

Sartre, Russell Urge Boycott of Olympics

Mexico City Stunned by Massacre in Plaza

Political Prisoners Include Well-Known Figures

On Czechoslovakia:

**British CP Continues
to Oppose Invasion**

U.S. Politics:

**Wallace Picks LeMay
as Fellow Leader of ALPs**

MEXICAN STUDENTS APPEAL TO BERTRAND RUSSELL

[The following is the text of a letter sent by the National Strike Committee of the student movement in Mexico to Bertrand Russell.]

* * *

Mexico City
October 3, 1968

Hon. Bertrand Russell

Dear Sir:

This letter is addressed to you in the name of the National Strike Committee of Mexico. The Committee is composed of over 100 students democratically elected as representatives of the many Universities, Technical and High schools on strike since the last of August* of this year. The membership of the Committee is rotating and is constantly renewed and continues to function -- even though many chosen representatives of the students are behind bars.

We know you as a person incessantly fighting for justice and human dignity and democracy, all of which are being trampled upon by the repressive Mexican Government. The most recent outrage rose to new heights of barbarity: the Government on October 2 unleashed upon 20,000 peaceful demonstrators in Mexico's Plaza de las Tres Culturas a systematic and savage attack, using crack troops and police,

* This is an evident slip of the pen. The strike began July 26. -- I.P.

supported by tanks and helicopters: killing over 50 persons and wounding at least 1,000, including students, women and children. Enclosed is a summary of ten serious violations of human rights perpetrated by the Government, of which the latest act is merely an example.

Our protest of police repression was not intended to interfere with the Olympic Games; rather the continued escalation of open, brutal repression perpetuates our stubborn and increased resistance. In our struggle, we have found deep and growing support from the population. We have the support of most of our professors and parents. This is in spite of the enormous efforts of the Government and the press to keep the population uninformed and misinformed. We shall keep fighting until we obtain justice.

We are convinced that Mexico's boasts to all foreign visitors who come to the Olympic Games of the progress and the quality of the Government will only demonstrate an already obvious hypocrisy.

The National Strike Committee asks you to take the steps you see fit in order to expose the actions of the Mexican Government and to protest against them, and to make known the just nature of the fight of the Mexican students.

Being certain of your positive action,

We send you a cordial greeting.

NATIONAL STRIKE COMMITTEE

RUSSELL AND SARTRE URGE BOYCOTT OF OLYMPIC GAMES IN MEXICO

[Bertrand Russell and Jean-Paul Sartre issued the following statement to the press October 7.]

* * *

Le Monde of October 5 carried a report over four columns which states: "The armed forces deliberately opened fire on demonstrators in Mexico." The first sentence of this report reads: "It is a massacre. There exists no other word to describe what took place during the meeting organized by the Student Strike Committee."

The account in Le Monde continues: "The speaker reiterated his advice to remain calm, but he was brutally attacked and garroted by one of those next to him, while others on the platform who tried to escape were seized by men emerging from

apartments. Contrary to the version given by most Mexican newspapers, there was no rifle shot or any provocation whatsoever. On the contrary, one could see in the crowd men in civilian clothes with the left hand in a white glove who gave a signal to the military to open fire from all directions. The horror began. There were over 5,000 soldiers with 300 tanks and they killed indiscriminately....The anger, astonishment, agony, horror are all combined. There has been nothing since 1914 in the way of comparable killing in the Mexican capital. The photographs of the wounded demand a reason for this massacre of the innocents."

This description by an indisputably impartial reporter of Le Monde suggests the enormity of the cold-blooded massacre of students and ordinary Mexican citizens, including women and children, who gathered

in a peaceful meeting to listen to speeches about the reasons for the student strike. The Mexican Government has behaved with a barbarity comparable only to the massacres carried out by occupying Nazi troops in Europe or by napalming American planes in Vietnam. Throughout the world people have been aroused to passionate anger and alarm. We express our most profound solidarity with the heroic Mexican students. We ask people, organizations and nations to boycott the Olympic games. We ask all those preparing demonstrations anywhere in the world, on any question, to direct their demonstrations as well to the Mexican embassy. We hope that the demonstration in London on October 27 will be a demonstration not only against the massacres in Vietnam, but in total solidarity with the Mexican students and in support of their legitimate demands.

Almost immediately after this ambush-massacre occurred, the Mexican Government met the Olympic Committee and said: "The intervention of the forces of

order have assured calm and there will be no trouble to prevent the Olympic games from taking place." The same day, the United States State Department declared: "The disturbances in Mexico City affected only a small part of the population and order is now restored." There is clear complicity between the United States and Mexican Governments to meet popular unarmed resistance with massacre. If the Olympic Committee agrees to hold the games in Mexico, it stands guilty of complicity in this crime.

If the Olympic games take place in Mexico, they will take place at the invitation of a barbarous government which is outside the pale of civilized society. We hope that Mexican workers and peasants will rise to the defense of their fellow Mexican citizens murdered in cold blood. Nothing short of the overthrow of this government will prevent further such atrocities. The Mexican students have the support of decent people in every country in the world.

MEXICO'S POLITICAL PRISONERS INCLUDE WELL-KNOWN FIGURES

[The following thumbnail sketches indicate the type of "criminals" seized by the Mexican government in its current effort to repress the student movement. Charged with a long list of offenses, none of which can stand up in court, they have been denied bail and thrown in prison to await a trial that may be delayed indefinitely under the Mexican system of jurisprudence.]

