this outspoken movement of solidarity. The organized meetings and resolutions have expressed only "guidelines" from the top and have been strikingly cool.

The same is true for Greece. There is a yawning gap between the feverish activity in the West and the indifference in the socialist countries. Public opinion in the Western countries is outraged at the coup d'état and there are stormy demonstrations of solidarity with the Greek democrats. In the other countries [of Eastern Europe] there is an almost total lack of the most elementary solidarity.

Latin America, differences in the revolutionary movement, Che Guevara, the Tricontinental Congress, and the Cuban policy are spoken of only in whispers. It was a long time before even a little reliable information about China began to appear and the situation is not much better with respect to Africa.

The lack of information, of initiative, the immediate interests of state diplomacy combined with "directives" from the party apparatus, the narrow economism that marked the mentality of the people -- all these separate deformations together created an atmosphere of total resignation in which everything was run from above. This resulted in a demobilization of public opinion on national problems which in turn caused all strata of the population to lose any sense of internationalism.

Today, when the democratization of public life is giving the Czechoslovak people experience in international affairs, the demand is arising among the broadest strata of the nation -- though still tim-

idly -- for support from world progressive opinion. And, at the same time, the people are becoming conscious that they cannot remain indifferent to developments affecting other countries.

This reawakening may mark the

HUEY NEWTON'S SENTENCE: "UP TO FIFTEEN YEARS" -- 29,000 DEMAND HIS FREEDOM

Black Panther party leader, Huey P. Newton, was sentenced to a possible fifteen years in prison September 27 by Oakland, California, Judge Monroe Friedman.

Newton was convicted of "voluntary manslaughter" earlier in the month in a frame-up trial for the death of an Oakland cop in October, 1967.

The indefinite sentence is a peculiarity of California law. In a felony conviction, the actual length of time spent in prison is determined arbitrarily by a state parole board, with only an upper and lower limit set at the time of the original trial. Newton must serve a minimum of two years before he will be eligible for parole, but he can be held the full fifteen years at the whim of parole officials.

Despite a national and international campaign in Newton's behalf, Friedman arrogantly rejected a series of motions presented by defense counsel Charles R. Garry at Newton's sentencing. Friedman refused to grant a new trial, despite his own admission the last day of the trial that new evidence had invalidated a central point in the testimony of the key

first step toward revival of a spirit of internationalism purged of formalism. One of the gauges of real democratization, of democratic socialism is undoubtedly the extent to which citizens from different strata of the population are involved in the events which are milestones in the development of the world we live in.

prosecution witness. The jury, which had already begun its deliberations when the change in the testimony was discovered, was not informed of the change.

Friedman also refused to grant Newton probation, and would not even allow the black liberation fighter to be released on bail while his case is being appealed.

A massive response was evident throughout the country in support of Huey Newton. Defense Attorney Garry presented petitions to the judge demanding Newton's freedom signed by 29,301 people. The petitions called Newton "an honest, dedicated, loyal and selfless human being" who is "needed by the community."

Even the New York Times said "he stood proudly" as he was being sentenced. Afterward he was taken immediately to his cell without even being allowed to consult his lawyer on plans for his appeal.

As he left the courtroom, he gave the clenched fist salute to the Black Panther members in the audience, and cried, "Power to the people!" The audience shouted back, "Power to the people! Free Huey!" and returned the salute.

STUDENT REVOLT HITS SOUTH AFRICA

Even under South Africa's fascist-like regime, the worldwide revolutionary student rebellion is having its impact. White students at Witwatersrand University in Johannesburg staged a demonstration September 10 despite threats of a government crackdown. Significantly the students were protesting the suspension of about 200 black students from the all-black Fort Hare University in southeastern Cape Province. The black students had been suspended for refusing to end a sit-in the previous week.

A September 10 Reuters dispatch referred to "student unrest sweeping the country."

The Witwatersrand students carried out their campus demonstration after be-

ing refused permission for a demonstration in the streets of Johannesburg.

The country's minister of police, Lourens Muller, took the occasion to repeat an earlier threat by prime minister Vorster that "steps would be taken" against the student protesters "if necessary."

To prepare the government's move against the students, a "judicial commission of inquiry" was appointed September 10 to investigate radical activities at white universities.

So far the students have stood firm in their rejection of government interference in academic activities in either white or black universities.

GOMULKA PUTS KURON'S AND MODZELEWSKI'S ATTORNEY ON TRIAL

Wladyslaw Sila-Nowicki, a prominent Polish lawyer, was put on trial in Warsaw September 25 on charges of allegedly possessing documents "deemed harmful to the interests of the state." The trial is being held behind closed doors, neither the public nor newsmen being allowed to observe the proceedings.

Sila-Nowicki has acted as defense counsel for many revolutionary political opponents of the Gomulka regime, includ-

ing Jacek Kuron and Karol Modzelewski, the two young lecturers at Warsaw University who were jailed in 1965 for distributing their famous open letter to the Polish CP calling for a political revolution to restore socialist democracy.

An announcement on the door of the Warsaw court the day the trial opened said Kuron and Modzelewski would be called as witnesses in the case. They are both presently in prison, having been rearrested during the student demonstrations this spring. A third witness, who was also defended by Sila-Nowicki, is to be Nina Karsow, who was sentenced to three years in prison in October of 1966 for comments critical of the regime which she had jotted down in a private diary.

This trial comes in the wake of sharp attacks in the Polish press on the democratic reforms in Czechoslovakia, and is evidently aimed at intimidating opposition tendencies in Poland itself. In addition, the trials of the students arrested last spring are slated to begin soon -- Kuron and Modzelewski themselves will go on trial again in the near future -- and the Polish bureaucrats are interested in discouraging lawyers from appearing on behalf of the students.

Wladyslaw Sila-Nowicki fought in the underground against the Nazis. Later, he spent nine years in Stalinist prisons. He is presently charged under Article 24 of the Small Penal Code and can receive up to five years in prison if convicted.

Although the specific counts have not been made public, he is evidently accused of having in his possession oppositional political material. He has maintained that these were documents relating to cases in which he was defense counsel, and were required for the preparation of an adequate defense. Under Article 24 "those who possess such documents because of their profession" are excluded from prosecution. The fact that Polish authorities are proceeding in violation of this law indicates the vindictive nature of the trial.



WLADYSLAW GOMULKA

DISSENSION IN BELGIAN CP OVER SOVIET INTERVENTION IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

In another sign of the division which the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia has provoked in Moscow-line Communist parties throughout the world, the Central Committee of the Belgian Communist party, meeting in Brussels on September 21-22, accepted the resignation of one of its members, Théo Dejace, who had opposed his party's condemnation of the

Soviet intervention in the internal affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

The Central Committee noted with regret that his resignation deprived Dejace of the opportunity to continue participating in the internal dispute in the committee over this issue.

HUGO BLANCO DENOUNCES MURDER OF PRISONERS IN EL FRONTON

[Fears were aroused recently that the Peruvian peasant leader Hugo Blanco had fallen victim to the death-camp regime on the penal island of El Frontón despite the worldwide protests against the harsh treatment he has received from the government of Belaúnde Terry.

[The basis of this apprehension was the report that Hugo Bravo Elías, an inmate of El Frontón whose name is similar to Blanco's, had been murdered.

[As Hugo Blanco explains below, Bravo and his friend "Ojón," both of whom had been captured by the police after escaping from El Frontón, were beaten to death by the prison guards. Blanco assembled the testimony of his fellow prisoners on these crimes and sent a letter to the editor of the Lima daily Ojo. This was published on September 12. The letter also exposed the prison administration's plans for mass reprisals to cover up its actions.

[While Blanco was not among the latest victims of El Frontón, it is clear that his courageous exposure of these murders, including the names of those implicated, puts his life in greater danger than ever.

[The translation of Hugo Blanco's letter, as published by Ojo, is by Inter-continental Press.]

\* \* \*

"I express," Blanco said, "the gratitude of all the prisoners for the interest you and your paper have taken in shedding light on the latest murders committed by the Guardia Republicana [Republican Guard] on this island.

"It is important to point out," Blanco noted, "that the statements were made to the ministers [who carried out an investigation] by eyewitnesses who risked future reprisals -- direct or indirect, delayed or immediate."

Blanco's version of what happened continues: "The most important statement was made by a prisoner who works in the office adjacent to the 'Casa de Drácula' [Dracula's Place] which is where these latest murder victims were tortured.

"On August 21 at 10:15 in the morning, he saw a Marine launch arrive carrying several persons, among them the escapees. Guardia Republicana Captain Arévalo began kicking them at the pier and the guards began beating them with clubs, forcing them to run to the Secretariat.

"Second Lieutenant Villacorta

joined the group. Together they brought the escapees into the torture room just as Captain Gil arrived. He said: 'What is going on here? I want to talk to them.'

"The prisoners were stripped and their clothing taken to the inspection office. Lieutenant Anaya and Second Lieutenant Pimentel went up and started to beat up the prisoners, ordering the guards to help them.

"The second lieutenant kicked them and the guards beat them with clubs. The torture victims were naked and their heads were shaved. They were set in different poses in different ways -- with their hands behind their necks, backs exposed, with one hand behind the neck and the other flexed over the shoulder. Muffled cries were heard in 'Dracula's Place' but more clearly a sound like a resounding drum.