* * *

Elí de Gortari: Leader of the Coalición de Maestros de Educación Media y Superior pro Libertades Democráticas [Coalition of University and High School Teachers for Democratic Liberties], an organization formed after the July 26 events which embraced the majority of high school and university teachers. He was arrested at his home on the day the military occupied the university.

He is the best known exponent of Marxist philosophy in Mexico and his works are circulated internationally. His most famous work Introducción a la Lógica Dialéctica [Introduction to Dialectical Logic] has been translated into several languages. His other works include La Ciencia de la Lógica [The Science of Logic] (1950), La Ciencia en la Reforma [Science in the Reform] (1957), La Ciencia en la Historia de México [Science in the History of Mexico] (1963), Dialéctica de la Física [Dialectics of Physics] (1964), and Lógica General [General Logic] (1965).

He is a full-time research fellow at the University of Mexico Center for Philosophic Studies (since 1954) and is a professor at the University of Mexico in the logic and philosophy of science. He is an honorary professor at the University of San Carlos in Guatemala (1958), and a founding member of the Academy of Scientific Research (1959) and the Mexican Society of the History of Science and Technology (1964).

He has been a professor at the National Teachers College [Escuela Nacional de Maestros], the National School of Education [Escuela Normal Superior], the National School of Anthropology, the University of San Nicolás Hidalgo in Morelia in the state of Michoacán, and the Melchor Ocampo School of Advanced Studies. In addition he has taught at the National Preparatory School.

He was a technical advisor in the University of Mexico College of Philosophy (1950-1963), Rector of the University of San Nicolás de Hidalgo (1961-1963), and acting director of the Center for Philosophic Studies (1963 and 1964).

Manuel Marcué Padiñas: Publisher of the recently suspended magazine Política, which was the most important magazine on the left in Mexico for a decade. He was arrested while watching a student demonstration on September 19, although he had no political or organizational connection with the student movement.

His magazine Política, although close to the Mexican Communist party, was noted for its support of the Cuban revolution and its defense of Mexico's political prisoners. It exposed many of the government's crimes, such as the murder of the peasant leader Rubén Jaramillo and his family in 1963. It called for the formation of political movements independent of the government.

Marcué also edited magazines of a more technical character: Problemas Agrícolas e Industriales [Agricultural and Industrial Problems] and Problemas de América Latina [Problems of Latin America].

Carlos Sevilla González: A well-known student leader, teacher, and revolutionary Marxist organizer and writer. He was arrested at the University of Mexico September 18 when the troops occupied the campus.

Sevilla led the left wing in the Consejo Nacional de Huelga [National Strike Committee], the leading body of the student movement, and was the initiator of the Escuela Preparatoria Popular [People's Preparatory School]. Formed to meet the needs of rejected applicants to the University of Mexico Preparatory School, this institution became a school of Marxism. It was taught principally by university students. The students and teachers at this school succeeded in compelling the University of Mexico to recognize their institution, grant it space at the university, and subsidize it in part.

Carlos Sevilla González was one of the organizers of the Trotskyist movement in Mexico and the editor of Perspectiva Mundial, the Spanish edition of World Outlook [now suspended]. He helped to found and lead the Comité de Defensa de los Presos Políticos en México [Committee to Defend the Political Prisoners in Mexico]. He also contributed numerous articles to journals published at the University of Mexico.

He is 32, a graduate of the University of Mexico School of Philosophy and Letters and is a student in the School of Political and Social Sciences at the same university.

César Nicolás Molina Flores: A leader of the Coalición de Maestros de Educación Media y Superior pro Libertades Democráticas and a leading defender of the political prisoners in Mexico.

He is a professor of philosophy at the University of Mexico and the leading exponent of logical positivism in the country. He has been friendly to the Marxist movement, however, and translated a selection of Trotsky's writings, The Age of Permanent Revolution, into Spanish.

Romeo González Medrano: A student leader and chairman of the executive committee of the School of Political and Social Sciences. He is 22.

Francisco José Valero Recio: A general with several children attending the university. When the military occupied the university, he was attending a meeting of parents who had assembled there to discuss the best means to aid their children in the student movement.

Julio Boltvinik Kalinka: A 24-year-old student of economics at the College of Mexico, he was a delegate from that school to the National Strike Committee. His political record goes back two months to the beginning of the student strike.

Francisco Gallegos García: A poet and composer. Known for his poetry of protest and revolution, the 29-year-old author is very popular among the students. He has dedicated poems to Régis Debray, Che Guevara, David Aguilar Mora, the struggling students, etc.

Salomón de Swann Oliva: An architect and holder of the chair of architecture at the University of Mexico. He is a Chilean by birth but has lived in Mexico for twenty years. He did nothing more than attend meetings held in the School of Architecture to support the student movement. However, he is suspect in the government's eyes because he visited Cuba and became an admirer of the Cuban revolution.

Rina Lazo de García: An exiled Guatemalan painter, she had nothing to do with the student movement but is known to sympathize with the revolutionary movement in Guatemala.

SILA-NOWICKI SENTENCED IN WARSAW

Wladyslaw Sila-Nowicki, a well-known lawyer, was sentenced to a six-month suspended sentence and prohibited from practicing law by a Warsaw court September 30. Sila-Nowicki has acted as defense counsel for many revolutionary political opponents of the Gomulka regime.

He was accused of possessing "religious documents" deemed harmful to state interests. The trial was widely regarded as an attempt to intimidate critics of the regime's action in Czechoslovakia. It was also a warning to lawyers not to defend student rebels in projected trials.

WOULD-BE FUEHRER GETS HOT RECEPTION IN BONN

Radical youth in Bonn gave the extreme right-wing National Democratic party a hot reception October 1 at the organization's first public rally in the West German capital. A capacity crowd of about 2,000 turned out to jeer Adolf von Thadden, the National Democratic chieftain

whose program is widely regarded to be in the tradition of Adolf Hitler.

Police attacked demonstrators who tried to enter the hall without tickets, and four glass doors of the new Beethovenhalle were smashed in the struggle that followed.

During Von Thadden's hour-long harangue, the audience derisively shouted "Sieg heil!" at the would-be fuehrer, and at one point a demonstrator climbed onto the stage and cried, "Down with fascism!" into Von Thadden's microphone. The police called a ten-minute recess at this point.

When the speaker resumed, a few individuals threw apple cores onto the stage. Von Thadden's bodyguards, wearing white armbands, threw the cores back into the audience.

Toward the end of the speech an unidentified person tossed a piece of cotton, soaked in a tear-gas solution, onto the platform. Soon everyone near the stage began coughing and weeping.

Von Thadden himself was led off with a handkerchief over his face by his detachment of bodyguards. The police then closed the meeting.

During the "rally," paramilitary units of the National Democratic party, including Von Thadden's bodyguards, attacked a number of demonstrators, which further angered the already hostile crowd.

Afterwards Von Thadden blamed his reception on Social Democratic-led trade unions, and the German Socialist Students Federation [SDS].

Meanwhile in Berlin, Mayor Klaus Shütz, evidently embarrassed by the National Democrats, and sensitive to Soviet criticism of the activities of the ultraright-wing group in the isolated capitalist outpost, appealed to U.S., British and French occupation forces to ban the party.

The "Western allies" are reportedly expected to comply.



ADOLF VON THADDEN

WHAT THE WAR IN VIETNAM IS ABOUT

Maj. Gen. Charles P. Stone, who commands 18,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam, said October 7 that it was his policy to send soldiers who failed to salute their superior officers to combat areas for punishment. Saluting, said the general, is a

necessary element of military discipline needed to maintain "responsiveness and alertness within the garrison." He told the press, "The policy is carried out with discernment only after a flagrant violation."

MEXICAN STUDENTS DEMAND AN END TO POLICE VIOLENCE

[The following statement was issued September 28 by the National Strike Committee of the Mexican student movement. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

* * *

To the People of Mexico

In recent days a wave of violence has been unleashed throughout the city. Since the military occupation of the university, the public forces have been used against the National Polytechnic Institute, the consequence being the bloody events with which we are all familiar. Indiscriminately attacking all public meetings called by the Consejo Nacional de Huelga [National Strike Committee], the police have prevented six demonstrations in the center and eight in various parts of the capital. Thus, the students and especially the members of this council have been persecuted in a most unworthy way.

In view of these events, the Consejo Nacional de Huelga makes the following declaration:

First: The climate of violence which now reigns in Mexico City was initiated by the military invasion of the University of Mexico campus. Shortly before this, the students showed by a silent demonstration that they intended to carry on their struggle in a peaceful and orderly way.

Second: The repression is shutting off the democratic avenues of struggle; and the people find themselves forced to defend themselves from police violence.

Third: Under these conditions,

with our rights denied us, no dialogue is possible. Therefore, we call for the immediate withdrawal of police and military forces from the polytechnic and university buildings, unconditional release of the prisoners, and a complete halt to the repression as necessary conditions for a speedy resolution of the conflict.

Fourth: Our movement will end -- and we must repeat this -- only with the satisfaction of our six demands:

(1) Freedom for the political prisoners.

(2) Repeal of Article 145 of the Federal Penal Code.

(3) Dismissal of Generals Cueto and Mendiola and Lieutenant Colonel Armando Frías.

(4) Dissolution of the granaderos [military security police].

(5) Compensation to the victims of the repression.

(6) Fixing of official responsibility for the repression.

Fifth: Finally, in view of false declarations which have been made, we want to make clear that no official of the educational system nor any student leader whatever can decide when the strike is to end. The strike was called by assemblies in each one of the schools and it is up to these assemblies alone to decide when to resume classes.

United We will Win

Consejo Nacional de Huelga

MASSACRE STUNS MEXICO CITY

In order to minimize the possible effect on attendance at the Olympic Games, scheduled to begin October 12, the press is doing its best to play down the massacre in Mexico City on the night of October 2-3. The blood spilled by the Díaz Ordaz regime in hope of repressing the student movement by a massive "whiff of grapeshot" is being pictured as just another in a series of battles between the students and the armed forces, in which the students provoked the action by sniping at the federal troops from apartment windows.

The Mexican press is especially tendentious, confining itself largely to

repeating the official government version of what happened.

It is possible, however, to put together sufficient admissions to reconstruct the truth.

Some "10,000 persons" had gathered at the Plaza de las Tres Culturas, according to the October 3 issue of the Mexico City daily La Prensa. They were listening peacefully to speakers of the students' National Strike Committee, who had projected a march to the Santo Tomás Vocational School about one mile away.

According to Paul L. Montgomery, re-

porting in the October 3 New York Times, a member of the National Strike Committee told the crowd that the march would not take place.

"There are 22 truckloads of troops, 14 jeeps with machine guns and many tanks at the campus," the speaker said. "The committee does not believe in sterile bloodshed. We ask you to go home when this meeting is over."