"Captain Bobbio gave orders to the officials from the lower part of the inspection office. Food was brought to the torture victims but they weren't able to eat it.

"During the afternoon mess, blows rained down on them. Shifts of three or four Guardias Republicanas alternated. As the prisoners kneeled, they were kicked and beaten on the thighs, on the back, on the chest, and all over their bodies.

"One of them said, 'Sir, I have had enough, don't beat me.' The answer he got was 'Shut up, you son of a bitch,' and a hard blow on the neck. 'Ojón' begged, 'Sir, I am going to die.' The unrelenting Sergeant Montúfar Sr. answered, 'I want you to die, you mother -----'. You kill us with one blow, we will kill you by inches.'

"Later the prison was locked up for the night. The intensity of the shouts and blows increased as the group was reinforced under the command of Sergeants Montúfar and Landa.

"When the prisoners fell during beatings, the guards forced them with kicks to get up and kneel. Hugo Bravo fell limp. They threw water on him, they stamped on him, but he didn't get up again. 'Ojón' shouted, 'Let me go, I'm strangling,' and tried to get up. The guards forced him back down on his knees with kicks. 'Call the nurse, I'm dying,' he said, his voice breaking, and he fell, blood pouring from his mouth.

"The officers and soldiers headed by Bobbio held a meeting. An infirmary aid was present, a mirror in his hand. There was a typewriter. That day they locked us

prisoners up earlier than ever before.

"On the following day, they wanted the prisoner who told us what happened to make two false statements. He refused indignantly, despite veiled threats.

"It is important to note that this compañero works in the office next to 'Dracula's Place' and that some of the scenes he described were seen by him through an open door and others through orifices in an inner door which the Guardia Republicana didn't know about. The ministers later confirmed this.

"Solón Poma said that the guards woke him up to cut the handcuffs off one of the dead prisoners because they had become imbedded in the bone. He refused in spite of threats. He reported that at 11:50 p.m. he saw the launch leave in which Sergeant Landa and the nurse Díaz Ninatanta took away the two bodies.

"The Guardia Republicana tried to get the prison to mutiny. They beat us without cause and subjected us to innumerable humiliations. They made us go along dusty ramps covered with excrement, both in going for our meals and as well as in going to meet visitors. All this in a pointless way. These goads, which are applied under different wardens, show a deliberate plan to provoke protests which could justify a massacre.

"That was why they murdered 'Negro Caycho' on a previous occasion. Kneeling, his arms crossed, he was shot in the back in front of everyone.

"The facts were revealed to the ministers in the presence of the former warden of El Frontón, Díaz Solari (now a major), who introduced the regime of terror, including beatings of political prisoners.

"In addition to these accusations, the prison personnel were charged with exacting fees for the use of different parts of the island and of collecting a percentage from the prisoners who made baskets, shoes, etc. Major Díaz Solari

answered these accusations by saying, 'It is absurd to believe prisoners.' He repeated this even when the prisoner Carlos Vigil Silva displayed a receipt signed by the major for a cut of the profits. (We have a lot of these receipts.)

"Later Díaz Solari told another officer, 'These prisoners should be sent to El Sepa.' We thought that 'accidents' might happen to them there, since El Sepa is very far from Lima, further than the murderous prison of El Frontón.

"In conclusion, I will list the hangmen we denounced to the ministers:

"Guardia Republicana Captain Daniel Gil Farfán, the former deputy warden.

"Captain Luis Bobbio (who gave most of the orders).

"Captain Carlos Arévalo Tenazoa.

"Lieutenant Fortunato Anaya.

"Second Lieutenants Moisés Pimentel Bustamante and Jorge Villacorta Villacrés (who participated in the murders).

"Sergeant Virgilio Landa Guillén.

"Sergeants Gamarra and Montúfar Sr.

"Corporal Eriberto Asto Vela.

"Privates Juan Espinoza García, Jesús Carrión López, Esteban Torres Lira, and Víctor Avalos.

"We make this accusation, sir [the editor of Ojo], despite threats and despite the fact that our lives will be in danger from now on because we do not believe that the ministers who came to El Frontón to pay their respects to the Year of Human Rights will make these things public.

"In the name of the prisoners of El Frontón who respect you and trust you, I thank you again for publishing this report.

"Hugo Blanco Galdós."

#### BRAZILIAN CP LEADER CALLS FOR ARMED STRUGGLE

Dedicating his statement to "Che Guevara whose example will bear its fruits throughout Latin America," Brazilian Communist leader Carlos Marighela called on the left in his country to turn toward armed struggle.

The object of this struggle, he declared in his statement, which was published in the Rio de Janeiro daily Jornal do Brasil of September 16, is to destroy

"the military personnel of American imperialism and the military forces of the Brazilian 'gorillas.'"

Marighela, who was expelled from the pro-Moscow Brazilian CP of Luis Carlos Prestes, said that the revolutionary fighters of Latin America must look for their inspiration and support to Cuba, which is "the vanguard of the Latin-American revolution."

CAN HUMPHREY PULL A "TRUMAN"?

All the polls show Humphrey to be running far behind Nixon in the U.S. presidential race. The Harris survey, for instance, showed Humphrey trailing Nixon by 31 percent to 39 percent in mid-September. According to a Columbia Broadcasting System survey released September 23, if the election were held then, Nixon would win by a landslide in the electoral college, with Wallace, the Southern demagogue, gaining second place.

The Democratic machine is reported by the more sensationalistic correspondents to be in "despair," and by the more political ones to be preparing for a Republican victory and a swing of the pendulum back to the Democrats in 1972.

Humphrey, doing his utmost to present the image of the Happy Warrior -- in imitation of Alfred E. Smith in 1928 -- is trying to counter the impression created by the polls that he is a "loser."\* He refers constantly in his speeches to the victory of Harry S. Truman in face of the findings of the pollsters in 1948 that he was certain to lose to the Republican candidate, Thomas E. Dewey.

Humphrey's effort to remind the American people of Truman's victory in 1948 deserves to be cited in the textbooks as fresh proof of the old adage that a drowning man grasps at straws. Can he have forgotten what Truman's victory brought the country?

The outstanding achievement of the Truman administration was to plunge the U.S. into the Korean war.

If Humphrey has forgotten this, the voters haven't. To remind them of Truman is to remind them of Korea, a good way to bring their anger and bitterness over Vietnam to the boiling point.

An analogy? Humphrey would do much better to refer to 1952 -- which is more recent than 1948 anyway -- when Truman left office, one of the most despised and hated of presidents.

Humphrey's handlers, as is the habit in their trade, consider the problem to be "bad image." They are doing their best to rectify this, an unpromising task in view of the refractory material they

---

\* In the abysmally corrupt and cynical school of American capitalist politics, a candidate always seeks the aura of being a "winner" in accordance with the propaganda that a vote cast for a "loser" is wasted, even if his platform represents the voter's deepest convictions and wishes.



RUNNING SCARED

have been condemned to work with.

First as to looks. His gray hair has disappeared, lost presumably in a hair-coloring parlor. However, this does not seem to have impressed the youth of today. Perhaps an inch longer might help, or they might try a beard on him, although time for that is running out.

Much worse is the man's garrulity. The photographers seem unable to catch him with his mouth shut. It's not that it hangs perpetually open. The jaw simply swings too fast. This is why Nixon's handlers are succeeding in building up their man's "charisma" through the strategy of having him say absolutely nothing.

Worst of all is the brutal fact that no matter what Humphrey does, the Johnson look keeps showing through. That is what is sinking him, the way the Truman look sank Adlai Stevenson in 1952.



GREECE IS STILL IN A "PLASTER CAST"

The new constitution, which the military regime unveiled for public inspection in Athens September 16, is a monument that is certain to be hailed by all those appreciative of the art that goes into sculpturing a fig leaf.

The State Department patrons of the military junta can congratulate themselves for what they have done to make it possible for Greece to again be listed as a democracy.

The Greek people voted on the new constitution September 29. The junta's forecast that the "yes" vote would be overwhelming was borne out with remarkable accuracy. The reason for their assurance in making the prognostication is indicated by the following UPI dispatch, datelined Athens, September 26:

"Mr. Emmanuel Karapiperis was sentenced by an Athens military tribunal on Tuesday to two years in prison. He was arrested a few days ago for having printed and distributed a leaflet asking voters to vote 'no' in the coming referendum on the constitution. The tribunal found Mr. Karapiperis guilty of 'antinational' plotting.

"The defendant was not present at his trial. The reason for his absence was not known."

With the referendum, the constitution goes into effect. However, the junta is to decide when to apply the provisions protecting individual rights, freedom of speech, the right of association and of assembly, the right to form political parties; when to apply the rules governing political trials, censorship, and elections; and when to make effective the articles forbidding drumhead courts and entry into homes without a warrant.

The secrecy of private mail is guaranteed, but the guarantee can be suspended in the interests of national security, public order, or a criminal investigation. No date is indicated for the first elections to be held under the constitution. When they are held, it will be under the auspices of the junta.

To make absolutely clear how democratic the new constitution really is, Premier George Papadopoulos spelled it out September 16. In promising to release all detained former politicians, "except Communists," he said: "I hope they will not make another false step and force me to put them away again."

And in releasing two former premiers, George Papandreou and Panayotis Canellopoulos, from house arrest Septem-



GEORGE PAPADOPOULOS

ber 23, Papadopoulos said, "I hope they will not make another false step that will force me to put them back into a plaster cast."

The reference was to a statement made by the dictator the previous week: "The country is still in a plaster cast because the fractures have not healed. The cast will be kept on even after the referendum so that it should not become necessary at a later date to suspend the constitution again."

## NEWSPAPER STRIKE IN INDIA WINS PARTIAL GAINS

By Kailas Chandra

Bombay

The long, history-making strike of 15,000 newspaper employees, including journalists, in twenty-one major big-business newspapers has ended with only partial gains for the employees. The strikers in most of the newspaper establishments in three metropolitan cities -- Bombay, Delhi and Calcutta -- except those of the Times of India group, returned to work on September 18 and 20, after staying out for fifty-seven to fifty-eight days. The Times of India in Bombay and Delhi reopened on September 23.

The strike, which started July 23, ended after the central government issued an order referring the entire dispute, arising out of the nonimplementation of the "award" given by a wage board to printshop workers last year, to a national tribunal presided over by a high-court judge.

The order, however, ensures that employees will receive at least 75 per cent of the benefits due to them under the wage-board award while the tribunal's inquiry is pending.

Although the central labour minister, Hathi, was committed in parliament to getting the wage-board awards for journalists and nonjournalists implemented in full, he finally succumbed to the pressure of the newspaper tycoons by agreeing to send the dispute to the national tribunal. While the printshop workers' award will be arbitrated upon by the tribunal, the journalists' award has been challenged before the Supreme Court.

Newspaper management have, however, stated that there will be no victimisation of the strikers. The newspaper employees demonstrated unprecedented solidarity and unity in action. Nevertheless they have gone back to work with a sense of dissatisfaction and a feeling that they could have won better concessions had the leadership of the All-India Newspaper Employees Federation [AINEF], representing the printshop workers, acted with greater imagination and foresight.

In following the back-to-work call, a split took place in the leadership of the AINEF between its president, S.Y. Kolhatkar, (belonging to the Left Communist Party of India [CPI]), and general secretary K.L. Kapur (belonging to the Right CPI). The Indian Federation of Working Journalists (of which S.B. Kolpe, a leading Trotskyist journalist, is secretary-general) participated in the strike mainly as an act of solidarity with nonjour-

nalist employees, since the demands of the journalists were not directly involved in the strike.

Apart from the undemocratic handling of the strike by the AINEF leadership, which did not involve the rank-and-file members at various stages, what contributed to the partial setback of the strike was the fact that the opportunist leaderships (CPI, Praja Socialist party, Samyukta Socialist party, etc.) of the central trade-union organisations failed to rally to the support of the striking newspaper employees. Instead of widening the scope of the struggle, the AINEF leadership got itself bogged down in protracted negotiations with the government and newspaper proprietors in the midst of the action, creating false hopes among the workers that a favorable settlement was pending.

A coordination committee of trade-union organisations, including the All-India Trade Union Congress, Hind Mazdoor Sabha (PSP), Hind Mazdoor Pancharat (SSP), UTUC (RSP), Bank and Insurance employees unions, with IFWJ secretary-general Kolpe as its convener, issued a call for a general strike in Bombay (to be synchronised with similar actions in Delhi and Calcutta) on September 4 in support of the strike. But the action was deferred by leaders of the CPI, PSP, and the SSP on the plea that they would organise a nationwide general strike on September 19 in support of 3,000,000 central government employees, whose organisations had called for a token general strike on that day in behalf of the demand for a need-based minimum wage.

The trade-union bureaucrats, who were under pressure from their rank-and-file members to join in common action, hoped, perhaps, that the newsmen's strike would not last till September 19.

When the question of joint solidarity action for the newspaper and central government employees on September 19 did come to the fore, however, the leaders of the central trade unions pulled out of their commitments on the plea that they did not have sufficient time to prepare for an all-India general strike. Leaders of the newspaper employees, who were to call off their strike in some establishments on September 18, were prepared to extend their strike for a day if the trade-union leaders were prepared for a general strike on September 19 in Bombay and other big cities. But the trade-union bosses refused to go into action, demonstrating the bitter truth that it is they who constitute the main roadblock in the

path of the working-class movement developing along militant lines.

Meanwhile the central government had issued an ordinance banning the September 19 strike of government employees and threatening drastic action against those who would participate in the strike or support it. On the eve of the strike, all prominent leaders of the Confederation of Central Government Employees and Workers were arrested for violation of bans on meetings or as a preventive measure.

Among those arrested in Bombay was K. Ramachandran, regional convener of the Joint Council of Action of the Confederation and general secretary of the Central Public Works Department Workers Union (western region), of which G.S. Joshi, a Trotskyist, is president. (Ramachandran is also secretary of the Bombay committee of the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party.)

Feeling betrayed by the traditional leadership of the central trade-union organisations, and buckling under government threats, some of the government employees unions withdrew their strike notices at the last moment.

The Central Joint Council of Action stuck to its decision but the outcome on September 19 showed that the strike was only partial -- 1,000,000 out of 3,000,000 responded to the call. The posts and telegraph departments and the Central Public Works Department were completely paralysed by the strike all over India. The defence establishments, railways and administrative offices were only partially affected.

Ten workers were killed by police firings in different parts of the country. A striker who sat down on a rail track in Punjab to prevent the movement of trains was run over and killed. In Delhi, the police entered the headquarters of the Central Public Works Department and beat up employees and officers.

More than 7,500 striking employees have been arrested by the government in different states. Most of these are expected to be sacked under the ordinance issued by New Delhi for participating in the strike.

S.M. Joshi, chairman of the Central Joint Council of Action (an SSP leader), who was arrested in Bombay on September 18, has been on a hunger strike protesting police repression.

The government employees have not been demoralized as a result of these measures. In fact, their unions are moving

in the direction of an indefinite strike to realise their demands. The posts and telegraph workers have begun agitation in different parts of the country demanding immediate reinstatement of union leaders who have been either dismissed or disbanded by the government.

A big agitation has been mounted in New Delhi demanding the institution of judicial enquiry into the police excesses.

There is no sense of defeat anywhere. In fact the leaders of the central trade-union organisations who ran away from the field are also realising the necessity of putting up a rear-guard resistance to the government.

The strike has created a governmental crisis between New Delhi and the Left CPI-led ministry of Namboodiripad in Kerala, which is supposed to have adopted a lenient policy in relation to the central government employees who were on strike on September 19.

The centre has accused the Kerala government of not carrying out its orders properly. Namboodiripad has, however, defended the action of his government on the plea that the centre acted without prior consultation with the state government.

Leaders of the All-India Port and Dock Workers Federation had also decided to go on an indefinite strike effective September 25, demanding that a minimum wage be set for the dock workers. The strike was called off, however, following a wage settlement between the central government and the federation leaders. There are nearly 200,000 dock workers throughout the country.

Significantly enough, the impact of the strike in West Bengal, supposed to be a stronghold of left parties, was not much. Evidently the traditional parties like the Left CPI, CPI, RSP, etc., did not enthusiastically go in for an effective strike action, maintaining that they were preparing for a midterm poll in the state in November.

Trade-union militants all over the country are now seriously discussing the outcome of the newspaper strike as well as the token strike of the central government employees. There is a general awareness that the traditional leaderships of all central trade-union organisations have let them down and there is an urgent necessity for creating a new militant leadership of the working-class movement.

This is certainly a positive gain.

CANADIAN COMMUNIST CLUB SCORES PARTY'S PAPER ON CZECH COVERAGE

The item reprinted in the next column appeared in the August 16 issue of the Pacific Tribune, a publication of the Communist party of Canada. It was originally printed in the August 2 edition of the American CP paper, Daily World, and it is probably making the rounds of the newspapers of various other Communist parties.

In the Daily World version the article from The Militant, the American Trotskyist weekly, was used to "illustrate" a wild tale about a sinister plot against the Dubček regime in Czechoslovakia. The "conspirators" in this rather vague affair were supposed to include "Prime Minister Couve de Murville of the Gaullist government of France; the Catholic parties of neighboring countries, particularly Austria; the leadership of the Socialist International...Radio Free Europe; the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States...and former Nazis, Trotskyites, the Social Democratic party [of Czechoslovakia -- which does not exist!]," etc.

An open letter to the Daily World from its Prague correspondents, George and Eleanor Wheeler, described this article as, "...completely undocumented and inconsistent, a wild collection of assertions of the McCarthy-Beria type." They added, "We cannot answer them in detail because every paragraph has its distortions, misstatements and misinterpretations." The Wheelers' letter was not printed by the Daily World.

The Canadian CP paper also drew its share of criticism. Unlike the Daily World, the Pacific Tribune printed a letter from some of its critics inside the CP, in its September 20 issue:

"At a club meeting on August 20, 1968, the following motion was passed by the Ginger Goodwin club [a unit of the Canadian Communist party in Vancouver].