"The crowd hooted and hissed mildly but appeared to be in a good humor. There were many women and children, in addition to parents, in the plaza, which is a paved area about 100 yards square. Twelve-story apartment buildings rise on two sides. The Aztec ruins are on the third side, and the vocational school on the other."

The meeting began at 5:30 p.m. Later in the evening, Gen. Marcelino García Barragán, the secretary of national defense, told the press that "at 5:30 p.m. a petition was received from the police soliciting the support of the Army, in view of the fact that the students themselves had begun shooting at each other."

The army was ordered out, according to the general, and when the shooting became "generalized," the federal troops replied.

Various sources state that the army began shooting at 6:10 p.m. John Rodda of the Manchester Guardian, who was trapped by the gunfire for three hours, said that the shooting began after four green signal flares had been shot into the air. [New York Post, October 4.]

Felix Fuentes, reporting in La Prensa, said that the flares were sent up by a helicopter and that then "some five thousand soldiers fired their arms in order to provoke panic in the crowd."

Fuentes said that the National Strike Committee leader speaking to the crowd at the moment demanded desperately that no one should start running.

"This was impossible," Fuentes continued. "The hail of fire from machine guns, bazookas and rifles had set off panic, a nightmare."

"Secret agents from various police agencies were ready to down the strike leaders, but some of them had also fled."

"On the fourth floor of a building, from which the speakers had harangued the crowd against the government, flames were seen. Apparently they had been lighted by agents of the Federal Department of Security and the District Judicial Police."

"People tried to flee out of the

east side of the Plaza de las Tres Culturas and many succeeded, but hundreds of persons ran into columns of soldiers who met them bayonets fixed and shooting in all directions.

"In face of this, the frightened people began to try to hide in the buildings, but most of them ran through the narrow streets to get to the Paseo de la Reforma, near the monument of Cuitláhuac."

"The writer was carried by the crowd close to the building of the Secretary of Foreign Relations. Nearby a woman fell; I don't know whether from a bullet or because she fainted. Some youths tried to help her, but the soldiers prevented them."

"For twenty minutes, the firing was heavy and the bursts of machine-gun fire caused terror. The military also fired against the buildings for some unknown reason."

"It soon became impossible to count the number of wounded and dead, because of the encircling military operation."

"Many soldiers must have wounded each other, since, as the circle closed, their bullets were flying all directions."

"The whine of the bullets caused as much terror as the shooting, and desperate women clutched their children to get out of the area without realizing that this exposed them to still worse danger."

"Hundreds of women, students and adults found refuge in the thousands of apartments in Tlatelolco, but many people, screaming, sought to hide on the stairs."

"People who had nothing to do with the strike movement, but who were infuriated by the military action, hauled out their pistols and fired from their windows at the Army.*"

"The cries, the sobbing and the desperate commotion was so great in this stretch of 30 minutes that it seemed like 30 centuries."

"In the midst of the chaos, youths stood up against the Army but they were met with the butts of guns."

"A fellow journalist shouted that he was a reporter and a soldier answered him: 'Glad to meet you!' Then he threw him against a wall, arms spread out. A

* In a press conference immediately following the massacre, Gen. Marcelino García Barragán admitted that every citizen in Mexico is permitted to have a gun in his home "but not to carry it."

photographer was bayoneted to make him let go of his camera.

"Our photographer Raúl Hernández was thrown to the ground by soldiers who insulted him in the vilest way; and while empty cartridges ejected by the automatic arms fell around him, he heard the whine of bullets coming from soldiers facing opposite them....

"During the 30 minutes the shooting lasted, the ambulances of the Red Cross and the Green Cross were prevented from entering the Plaza de las Tres Culturas. A Green Cross ambulance driver told La Prensa that he was stopped by warning shots.

"At 6:30, light tanks and other armored vehicles surrounded the Plaza de las Tres Culturas.

"Shots continued to be heard after 6:40, but they were already sporadic....

"Around 7 p.m. ambulances were permitted to enter...

"The Army had moved in when the meeting was already ending and when a leader had told the crowd that it was 'advisable to suspend the demonstration that was planned at Casco de Santo Tomás.'"

The account in the October 3 El Universal, written by the editor, Jorge Aviles R., hewed much closer to the official version about the first shots having been fired by "snipers" against the advancing troops. Nevertheless Aviles reported some revealing details.

"Within minutes, the plaza was an inferno. The noise from the shooting was deafening. The windows of apartments flew to pieces. Inside, families mad with fear tried to protect their youngest children.

"There were staggering scenes like the following one witnessed by this reporter when he stopped at the third floor of one of the buildings: A man cried out, 'My baby is in her play pen.' He ran inside the apartment. We saw him when he fell, shot in the chest, right after he had rescued his baby. We gave her to the mother who appeared like someone walking in her sleep, suffering from tremendous shock.

"The flames in the Chihuahua apartment building spread to such an extent that by 7 p.m. a big part of the edifice was ablaze.

"The fire lasted a long time. The flames reached the tenth and thirteenth floors and many families had to flee, in the midst of intense gunfire, carrying their children and risking being wounded. Thus, we saw many more fall from the bul-

lets.

"There is no doubt that the group of snipers who were in this part of the Chihuahua apartments were killed. No human being could have escaped the high-powered gunfire that was concentrated on them.

"The fire burned for approximately an hour. The fire department arrived soon, but the snipers did not permit them to come near for a long time."

Aviles said he saw the arms seized by the troops and police in their raids and arrests. These consisted of "pistols, knives, hatchets, one sub-machine gun and other arms..." Also "many boxes of cartridges..."

El Universal also reported that Gen. Luis Cueto Ramirez, the city's chief of police, claimed that "Russian arms" were found in some of the buildings in the area. He did not say whether they were of recent manufacture or of Czarist vintage.

The October 3 La Prensa published a photograph of arms claimed by the government to have been captured from a "band of terrorists." The "terrorists" were five youths alleged to be guerrillas who had engaged in such activities as bank robberies. Three of them were Guatemalans and one was a Canadian.

The photograph shows one M-1 rifle, one cartridge clip, and 15 cartridges. As is well known among gun experts, the M-1 is not of Moscow origin.

El Universal said that at the time it went to press there were "not less than ten thousand soldiers in the area, all in battle dress and ready to continue the siege until those who caused the conflict are captured."

According to an October 3 Associated Press dispatch, "Gen. Marcelino García Barragan, the defense secretary, said he had orders to crush the student uprising at any cost."

It was not reported who gave the general these orders. Undoubtedly the orders came from President Díaz Ordaz himself.

As to the casualties, Paul L. Montgomery wired the New York Times that "it was virtually certain that at least 49 persons had been killed and 500 wounded." These figures include women and children.

Montgomery put the number in jail at 1,500. The Associated Press said, "Thousands of persons were believed under arrest at military posts."

Montgomery also reported: "Students said today that six members of the National Strike Committee...were among the dead. Most of those taken prisoner last night were students."

The troops appeared to have been turned loose in the area following the massacre. "The owner of a curio shop in the plaza said that soldiers had stolen much of her stock," Montgomery reported. "There were five bullet holes in the windows of her store. Another woman said that drunken soldiers had rampaged through the project looking for girls."

In the days immediately following the bloodletting, the populace of Mexico City appeared to be stunned as they sought to assess what happened and what it portended.

The students continued sporadic gestures, such as painting signs in public areas, but appeared to be studying the lessons of the government assault. "We have not given up," one of the members of the strike committee told Montgomery. "I was in that massacre last night, and after that I would never give up. But we need time to organize before we can go to the streets again."

The government was doing its best

to put over the propaganda that the students were to blame for the bloodshed and that behind them was a "foreign conspiracy." Few were buying this version.

"Government supporters," said Henry Giniger in the October 5 New York Times, "revived their talk of an outside or foreign plot against Mexico by agitators who provoked the army, by sniper fire, into shooting during a student meeting Wednesday. But eyewitness accounts of soldiers indiscriminately firing into the crowd, and the circumstances surrounding the clash, suggest to some observers a deliberate Government effort to terrorize the students into quiescence at least for the period of the Olympic Games, which open here Oct. 12 and run through the Oct. 27."

One figure did find the lies of the Díaz Ordaz regime in tune with his own thinking. Avery Brundage, president of the International Olympic Committee, said the games would go on despite the violence in the Mexican capital.

"As guests of Mexico," an October 4 AP dispatch reported him as saying, "we have full confidence that the Mexican people...will join the participants and spectators in celebrating the games, a veritable oasis in a troubled world."

WHO'S PULLING WHOSE LEG?

By Alexandr Kliment

[The restoration of press censorship is a central demand the Kremlin has insisted upon in Czechoslovakia. The Soviet bureaucrats want to silence revolutionary voices to the left of the Dubček leadership. They also want to prevent the Czech press from replying to slanders appearing in the press of the Warsaw Pact countries.

[How the censorship serves the professional slanderers in the Kosygin-Brezhnev team is illustrated by the brazenness with which Pravda dared to repeat in its September 27 issue a charge which had been spread in Czechoslovakia before the invasion and which had been publicly spiked in the Prague press.

[In reviewing a book on Czechoslovakia purporting to document the Kremlin's case for intervening, Pravda cited as a fact the following allegation leveled against Club K 231, an organization of former political prisoners:

["The direction of this 'club's' activity is plain from a statement of its general secretary, J. Brodsky, who declared

in a meeting of the club that 'The best Communist is a dead Communist, and if he is still alive then you should pull off his legs.'"

[This tale was originally put into circulation by Alois Indra, an old-line Stalinist member of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist party. Alexandr Kliment exploded the tale in the Czech Writers Union weekly Literární Listy of July 27. The appearance of such articles explains why the Soviet occupiers banned this journal.

[As an example of the kind of material considered by Moscow to be "counter-revolutionary," we are making the full text available. Kliment's article is entitled "Who's Pulling Whose Leg?" The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

* * *

I have heard it repeated many times that anti-Communist tendencies are appearing in our country, but only in the statements of certain leading KSC [Komunist-

ická Strana Československá -- Czechoslovak Communist party] functionaries. Unfortunately, the assertion had never been backed up with any specific examples. Still less had there been any attempt to conduct a polemic with such tendencies. Finally, a member of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the KSC, Alois Indra, did offer some examples at a party meeting in Gottwaldova on June 5.

One of his examples is being quoted in public. According to the 7 p.m. news program of June 5, 1968, "Alois Indra said that numerous attacks on the Communist party's post-January* democratic road were coming from members of Club K 231...At a meeting of Club K 231 in Pilsen, Brodsky declared that you should grab every good Communist by his leg and pull it off."

That, to be sure, is an expression of radical (and not only theoretical) anti-Communism. But let us go to the source of this story. Brodsky is the secretary of Club K 231 and thus the leading representative of the Organizing Committee of this club which today has 80,000 membership applications from former political prisoners.