"MSC -- The Ginger Goodwin club expresses strong criticism of the Editorial staff of the Pacific Tribune for the insertion of the article 'Czechs Publish Trotskyist Manifesto' on page 6 of the August 16, 1968, issue. In our opinion it is misleading and dishonest in that (a) the headline infers that it is the Czech government that is responsible for publishing the statement, which is not the case, and (b) both the headline and cutline have nothing to do with the content of the article quoted. This use of headlines to distort news is characteristic of the bourgeois press, and has no place in a Communist paper."

It was small wonder that the head-

# Czechs publish Trotskyist manifesto

## THE MILITANT

Published in the Interests of the Working People

Vol. 32--No. 31 Friday, August 2, 1968 Price 10c

### Left Communist group forms in Czechoslovakia

*The following was printed in Informacni Materialy, a left communist journal now appearing in Czechoslovakia, June 14.*

On June 7, 1968, a meeting took place of those responding to a call published in Rude Pravo of May 21 for the establishment of a left-wing association. In a working discussion we clarified a series of specific theoretical and practical questions. We agree that we want to work to deepen the revolutionary socialist process begun in Czechoslovakia in February 1948 and that we reject all attempts to halt or eventually to reverse this progress. We want to give our most active support to the Czechoslovak Communist Party in every way that will deepen the socialist character of our society. We fear, however, that many obstacles will be put in the way of our efforts both by the conservative forces and the liberal forces, in essence anti-Communist, which are growing.

We want to function as a free association of discussion clubs and circles. In this association, we want to carry on primarily theoretical discussion and educational work in active support of the principles of socialism in our country and in the world revolutionary movement. We want to fight for the development of forms of democratic socialist society. We want to have ideological contact with all elements in the international revolutionary movement. We want to work for an unfettered exchange of information in this sphere. At the same time, we demand the speedy adoption of a new law granting freedom of association so that we can legally organize our work.

Our address is: Julie Novakova, Postovni Schranka 1023, Praha 1, Czechoslovakia.

**PROVOCATION IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA:** The Militant, an American Trotskyist paper, proudly displays this example of Trotskyist treachery in Czechoslovakia.

PACIFIC TRIBUNE—AUGUST 16, 1968—Page 6

line seemed to have little to do with the article, inasmuch as what is purported to be a section of the front page of The Militant was pasted together from three separate items in The Militant. The headline on top referred to a report on the publication in Informační Materiály, a nongovernmental, left Communist journal, of a manifesto of the Fourth International. The Daily World put the headline over a different article describing the formation of a Czech left Communist group in order to imply that the new group was Trotskyist.

Even more outrageous than this man-

ufacturing of "proofs" was the assertion, repeated by the Canadian paper, that the demand of Communist tendencies for the elementary right to form an organization [the World underlined this] is "treachery."

The letter from the Ginger Goodwin club concluded with a final criticism, from its viewpoint, of the article:

"In addition, it fails to counter the real Trotskyist position, which opposes the Dubcek leadership and calls for the replacement of the leadership of the Czechoslovakia Communist Party with so-

called 'workers' councils'. We request that this motion be published in the Pacific Tribune."

The editor's complete reply to the criticism of the Ginger Goodwin club was as follows:

"The item mentioned above -- including the head, reproduction of the statement from the Trotskyist paper, The Militant, and the outline -- was taken exactly as it appeared in the PT from the U.S. Communist paper, Daily World. We understand it was also reproduced in other left wing papers."

#### MASS DEMONSTRATIONS STAGED IN USSR BY CRIMEAN TARTARS

[The following article was written by our Paris office on the basis of information provided by a tourist who recently returned from the Soviet Union.]

\* \* \*

One of the most serious difficulties created by bureaucratic oppression in the USSR has been the national problem. As is known, during the second world war Stalin exiled various small nations inhabiting the northern Caucasus (the Chechens, the Ingush, and others) as well as the Crimean Tartars on the pretext that groups belonging to these nationalities collaborated with the Germans.

In the Khrushchev period almost all the peoples in question were "rehabilitated," and the remnants of these nations received permission to return to their homelands. In some cases they were permitted to reconstitute their former republics and autonomous regions.

The Crimean Tartars, however, were an important exception. They were not rehabilitated in Khrushchev's time; and the most they were granted was permission to move from Siberia to Uzbekistan. There was no discussion of their being allowed to return to the Crimea, although, especially in the early sixties, the Crimean Tartars on several occasions petitioned the leading party and government bodies to let them go home. In all probability the major obstacle to rehabilitating them, even in the period of greatest anti-Stalinist fervor, was fear among the bureaucrats over having them back in a region like the Crimea. This territory is rich in natural resources and is the most developed tourist center in the USSR.

In the deepening crisis that has racked the bureaucracy since Khrushchev's fall, the national problem has been very acutely felt, and it was natural for the problem of the Crimean Tartars to assume

proportionately greater gravity.

About a year ago, Brezhnev and Kosygin "rehabilitated" the Crimean Tartars. But they converted it into a very deft balancing act, probably in hope of bolstering the stability of their regime. They notified the Tartars, but kept their decision secret from everyone else. At the same time, they sent a secret directive to the local authorities in the Crimea to prevent the Tartars from returning by administrative means -- refusing residence permits, etc.

This attempt to cheat history was not overly successful. Encouraged by their victory, which they rightly judged to be but the first one in the struggle, the Crimean Tartars decided to follow up with the utmost energy and determination.

So last April 21, on Lenin's birthday, they organized mass demonstrations in a number of small towns in Uzbekistan to pay homage to the founder of the Soviet state, "the signer of the decree constituting the Tartar Autonomous Republic."

In this way, they clearly counterposed Lenin's national policy to the oppression practiced by Stalin's heirs.

These demonstrations which their organizers intended to be as legal and peaceful as possible were suppressed with great harshness. An impressive array of police tried to prevent the marches from forming. Failing in this, they launched a savage attack against the demonstrators, using clubs, machine-gun butts, and water hoses, although there were a large number of women and children among them. An all-out pursuit of fleeing demonstrators followed, and several hundred persons were arrested.

But the leaders of the Tartar national movement, who include many veterans of the war against Nazism and many

party members, decided not to stop but to broaden the protest. Toward the middle of May several hundred Crimean Tartars came to Moscow to visit the complaint bureaus of the Central Committee of the Communist party and the Supreme Soviet. After a moment's bewilderment at the peaceful "invasion" of these offices by a few hundred Tartars, the Moscow bureaucrats resorted to the Lubyanka\* method and had all those present arrested and held for the night in a sobering-up center for alcoholics.

The next day those Tartars still free went in a group of about a hundred into the garden near the offices of the Central Committee of the Communist party of the Soviet Union to demand the release of their arrested comrades. Along with them went some of the most courageous representatives of the opposition intellectuals, among them former General Griorenko, noted among other things for his role in organizing the protests against the sentences given Ginzburg and Galanskov.

The police immediately attacked the group. They did not confine themselves to arresting those present but unleashed a full-scale Tartar hunt in the adjacent streets, going after anyone who

even "looked like a Tartar."

The following day all the imprisoned Tartars, escorted by large contingents of police, were loaded on a train for Central Asia.

In various statements circulated later, the leaders of the Tartar national movement called for the immediate release of all the arrested demonstrators and for permission for the Tartar people to return to the Crimea in an organized manner. These demands -- and this is a very interesting fact from the political standpoint -- have been supported by the vanguard intellectuals in Moscow. Moreover, these intellectuals have striven to publicize the Tartar statements as much as possible under the clandestine conditions in which such work must be conducted.

This is perhaps the first time the opposition intellectuals have become involved even episodically in a movement of this kind. It is a sign of the times to see the internationalist spirit reemerging in the struggle after years of chauvinist education by the bureaucracy.

Solidarity with the just demands of the Tartar people against the repressions of the Soviet bureaucracy is called for.

---

\* The notorious prison.

#### MEANWHILE, THE ALLIED OCCUPATION OF WEST GERMANY CONTINUES

With world attention centered on the Kremlin's intervention in Czechoslovakia, the allied military command in West Berlin issued a set of decrees that received little notice in the press although the action underlined with cynical frankness the fact that final authority in West Germany resides in Washington.

The decree, which was approved by the British and French military brass sharing in the Pentagon's occupation of West Germany, imposes harsh new penal measures aimed at German leftists, particularly students, who have been trying to talk American soldiers into deserting as a gesture of protest against the war in Vietnam.

The decrees order the West German courts to prosecute and punish anyone who seeks to influence allied soldiers or to interfere with traffic between Berlin and the West.

The courts were ordered to impose prison terms up to five years and fines

up to \$6,250 for anyone caught trying to influence American troops into deserting.

For interfering with traffic, the military commanders ordered the courts to impose prison terms up to ten years and fines up to \$12,500.

According to the September 20 New York Times, American officers said that the desertion campaign, which was started last spring by left-wing students, had turned out to be a complete failure.

The claim appears to be exaggerated; otherwise it is difficult to understand why the Pentagon felt it necessary to issue its set of decrees.