That Brodsky's statement was not made in Pilsen can be verified from the taping of the entire K 231 meeting in Pilsen (May 16, 1968). Already in our evaluation of this story we find a mistake. From K 231's archives it can be ascertained that the incriminating statement was culled in distorted fashion from statements Brodsky made in Litoměřice (May 3, 1968, at the Hotel Labut') and in Prague (April 23, 1968, at a restaurant in Zábřanský). Both statements are given here in their full context as copied from the tape recording. They go as follows:

"Those barbarous months and years began when even our children hung their heads like criminals. All that, those times. And so I agree with you, when I was in jail in 1952 or 1953 I thought that the slogan, 'The only good Communist is a dead Communist,' was right. Moreover, I put Communists in two classes -- the good ones whose legs you should pull off and the bad ones you should beat to death with them.

"And that was the way it seemed to us then. I believe I came to the same thoughts and views that we all perhaps rightly shared in the years 1952-53, in those bitter years of pitiless misery and cruel injustice.

* The democratization in Czechoslovakia began with the victory of the Dubček faction at the Central Committee plenum in January 1968. -- I.P.

"But at the same time I think that things are better in 1968. Because I never stopped respecting brave men. They were an example to me no matter what camp they belonged to. I sincerely admire these brave young men, these Communists like Dubček, Smrkovský, and the rest. I will protect their every finger and toe so that they will win and nothing bad will happen to them.

"You know we are correcting and we must correct some of our past attitudes. Basically we looked at things in a beautiful and honorable way. But I admit that when I came home in the sixties I paced the floor of my room for several hours because I realized that I had to be grateful to a Communist. That was a shock for me. I did not understand it. I felt a deep humiliation. There were a number of reasons, moreover, why I should not have had a Communist to thank but someone else.

"The clear lines of conflict somehow got mixed up and split...I see only one criterion for dividing the good from the bad. And here I don't discriminate. If you are an honorable man, you have my fervent sympathy. I don't share the foolish view that everything nonparty is good. That is not the truth. There were a lot of cowards and worthless people on that side. Nor was everything in the party bad" (Prague tape).

"It is our good will that brings us here when others are waiting, when party members are waiting to see what happens in the party, when nonparty people are waiting. We are taking a risk again. If nothing else we are risking our good reputation, because we have taken a stand again for someone who is making promises.

"You know that there were times when every promise was a deception and every act was a violent one. In spite of this we took a stand in favor of the new trend (from the preceding context, in favor of the renovating process -- A.K.). And we feel we have done the right thing. Because it is an entirely honorable trend. By the way it is developing, that is clear today for us and for everyone. What is decisive in the last analysis, we do not have power in our hands at the moment, but it is clear to Smrkovský and the rest that we are all in fact in the same boat.

"Brothers and sisters, I was by no means fond of Communists when I was in prison. In fact, I said you should pull off the legs of good Communists and beat the bad Communists to death with them. Perhaps that is the way we all looked at it then. But, I repeat, I said that in Ustí, and when that thought creeps back into my mind, I think that I myself had to be grateful to the Communists after my re-

turn -- I felt like a fool -- I had to be grateful to the Communists, who took care of me, who helped me.

"And on the other hand, some friends whom I had full confidence in totally failed me. And there was every reason for them to help. Because when I was arrested it was only because of me that they weren't also. I said, look pal, help me out. I helped you. But when I got back they would cross over to the other side of the sidewalk to avoid me.

"I have the feeling, I see that you are nodding, that we have similar attitudes.

"But look, if we hold to the old divisions today between Communists and non-Communists, between believers and nonbelievers, that would limit us to one view. I think the basic question is whether a person is a good man or not. And I give my hand to any good man. We all agree on that" (Litoměřice tape).

So I have shown that in this statement, Brodsky was illustrating the emotional state of a political prisoner of the Czechoslovak regime in the years 1952-53, that he was talking about the past, about himself in the past. And it is clear that in that context he pointed out, "We must correct some of our past attitudes."

Furthermore, it has been shown that a member of the Presidium of the CC of the KSC took this statement out of context, tendentiously shifted it to the present tense, and crudely transformed it into a brutal demand for physical terror. Thus, Alois Indra deceived the public. And by distorting a fact into a lurid and false propaganda story, he tried to discredit not only the author of the remark but the association of former political prisoners which he heads.

To the contrary, the passage quoted from Brodsky's speech is a sincere appeal for a dialogue, for a reevaluation of the past, for general reconciliation. Why did Alois Indra, the secretary of the CC of the KSC, turn his back to this appeal? More, why does he choose to arbitrarily interpret it as an appeal to terror?

Unfortunately -- and that is thanks to another kind of Communist than Alois Indra -- public opinion is operative. Anyone who distorts facts like Indra will lose the confidence of the public. This case is really an example of the importance of free public opinion and an uncensored press. Propaganda of this sort could only go unanswered in the past, in the period when the communications media were held as a monopoly.

It is possible that Secretary Alois Indra himself was the victim of bad information, that he received predigested, worked over, and abridged "material." But in that case who prepared this material? And what guarantee do we have that the leading representatives of the party, who have appealed for cooperation from the broadest elements of the population and from the nonparty public, what guarantee do we have that they will not find such predigested, arranged, and worked over "material" on their desks?

In the apparatus of the CC of the KSC, this is called "perverted material" or "perversion." Which of our attitudes, views, and demands have been "perverted"?