The Pentagon no doubt felt that the time was unusually propitious for its move against the German partisans of the Vietnamese revolution. In particular, after the recent events in Czechoslovakia, Washington knew it could count on an appreciative grasp in Moscow of the use of diktats in running a satellite country.

WHY LUIS TARUC WAS PARDONED

[The following article appeared in the September 15 issue of Laging Una, "The Voice of the Filipino People," published in Los Angeles.]

\* \* \*

Luis M. Taruc, former Supremo of the insurgent Hukbalahaps, was pardoned by Philippine President Ferdinand E. Marcos on Sept. 12 and went straight from prison to Malacanang Palace to express his gratitude to the President.

Imprisoned in 1954 on rebellion charges, Taruc, now 55 years old, would have been set free routinely on June 17, 1969, with the completion of his sentence. His earlier release was due to his public disavowal of revolution and a promise to cooperate with the government.

In the Huk ranks, where he was top leader for eight years of an armed struggle aimed at changing the social order in the Philippines, Taruc was excoriated as a traitor because of his voluntary surrender to the government, which he compounded while in prison by denouncing the Communist party and its leaders, Jesús and José Lava, who were later captured and jailed.

Taruc came down from his jungle fastness in the Sierra Madre of Central Luzon and gave himself up to the government on May 17, 1954. His ignominious capitulation came but a few days after the fall of the French fortress at Dienbienphu to the Viet Minh forces of Ho Chi Minh, counterpart of Taruc in Indo-China.

The surrender of Taruc was arranged by a Manila Times reporter, Benigno Aquino, who last year was elected to the Philippine senate. It took place in San Pablo, which is near San Luis, the Pampanga barrio where Taruc was born. As he was being driven to Camp Murphy, Aquino noted that villagers along the way wept bitterly at seeing their long-time

champion in captivity.

Across the Pacific, in Kansas City, Carlos P. Romulo, President Magsaysay's representative in America, made a prediction: "There now will be peace and order throughout the Philippines. Taruc is the man who had the following. With his surrender the rebellion is ended." He opined that what survived of the Huk movement would degenerate into local banditry. On both counts Romulo proved to be a false prophet.

In a press interview in July of last year, Taruc said that while in prison he had become disenchanted with the "Stalinist concept" (meaning the Communist party program) and "came to realize that, after all, my Christian Socialist democratic ideology was essentially the right thing."

Those who have followed his career will wait with interest to see what use the Philippine government will make of the renegade. He gave a hint in the press interview when he said: "I can easily help the government in rallying the people" and expressed the hope that he could work as an organizer of rural projects.

In this connection, the onetime Huk leader expressed enthusiasm for a minuscule rural reform program which President Marcos inaugurated in Pampanga province, heartland of peasant insurgency. The larger land reform program remains on paper, although it was signed into law five years ago.

Present Huk Supremo is Pedro Taruc, whose mother is a second cousin of Luis. In the second spot is Faustino del Mundo (known as Commander Sumulong) whom government forces claimed to have killed in action but without confirmation. Luis said both men could be persuaded to return to "peaceful civilian life" if President Marcos proclaimed a general amnesty for the insurgents. Pedro has said he will not abandon the struggle.

BRITISH BLACK PANTHERS JAILED ON FRAME-UP CHARGE

By Robin McGovern

London

Three black power militants have been in jail here since the beginning of August on the fraudulent charge of "threatening to kill policemen." Obi B. Egbuna, Gideon Dolo and Peter Martin of the Black Panther organisation recently formed in Britain are being held for trial on charges of writing a statement sup-

posed to have contained the alleged threat. Their movement was inspired by the Black Panther party in the United States. Bail and legal aid has been denied to the three victims of a ruling-class vendetta. Even attorneys for the imprisoned black spokesmen have not been told when the trial is likely to begin.

The charge was brought after a

printer, who published their magazine, Black Power Speaks, took copy intended for publication to the police. The black militants charge that what the police received was part of the text of a play.

This victimization indicates the alarm with which the British ruling class views the growing black power movement. Despite its present small size, this movement affects a particularly explosive area in British society. The conditions of life for black immigrants have seriously deteriorated in recent years. White racism is given "official" sanction by a number of prominent figures, such as the Conservative MP Duncan Sandys and the infamous Enoch Powell.

As unemployment increases, black people find themselves at the back of the queue for jobs, as they do in search for houses.

Britain can even claim a new form of discrimination: Sikhs, who wear turbans for religious reasons, are refused jobs as bus drivers and conductors in many towns, on the pretext that they contravene the "regulations" regarding uni-

form. Since public transport is a major field of employment for immigrant workers, this is a cruel blow to this section of the black community.

Realising that it is sitting on a volcano, the ruling class is trying to eliminate any manifestation of black militancy. The arrest of Egbuno, Dolo and Martin came only a few weeks after Michael X, the well-known Black Muslim leader, was released from prison after serving a sentence solely for his ideas, imposed under legislation that was passed supposedly against racialism.

There is a danger that without a widespread campaign for their defence, arrested black militants will be at the mercy of the authorities. Large sections of the left in Britain have yet to act in solidarity with the black power movement.

The Black Panther movement itself has carried on an energetic campaign on behalf of its imprisoned leaders. A demonstration in London of several hundred people was organised at the time of the arrest, and a protest rally in Trafalgar Square was sponsored by a number of black power and antiracist organisations.

#### SIX KILLED, THOUSANDS JAILED IN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES STRIKE IN INDIA

More than 6,000 people were jailed and six killed in India September 19 when that country's capitalist rulers attempted to smash a one-day strike staged by government employees.

The strike had been called by the three-million-member Confederation of Central Government Employees Unions to demand the establishment of a "need-based wage." There has been no increase in the basic wage of government employees in nearly ten years.

The government had threatened harsh reprisals against strikers, despite the fact that the strike was perfectly legal under Indian law. Home minister Y.B. Chavan announced that striking workers would lose their seniority benefits, and that any of the mass of "temporary"

workers who joined the strike would be fired.

In response to this, many workers went to their offices, but refused to do any work once they got there. All mail and telegraph service was stopped by the strike.

In New Delhi some of these "non-strikers" allegedly threw stones at police from windows of the Public Works Department. The police invaded the offices and killed one employee and seriously injured fifty others, many of them women.

In a number of places strikers sat on railroad tracks to stop trains from running. Police fired on crowds at Pathankot in Himachal, Kikaner in Rajasthan and Gauhati in Assam.

#### CIA? BARRIENTOS ISN'T TALKING

After former Bolivian minister of the Interior Antonio Arguedas revealed in press conferences in August that he had been a CIA agent while he was in full charge of a ministry handling all aspects of internal security, many Bolivian citizens expressed dismay about the great power this mysterious agency seemed to

wield in their country.

President Barrientos, Arguedas' superior, tried to reassure his suspicious countrymen at a news conference in La Paz on September 28. Asked about the CIA's role in Bolivia, he answered, "The CIA, I know nothing about it."



CZECHOSLOVAKIA -- FIRST BALANCE SHEET, FIRST LESSONS

[The following is a translation of an editorial scheduled to appear in the next issue of Quatrième Internationale, the official magazine of the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International.]

\* \* \*

Czechoslovakia, economically the most developed of the workers states, happened to be the least affected by "de-Stalinization." The bureaucratic rigidity engendered economic stagnation. The country fell further and further behind the capitalist countries in technology. In recent years the standard of living of the masses dropped. All social activity stagnated. The Communist party became more and more isolated from the vital forces of the nation, especially the youth whose independent creative initiative was completely stifled by the barracks regime.

A part of the state economic apparatus and also a section of the party apparatus realized that certain changes had to be made and they began to oppose the Novotny leadership. For several months the struggle within the leading apparatus of the party and the demonstrations and demands of the students and intellectuals affected each other reciprocally.

Finally, on the basis of a small majority in the Central Committee, Novotny was removed from his posts, first as party secretary, then as chief of state, and was replaced by Dubček. The Soviet leaders, to whom Novotny appealed for reinforcement, at first accepted the shift. At the time they saw no danger in the policy envisaged by Dubček. He had no intention of leaving the Warsaw Pact, to say nothing of making any change in alliances. Who could think that in the present division of the world a Czechoslovak government could dream of an alliance with West Germany? The Soviet Union had no objection to Czechoslovakia's strengthening its economic ties with the West nor to the introduction of technocratic economic reforms to stimulate the Czechoslovak economy. The Kremlin's acceptance of Dubček's policy in this period shows, if any proof is needed, that some of the arguments advanced against him today are put forward only out of the needs of the moment and were not the real reason for the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

The economic and social consequences of the "democratic reforms" introduced in various workers states have for some time been considered by certain tendencies in the international revolutionary workers movement to indicate that in these countries the danger exists that

capitalism can be restored. The international relations maintained by some of these countries toward other workers states, as well as the capitalist states, have reinforced these fears. The case of Yugoslavia appears to them to be typical in this respect. The sympathy displayed by the new leaders in Czechoslovakia toward the domestic and foreign policies followed by Yugoslavia has likewise fed this fear.