If he had read his real statements -- which I, a private citizen, was able to get hold of -- it is not possible that Alois Indra could have accused Brodsky and the K 231 in this way. Or if it is possible, then Secretary Alois Indra has somehow overlooked, has not taken cognizance of what has been going on here since January and underestimates public opinion.

But if it had happened -- let us allow for some other case -- that someone made an extremist statement at a meeting of K 231 or in public in general, it would then have to be asked, checked, and proved whether or not this was a statement of an individual or if it represented a group of citizens (an association or party).

No politician can ever presume to use the statements or even the acts of individuals against any group of citizens, if they dissociate themselves from these, or fail to ask whether or not they agree with such specific statements. So whenever anyone talks about antisocialist tendencies and you look around to see who is really involved, if you don't see anyone fitting that description, you begin to wonder if it isn't you they are thinking about.

In their last meeting, the representatives of the CC of the KSC declared that the party's mistakes in the past could not be blamed on the party as a whole but on the individuals who ran the party. Our public is politically mature enough so that it does not attribute even present mistakes to the ruling party but to specific politicians.

We must trust that Indra will withdraw his remarks fully at the same level and as publicly as he made them. If he does not do so, then his statement must become the object of public debate. That would be evidence of the deepening democratization and the normalization of political relationships in our country.

WALLACE PICKS LEMAY AS FELLOW LEADER OF THE AIPS

By Joseph Hansen

The announcement by George C. Wallace October 3 that he had chosen General Curtis E. LeMay, the former Air Force Chief of Staff, to be vice-presidential candidate of his "American Independent Party" [AIP], touched off fireworks in the bourgeois press in the USA.

At the press conference in Pittsburgh, where Wallace made the announcement, LeMay responded to the fishing of the reporters with the kind of statements they hoped for, while the AIP chief danced in anger.

"We seem to have a phobia about nuclear weapons," said LeMay. "I think to most military men that a nuclear weapon is just another weapon in our arsenal."

The cigar-chewing general went on: "I think there are many occasions when it would be most efficient to use nuclear weapons. However, the public opinion in this country and throughout the world throw up their hands in horror when you mention nuclear weapons, just because of the propaganda that's been fed to them."

As a professional mass butcher, Wallace's running mate takes a down-to-earth view of the tools of his trade. "Now nuclear war would be horrible," he said. "To me any war is horrible. It doesn't make much difference to me if I have to go to war and get killed in the jungle of Vietnam with a rusty knife or get killed with a nuclear weapon. As a matter of fact if I had the choice I'd lean toward the nuclear weapon."

A reporter tried to get LeMay to express his views even more frankly on using nuclear weapons in Vietnam: "If you found it necessary to end the war, you would use them, wouldn't you?"

"If I found it necessary," replied LeMay, "I would use anything that we could dream up -- including nuclear weapons, if it was necessary."

Wallace intervened in the discussion in a vain effort to help the general get his foot out of his mouth. "General LeMay hasn't advocated the use of nuclear weapons, not at all," he said. "He's against the use of nuclear weapons and I am too." Wallace claims that the U.S. can win the war in Vietnam without the use of nuclear weapons. Up to now he has avoided the kind of blunt statements on foreign policy that doomed Goldwater's campaign in 1964. "Lawnorder" is the racist demagogue's pitch.

But Wallace, of course, is well ac-



"LAWNORDER" WALLACE

quainted with the general's predilections, including his admiration of Barry Goldwater. Why did he choose for his running mate a man who has repeatedly proclaimed his admiration of the efficiency of the bomb?

The answer is very simple. Seeking to assemble a national movement, Wallace is appealing to every club-wielder, actual or potential, in the country -- and regardless of whether they think in terms of wooden clubs or nuclear clubs. LeMay, an influential figure in Pentagon circles, is one of the heroes of these Neanderthals. Voicing the views of the rank-and-file AIPs, LeMay fittingly complements Wallace, whose field is domestic policy.

The American capitalist class as a whole is not ready to accept as president

someone of the stripe of Wallace. They are somewhat angered at his challenge to the two-party system. Their press has therefore begun to pay attention to the demagogue and to "educate" the voters on his "unfitness" for the White House. The New York Times even reminded the capitalists who are backing him financially of the unfortunate experience with Hitler. That is why they gave LeMay the "treatment."

In denouncing with fear and horror the very thought of a military man like LeMay -- instead of civilians like Nixon or Humphrey -- being placed within reach of the buttons in the White House, the bourgeois press diverts the attention of its readers from some not very palatable facts.

It was precisely a civilian president, Harry S. Truman, who actually used nuclear weapons. Hiroshima and Nagasaki remain for all time to come as monuments to his years in office. Grimly enough, Humphrey in campaigning for the presidency refers daily to Truman as his model. The civilian Nixon, of course, has long cultivated an even more "hawkish" image.

The civilian Kennedy did not hesitate to threaten to precipitate a nuclear war in 1962 during the famous "Caribbean crisis." And both the civilian Nixon and the civilian Humphrey backed Kennedy to the hilt in this.

Since obliterating Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the political executives of the American capitalist class have been deterred from again resorting to the bomb for two reasons. One is the Soviet Union's possession of the bomb (and now China's). The other is the weight of public opinion, including opinion in the United States. Even a general in the White House, Eisenhower, has had to recognize these factors and at least disclaim any intention of making a "first strike."

This, naturally, has not prevented Washington from continuing to stockpile nuclear weapons until the Pentagon's capacity to "overkill" all the higher forms of life on this planet now sounds like something out of science fiction.