This rightist policy, which is in large part a reaction to the way the Kremlin acts like a big power toward the smaller workers states, is certainly to be condemned; but it cannot be characterized as restorationist with regard to capitalism. Such a conception implies the possibility of a workers state gradually becoming a bourgeois state, of a noncapitalist economy gradually becoming a capitalist economy. This is nothing but a reformist conception in reverse. There is no capitalism in which a bourgeois class does not hold power, in which there is no private appropriation of the means of production and of the social surplus product. The restoration of capitalism is not possible without a new bourgeois class appropriating the basic means of production and overturning the workers state in order to create a different one to serve its interests. Nothing like that has occurred in Yugoslavia; nothing like that threatened to occur in Czechoslovakia. In Yugoslavia, the strikes in 1966 and 1967, and the student demonstrations in June, 1968, showed that although the rightist policies of the country's leaders had introduced grave contradictions into the economy and society, the social forces most attached to socialism were capable of battling this policy favoring the petty-bourgeois social layers.

In Czechoslovakia, a procapitalist social layer capable of organizing an attempt to reestablish private property in the means of production and the social surplus product has not appeared. To the contrary, in this country, where the peasantry is only a weak minority of the population and the proletariat constitutes a big majority, the situation developed rapidly toward socialist democracy. It was the proletariat that speedily determined the direction of events.

The Czechoslovak workers were at first hesitant, even mistrustful toward the changes that were advocated because they feared not without reason that the economic reforms would provoke a rise in prices, a reduction in the standard of living, and the threat of unemployment. The policy of the new government contained no call for genuine workers self-management of the plants, or for greater

equality. To the contrary, the "liberal" wing of the bureaucracy called for even greater privileges. But the struggle between the two wings of the bureaucracy and Novotny's resistance stimulated debate. A general renewal of political life in the country resulted from this which began to affect the working class and to penetrate into the plants and organizations (parties, unions, youth, etc.). This brought on a struggle for the rehabilitation of the victims of the Stalinist purges, the emergence of political clubs, a fight for real freedom of the socialist press and the abolition of censorship, as well as the dismantlement of the secret police and its repressive apparatus. An increase in the workers' level of consciousness and activity was seen. Many party committees were changed from top to bottom. The delegates to the Fourteenth Party Congress were elected directly by the rank and file or under the pressure of the masses. The new draft statutes for the party testified to the pressure of those wanting to restore the Leninist norms of internal democracy in party life. This struggle, together with the struggle to abolish press, radio, and television censorship, was the axis of the political battle fought throughout the country.

The Soviet leaders began to get worried when a movement assuming a mass character developed in the country, independently of the Dubček leadership and in spite of it, which did not want a gradual "de-Stalinization" or a "liberalization" dependent on the benevolence of the leaders of the party and state and which sought to establish real socialist democracy. Worse still, the Dubček leadership showed itself to be sensitive in no small degree to this more and more irresistible pressure from the masses.

This situation gave rise to considerable alarm among the leaders of the Kremlin and its satellites for reasons going far beyond the frontiers of Czechoslovakia. All reports agree that the "Czechoslovak spring" was followed with much interest and sympathy in the countries of Eastern Europe, especially in the Soviet Union where for almost two years the regime had been getting more authoritarian, taking back among other things the "freedoms" which it had granted the intellectuals a few years previously. The Kremlin leaders knew better than anyone the situation in the Soviet Union and the repercussions that could result from the restoration of workers democracy in Czechoslovakia. In all the states of the "socialist camp," the aspirations for socialist democracy grew apace, voices succeeded in penetrating the bureaucratic censorship to remind people of the fundamental truth that a socialist society must be more humane, freer than the most democratic bourgeois society. And here were the workers, the stu-

dents and intellectuals of Czechoslovakia beginning to prove by their actions the real possibility of such a socialist democracy in an economically developed country. If the fact is taken into account that the "Czechoslovak spring" was arousing great interest among the masses of workers in the economically advanced capitalist countries as they saw, for the first time since the early years of the October revolution, socialism associated with a democratic political regime, there was all the stronger reason to understand how this example could arouse the hopes of the workers in the Soviet Union and the other workers states suffering under the bureaucratic club. In case it succeeded, it would arouse not only hopes but movements and mobilizations. The bureaucratic regimes thus felt directly and dangerously challenged.

The first attempts of the Kremlin bureaucracy and its satellites to stop this process which was unrolling in Czechoslovakia, in particular the Warsaw letter sent by the five allies, had a result opposite to what was desired. The hesitations of the masses vanished; they drew more and more firmly around the Dubček leadership because it seemed not only sensitive to their desires but resistant to the pressure from the Kremlin. It was not against the nonexistent "danger of capitalist restoration" that the Kremlin, gripped with hate and panic, decided to send armored divisions into the Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia; it was to combat this situation which clearly presaged a political revolution.

The invasion, coming without any warning less than three weeks after the Cierna and Bratislava conferences, did not induce the fear and intimidation the Soviet leaders and their allies had certainly counted on. To the contrary, the mass upsurge continued with incomparable power and unequalled political ingenuity. The workers, students, and intellectuals refused to help the occupiers in any way. A clandestine press and clandestine radio stations continually inspired the mass mobilization. An underground party congress was held in one of the largest factories in the capital city under the protection of the workers. Surprise strikes, manifold forms of sabotage (removal of street signs, etc.) slowed down the occupying armies. And at the same time the populace talked with the soldiers, exposing the lies they had been fed, explaining to them the true situation in the country and the counterrevolutionary task they were being used for.

We saw the unprecedented phenomenon of a Communist party in power going underground and receiving the sort of mass support it had never received before, because its members were in the forefront of the struggle.

While succeeding militarily, the occupation proved to be a political fiasco. Not a single one of the known partisans of the Kremlin in the Czechoslovak Communist Party dared to come out in favor of the intervention and put himself at the disposition of the occupation in order to set up a puppet government. Consequently the operation presented great dangers for the Kremlin. The Soviet and allied troops were disoriented, powerless. Even worse, before their eyes was the example of a workers state emerging free of the bureaucratic grip, functioning democratically through the action of the masses in the very presence of Soviet tanks.

The Kremlin, placed in a totally unexpected position charged with dangers, made an about-face. It reestablished contact with Dubček and those around him whom it had just previously described as "leaders of a minority clique," whom it had arrested. It compelled this leadership, which it had tried to drive from power, to sign an agreement, which, according to Tass, was based "on the principles of mutual respect, of equality, territorial integrity, independence, and socialist solidarity," but which was nothing more than a diktat. This same "agreement" stated that "the troops of the allied countries which temporarily entered Czechoslovak territory will not intervene in the affairs of the Socialist Republic of Czechoslovakia," and that they will leave the country "as soon as the situation has returned to normal." But what makes the situation abnormal is the presence of foreign troops and Soviet functionaries, from the special services in particular, in the Czechoslovak ministries, especially the Ministry of the Interior.

Despite the indignation, anger, and strength they displayed, the Czechoslovaks are today demobilized politically. They will be subjected for an indeterminate time to an occupation which for one week they resisted in a thoroughly remarkable way. Temporarily, "law and order" seem to prevail in Prague.

The events which were so painful to Czechoslovakia have a worldwide importance. They raise many fundamental questions. How and why could they happen? What do they signify? Why did the movement suddenly come to a halt? What are the implications for the Soviet regime, the Czechoslovak Communist party, the war in Vietnam, international relations, the international workers movement? What are the perspectives?

The Soviet government's action has dealt the cause of socialism, of Communism, a grave blow. The basic questions that have been raised must be dealt with without any reticence so that the mili-

tants and the workers movement can find the means to remedy the situation that has been created, to prevent the revival of and to remove once and for all from the world socialist movement the gangster methods that marked the reign of Stalin and his successors.

The first conclusion to be drawn from this use of force concerns the Soviet bureaucracy itself and the "de-Stalinization" carried out after Stalin's death. As the Fourth International has said from the beginning, the purpose of "de-Stalinization" was to defend and not to liquidate the bureaucracy. The bureaucracy did rid itself of some of the Stalin regime's particularly repugnant aspects, not because they found these aspects repugnant but because continuing them threatened to become too dangerous. Giving them up was the price the bureaucracy paid to keep their essential privileges and to maintain their political power over Soviet society. The latter item was particularly vital. The party apparatus especially was determined to defend its hegemony over society because it is increasingly hated by the intellectuals and technocrats as well as the scientists and technicians of all types, who are in position to see the progress made in their fields in the Soviet Union and to contrast it with the way the party apparatus, made up of complete mediocrities, keeps the whole society laced in a straitjacket, depriving it of freedom of thought, expression, and participation in political life, imposing the most grotesque intellectual and artistic restrictions on the country.

The "de-Stalinization," begun about fifteen years ago, aroused hopes in very broad layers of Soviet society. Within a few years, the limits of this "de-Stalinization" became clear and tendencies began to rise in Soviet society seeking to sweep away these barriers. In the face of what seemed to be a mortal danger to its political power, the Kremlin bureaucracy reacted against the Czechoslovaks with extraordinary brutality, trampling underfoot all decency both in regard to its own people, to whom a tightly controlled press dished out a succession of the crudest and most shameful lies as the days went by, and in regard to the peoples of the East European workers states whose governments, in the name of the Warsaw Pact established against the North Atlantic Alliance, were brought into association with the military invasion of a "brother country" for the purpose of changing the leadership of a Communist party. The Kremlin bureaucrats showed the same disdain for the Communist parties and the proletarian and colonial masses of the entire world.

After this operation, no one can consider this bureaucratic layer capable of reforming itself, of voluntarily re-

linquishing its privileges and above all its political privileges to make way for a regime of socialist democracy. The tanks sent to Czechoslovakia were a warning to the masses of the Soviet Union, to its youth and intellectuals that they must renounce their aspirations to socialist democracy under threat of repression by force.

There is no other way to establish a system of socialist democracy in the Soviet Union and the other workers states than to drive out these infamous bureaucrats by a revolution -- the political revolution which Trotsky was the first to advocate. The "Czechoslovak spring" showed for the first time the power of this revolution and what it can achieve.

The Kremlin's operation in Czechoslovakia, which unfortunately shows a certain symmetry with the American operation in Vietnam, also reveals that the talk of the post-Stalinists about "national roads" to socialism is nothing but the application of the concept of "Socialism in One Country" invented by Stalin to a new situation. There is no doubt, since every country has a social structure and history different from other countries, that every socialist revolution will take on certain specifically national characteristics. But this calls for no special theory since it by no means signifies that there is a "national road" for every country permitting it to build a socialism cut to the measure of its frontiers independently of everything that occurs outside them. It is clear in Vietnam that the socialist revolution is an international problem because its triumph hinges much less on the struggle with the native bourgeoisie than with the forces of American imperialism. In Czechoslovakia, the Soviet bureaucracy showed that the struggle for socialist democracy is also an international problem because it can triumph only in a struggle against the ruling bureaucracy in the Kremlin, which in the past brought pressure to bear on Yugoslavia, China, etc. As long as this bureaucracy commands the resources of the Soviet state, as long as the Soviet masses have yet to reestablish socialist democracy in their country, no workers state will be secure from pressure or possible military intervention at its hands.

Coming after Vietnam, Czechoslovakia points up more powerfully than ever the international character of the struggle for socialism. The victories of the Vietnamese revolution over American imperialism are victories for socialism and the masses throughout the world. The bureaucratic crime against the cause of socialism in Czechoslovakia is a crime, a blow against socialism and the masses throughout the world. The democratic right to independence and self-determination of nations, above all the small and

weak nations, is one of the basic demands of the workers movement. However, this right can only be assured by the international action of the working class.

The power displayed by the mass movement in Czechoslovakia in resisting the armored divisions of the Warsaw Pact "allies" demonstrated in a remarkable way how the determination of a people can checkmate an army whose military might is recognized by all. The question arises then how such a powerful, such an extraordinary, movement suddenly subsided, if only temporarily as we may assume.

The decline of the movement was by no means caused by any intrinsic weakness in the mass movement itself. The many militants (party cadres, rank-and-file members, journalists, intellectuals, workers) who vied with each other in their ingenious resistance to the occupying forces, often succeeding in making them uneasy about the job they were ordered to do, were neither broken nor worn out. The cause for the subsidence of the movement, it must be stated clearly, lies with the Dubček leadership. We do not by any means deny the infamous treatment to which the members of this leadership were subjected, which was not limited to their arrest but included brutal physical treatment and psychological pressure. Likewise we do not deny the courageous defense which the members of the Dubček leadership put up in the weeks preceding the invasion and in the course of it as well as during their meetings in Moscow with their jailers of the Brezhnev stripe, where in contrast to the discussions at Cierna and Bratislava, they were cut off from their country and their people. Up to now they have still not tried to idealize the "agreements" signed in Moscow. And the statements they made on their return cannot hide from the Czechoslovak masses the fate that the occupying power is imposing on them. Their courage and personal honesty are not in question. What is involved is a political problem which one of them, Smrkovsky, indicated as follows:

"We could have rejected any compromise and let the situation develop to the point where an occupation regime would have been established, with all the consequences for national sovereignty, political rights, the economy and possible loss of life which such a development would undoubtedly have involved....

"We therefore decided to take the other road which offered some hope that we could continue on the path outlined by the January plenum. This was accepted by the other party as the basis of a possible solution. Our decisions were made no easier by this and we spent a day and a night in reaching them.

"We were aware that our decision

might be judged by the Czechoslovak people and history as either a wise solution or as treason."

The Dubček leadership were not intransigent Bolsheviks with a political firmness equal to any test but men with an essentially bureaucratic training long steeped in the system which had turned against them. They had developed to the point of opposing the rigidity of Novotny's policy but they did not understand the real essence of the Soviet bureaucracy. As liberals they had been subjected to brutal interventions by the Moscow bureaucracy, but they did not understand that it was concerned first and foremost with its own narrow national interests and was ready to sacrifice anything that stood in the way. Finally, and most important, because of their bureaucratic training, they lacked any confidence, basically, in the masses. At best, in certain circumstances, they could utilize them as they had at a given moment to break Novotny's final resistance, but they certainly did not envisage pushing the mobilization of the masses too far. At the time of the first pressure exercised against them by the Soviet leaders they did not initiate anything along this line. Each time it was the ranks who undertook actions that stimulated the masses. They were partially responsive to the masses, but at no time did they stand at the head of the movement, of this rising process of political revolution in Czechoslovakia. That is why, finally placed in a situation that utterly condemned the Kremlin leadership, they never turned to the masses; and, instead, met the dilemma posed by Smrkovsky in the worst way.

Held prisoners, they were brought in to face the Soviet leaders in a situation where their sole strength lay in the incapacity of their adversaries to find a Quisling to govern Czechoslovakia. To begin "negotiating" an "agreement" meant losing their sole trump. Bolshevik leaders would have demanded that they be returned to their country without any conditions and without any pseudo negotiations. By agreeing to "negotiate," the Dubček team began sliding down a slope on which it will be difficult, if not impossible, for them to stop. The masses became disoriented, then demobilized; hence a loss in militancy which the occupation is now seeking step by step to turn to its advantage.

The concessions which Moscow wrung from Dubček and his companions are not yet known, but the agreements they signed will not appease the Soviet leaders. Utilizing their material power, they have profited from the agreements to regain some of the ground they lost in the first days. They accepted the Czech leaders as interlocutors only to force them to carry out a policy in which more will be demand-



JOSEF SMRKOVSKY

ed from them each day until they finally lose all the authority and prestige won through their previous resistance. The Soviet leaders will continue this game until they think that they can drop them in favor of opportunists who will relieve them of any need for further worry. The calculation of the Soviet leaders in this matter is based, like the calculation that led them to invade Czechoslovakia, on assumptions concerning the objective reality that are mistaken. But their calculation as to what will happen to the Dubček leadership is correct. This leadership cannot help but disintegrate. The mass movement in Czechoslovakia will rise again and go forward but not under this leadership.

For the immediate future, the upshot of the invasion of Czechoslovakia is generally favorable to all the reactionary tendencies, whether in the capitalist camp or the workers movement.

However, these are only temporary effects. We are no longer living in the conditions that prevailed in the world in Stalin's time, or even in the conditions of the "cold war." For several years, thanks first of all to the Vietnamese people's magnificent and victorious resistance to the counterrevolutionary intervention of American imperialism, we have been living in a period of revolutionary

upsurge, of a revolutionary thrust, which underwent an extraordinary extension in 1968.

The victorious Tet offensive produced a crisis of leadership in the United States which the coming presidential elections may not resolve. Next, in France, student actions gave rise to a genuine revolutionary crisis; a general strike encompassing ten million workers was on the point of overthrowing de Gaulle's Bonapartist regime. It ended the era of stagnation and apathy which has reigned for almost twenty years in Western Europe. In August came the release of the potential revolution in Czechoslovakia; we have mentioned the example it constitutes for the workers of the Soviet Union and the other workers states of Eastern Europe. Now in Latin America, where for some years the revolutionary movements were centered among the peasant masses, we are witnessing increasingly powerful mass demonstrations in the big cities of the continent from Mexico to Argentina.

These are not episodic events without any future. In the years following the second world war the European revolutionary movements were quite quickly liquidated. This was primarily due to the class collaborationist policies of the Social Democrat and Stalinist leaderships. Economic prosperity did the rest for a whole generation. After Stalin's death, a series of "de-Stalinization" measures succeeded in creating a reformist spirit in the Soviet Union and the East European workers states, after the bureaucracy had overcome the 1956 movements in Poland and Hungary, by a bloody repression in the latter case. In the past twenty years, only the colonial revolution developed with extraordinary vigor as the spearhead of the world revolution. Although it has experienced its ups and downs, it has never been definitively defeated by the cruelest repressions. In 1968, the revival of the European workers movement, which began with the May events in France, and the rise of the political revolution in Czechoslovakia, show that a period has now begun in which the world revolution will move forward on all three fronts: the proletarian revolution in the economically advanced capitalist countries; the colonial revolution in the economically underdeveloped countries, formally independent or not; and the political revolution against the omnipotent bureaucracy weighing down all the workers states.

The mass movements of 1968 certainly did not attain the objectives they could have attained, but they were not broken or destroyed. If the year 1968 illustrated anything, it is that in the present extremely tumultuous world situation, even when a struggle does not succeed, it does not fail to encourage new struggles in other countries and to start

up again after a certain time. We are not in a phase of exhaustion but of the maturation and extension of a revolutionary wave such as the world has never before seen.

The mirages of the "consumer" society of neocapitalism, of "peaceful co-existence" and "peaceful and parliamentary roads," are fading more and more, especially in the eyes of the younger generation, and these mirages will not soon reappear. The young generation is rediscovering the revolutionary program and forms of struggle which the reformist leaderships of the mass movements, whether Social Democrat or Stalinist, suppressed for almost forty years.

The mobilizations of 1968 showed the presence of a gigantic revolutionary potential which was released in an unexpected and surprising way. But they also showed that no matter how powerful a mass movement may be it cannot attain victory by spontaneity alone. They showed that to achieve victory, mass movements require a revolutionary leadership armed with a clear program and an international view of the battlefield, organized as a politically cohesive party linked to the masses, and audacious in action.

The appeal for the creation of new revolutionary Marxist mass parties, which the Fourth International has advanced by its mere existence and its activities during the years of reaction, has become imperiously urgent in the present circumstances. This is the prime task for revolutionary militants in the great struggles which have begun to unfold, a task to be achieved in and through these struggles. We must prevent all this revolutionary potential from becoming dissipated in a succession of aborted movements. The more quickly the construction of new revolutionary leaderships is accomplished, the quicker the socialist revolution will go forward and triumph throughout the world.

What are the immediate tasks posed by the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia and the situation it has created? Every militant and every worker devoted to the cause of socialism must consider the Moscow diktat to be null and void. The workers of Czechoslovakia must be helped in blocking it. The honor and the future of socialism are at stake. It is necessary to strengthen an international organization that can help the Czech and Slovak revolutionists condemned to work illegally under the military occupation.

The mass movement for socialist democracy in Czechoslovakia has been disoriented and temporarily dissipated; it has not been beaten and crushed. The Dubček leadership was not strong enough to resist and, as history has shown more than once, it would be expecting miracles to

believe that it can right itself. But the movement for a political revolution will start up again. Revolutionary cadres and a new revolutionary leadership will emerge from the thousands and tens of thousands of militants who went into action during the week of August 21-27. A new vanguard will draw the lessons of the "Czechoslovak spring." They will take up the elements of real socialist democracy which were put forward -- workers power based on democratically elected workers committees, freedom to organize parties that respect socialist productive relations, the right of tendencies, opposition to the aspiration of any sector of the bureaucracy to monopolize or dominate any area of society. The vanguard will reorganize in a spirit of proletarian internationalism, moving to the fore in the struggle for the world revolution on all fronts. They will organize an underground resistance which in manifold forms, from the most vigorous to the most flexible, will finally succeed in abrogating Moscow's diktat and complete the political revolution begun in 1968.

Throughout the entire world, workers demonstrations of an unequivocal character, excluding as they spread those who have never fought against the war in Vietnam, will insist on the immediate and unconditional evacuation of Czechoslovakia.

There must be the strongest possible intervention to stay the hand of the Soviet police who are preparing to hit at the so-called "40,000 hoodlums" -- in fact the Communist militants, the journalists, the students, the intellectuals, the factory cadres, who were the leaders of the resistance in the first week of the occupation.

But action on behalf of Czechoslovakia must not stop at these most immediate objectives. The intervention in Czechoslovakia was only the latest in a long series of crimes against socialism committed by the Kremlin bureaucrats who have usurped the flag of October for more than forty years. The Soviet Union, the workers states, and the international workers movement still suffer from the evils of Stalinism and its gang. They must be eradicated.

The invasion of Czechoslovakia attacked at one and the same time to the Soviet regime's first-rate military power, its difficult political situation, and its panic.

We salute the courageous men and women who, after publicly defending the writers unjustly sentenced by courts that dishonor the Soviet Union, dared to appear in the Red Square in Moscow to demonstrate their opposition to the invasion of Czechoslovakia. They, too, must be rescued from jail. The struggle to obtain their release

as well as the withdrawal of foreign troops from Czechoslovakia will encourage and inspire the Soviet masses.

The workers, the youth, and the intellectuals of the Soviet Union must be assured that no one in the workers movement is taken in any longer by the lies of their leaders and the lackeys in the pay of these leaders; and that any action they undertake to remove these leaders from power will be received with enthusiastic solidarity by the workers of the entire world.

In the other countries which sent troops to invade Czechoslovakia, courageous men have likewise risen up to protest against this crime. In Poland, for example, the leaders of the Communist renewal, Kuron and Modzelewski, who had already suffered many years in prison for being the first since the Left Opposition to formulate a program of antibureaucratic revolution, were again imprisoned last March. Demonstrations against the bureaucracy's crime have occurred, at times taking a mass character and reaching into the factories. International action by the workers in solidarity with the Czechoslovak people must extend also to the defense of all those who pioneered in the anti-bureaucratic struggle in these states.

Tito in Yugoslavia and Ceausescu in Rumania protested against the invasion of Czechoslovakia; but their opposition was essentially that of heads of state. Tito did not want the mass demonstrations that occurred in his country. Last June he already had all he could handle with a powerful student revolt against the ruling bureaucracy in Yugoslavia. Ceausescu began by organizing workers militias but quickly moderated his protests. Above all, he maintains a rigid bureaucratic, police-state regime in his country.

In this whole part of the "socialist camp," the desperate action of the Kremlin leaders and their satellites must be taken as the signal for a determined struggle for socialist democracy.

The official Communist movement is now in a desperate state of ideological decomposition and organizational weakness. A balancing act such as the French Communist party is performing to maintain its ties with the Kremlin without losing its standing with the French Social Democracy and the left wing of the bourgeoisie, is useless in this situation. A great number of militants, broken by Stalin and the post-Stalinists, dropped out of politics or sought to escape by converting the Communist parties into closer and closer facsimiles of the Social Democracy. To those who have not lost confidence in Communism, and to those who have regained hope in the light of what the events of the last months have shown, we say: Stop

practicing an ostrich-like policy in face of the crisis your movement is going through, meet the basic issues unflinchingly, don't be afraid to push this crisis to its logical conclusion. The sickness which has so long beset the communist movement cannot be cured except by strong remedies and resorting to surgery. Join in the work of building a new revolutionary Marxist leadership with the militants who have waged this same struggle for long years under the banner of Trotskyism. Join with them and with the new youth vanguard that has appeared in recent years.

Far from being fatal for socialism, the crime the Kremlin has just committed, which marks a particularly low point in the abyss of ignominy and infamy into which the bureaucracy has sunk, can be the origin of a powerful renewal of the communist movement. The highly revolutionary conditions in today's world are very favorable for this. Military force -- as has just been proved beyond the shadow of

a doubt -- cannot triumph over a powerful mass movement with a firm and audacious leadership. What has happened in Prague does not mark the hour of despair and retreat but the moment to take the offensive.

Down with the Kremlin's counter-revolutionary intervention in the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic!

Immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all foreign troops from Czechoslovak territory! Hands off the militants of the Czechoslovak resistance to the invasion of their country!

Solidarity with the heroic people of Vietnam! Give the Soviet tanks in Czechoslovakia to the fighters in Vietnam!

Long live the world socialist revolution!

September 15, 1968

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
DRAWING: Carlos Sevilla González .....	825
Why the Mexican Government Ordered Out the Troops -- by Ricardo Ochoa .....	826
The Military Occupation of Mexico's Polytechnical Institute .....	830
104 of the Political Prisoners in Mexico .....	832
Massive Arrests in Mexico .....	833
Mexican Political Prisoners Voice Thanks for Solidarity .....	833
From the Czechoslovak Press:	
Socialist Democracy and Internationalism -- by Ilios Jannakakis .....	834
Huey Newton's Sentence: "Up to Fifteen Years" -- 29,000 Demand His Freedom .....	836
Student Revolt Hits South Africa .....	836
Gomulka Puts Kuron's and Modzelewski's Attorney on Trial .....	837
DRAWING: Wladyslaw Gomulka .....	837
Dissension in Belgian CP over Soviet Intervention in Czechoslovakia .....	837
Hugo Blanco Denounces Murder of Prisoners in El Frontón .....	838
Brazilian CP Leader Calls for Armed Struggle .....	839
Can Humphrey Pull a "Truman"? .....	840
DRAWING: Hubert Humphrey .....	840
Greece Is Still in a "Plaster Cast" .....	841
DRAWING: George Papadopoulos .....	841
Newspaper Strike in India Wins Partial Gains -- by Kailas Chandra .....	842
Canadian Communist Club Scores Party's Paper on Czech Coverage .....	844
Mass Demonstrations Staged in USSR by Crimean Tartars .....	845
Meanwhile, the Allied Occupation of West Germany Continues .....	846
Why Luis Taruc Was Pardoned .....	847
British Black Panthers Jailed on Frame-up Charge -- by Robin McGovern .....	847
Six Killed, Thousands Jailed in Government Employees Strike in India .....	848
CIA? Barrientos Isn't Talking .....	848
Documents:	
Czechoslovakia -- First Balance Sheet, First Lessons .....	849
DRAWING: Josef Smrkovsky .....	853

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.