It is thus quite hypocritical of the bourgeois commentators to picture LeMay as a strange wildman, qualitatively different from Nixon and Humphrey, because he voiced what most of them really think. But they are concerned about the shakiness of the two-party system. They want to shore it up. Consequently they are grabbing at anything convenient in bidding the voters to take either Nixon or Humphrey, whatever their smell, as a "lesser evil" to Wallace.

Symmetrical to the sudden shouts



"LOVE THE BOMB" LEMAY

of alarm over Wallace is the conspiracy of silence maintained by the bourgeois press with regard to the candidates of the Socialist Workers party, Fred Halstead and Paul Boutelle.

Halstead and Boutelle offer a genuine alternative to Wallace and LeMay. That means an alternative to the two-party system from the left. As against the socialist road, which Halstead and Boutelle represent, the capitalist class -- if it comes to that -- will most certainly take a Wallace and LeMay any time, clubs and bombs and all.

That is why they find it possible to disregard the fact that the treatment they give Wallace and LeMay also helps build them up in the absence of any publicity indicating that America does have a socialist alternative to the hood, the nightstick and the nuclear bomb.

COMMUNIST PARTY OF INDIA DIVIDED OVER CZECH EVENTS

By Kailas Chandra

Bombay

As is the case with several pro-Moscow Communist parties in different countries, the leadership of the pro-Moscow CP in India also has been seriously divided on the military invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact powers in the name of fighting a "counterrevolution" in that country.

The National Council of the CP, which concluded a ten-day session in Delhi on September 9, has failed to evolve a definite stand on the events in Czechoslovakia. It could not even agree on a document meant to be circulated among party members for inner-party discussions. Instead the National Council constituted two separate committees to prepare draft documents to be circulated for discussions with a view to "unifying the understanding of the party."

One of the committees thus set up consists of the hard-line defenders of the Kremlin bureaucracy, including S.A. Dange, chairman of the CPI; C. Rajeshwar Rao, general secretary; N.K. Krishnan (Madras); S.G. Sardesai (Maharashtra); M. Kalyanasundaram (Madras); Biswanath Mukherjee (West Bengal); and Kali Shankar Shukla (Uttar Pradesh).

The other committee, representing strong critics of the Soviet action and supporters of the Czechoslovak experiment of "liberalisation," includes Bhupesh Gupta, M.P. from West Bengal; Dr. G. Adhikari, the party's top theoretician in Bombay; Satyapal Dang (Punjab); A. Ahmed, M.P. from Uttar Pradesh; Achutha Menon (Kerala); H.K. Vyas (Rajasthan); and Yogendra Sharma, M.P. from Uttar Pradesh.

A "compromise" resolution released to the press on behalf of the National Council, however, did not specifically condemn Soviet action or demand withdrawal of Soviet troops, but expressed fraternal sympathy with the people of Czechoslovakia in their "struggle for firm defence of socialism."

It also expressed the hope that all necessary steps would be taken by the Czech and Soviet leaderships to ensure "speedy and effective implementation of their respective obligation" under the Moscow agreement reached by the Soviet leadership with Czechoslovak leaders.

The statement supported the decisions of the January and May plenary meetings of the Central Committee of the Communist party of Czechoslovakia. At the

same time it stressed that "collective spirit and mutual cooperation in faithfully implementing the terms of the Moscow agreement can alone provide a solution of the problem on the basis of proletarian internationalism."

The National Council meeting was called to discuss the Czech events as the party's Central Executive Committee found itself hopelessly divided. Chairman Dange -- a faithful Moscow protégé -- stoutly defended the Soviet action as an "inevitable" measure to crush a "counterrevolution" in Czechoslovakia, while the opposition to the pro-Moscow group, led by Dr. Adhifari, justified the Action Programme of the Czechoslovak CP and condemned the invasion.

Initially it would appear that the defenders of Soviet action had a slight majority in the National Council meeting; but the balance was tilted against them with the dramatic arrival from Prague of Somnath Lahiri, a West Bengal leader (a minister in the former West Bengal United Front government).

Lahiri was undergoing medical treatment in Prague during the Soviet invasion. Although the Czech Communist doctors promised him safe conduct, he decided "as a matter of conscience" to get himself smuggled out of the country across the Austrian border to be able to report to the National Council.

According to a report appearing in National Herald of Delhi, September 7, Lahiri told the council: "From what I have seen of occupation in Czechoslovakia, if this is defence of socialism then slavery is better....You want socialism and defend Soviet action in the name of socialism. Can a slave country be socialist? Is socialism possible without independence?"

Lahiri reportedly gave an account of what he had himself "seen with my own eyes and heard with my own ears" from the Czech Communists at different levels of the party hierarchy.

Two important documents sent by Indian Communists stationed in Prague giving a graphic account of conditions in Czechoslovakia were also read at the meeting along with a letter critical of the Soviet action released by the CP-controlled World Federation of Trade Unions both in the workers states and the capitalist countries.

The WFTU, in what was described as a mandatory circular to all its affiliates, issued before the signing of the Mos-

cow agreement, called upon trade unions of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact countries to "urgently and immediately" demand from their governments the withdrawal of all their troops from Czechoslovakia.

The circular also noted that the trade unions of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact powers had refused to respond to its call and characterised this development "as a lamentable state of disruption in the WFTU."

This caused a great deal of discomfiture to the supporters of the Soviet action. Dange happens to be a vice-chairman of the WFTU.

The documents sent by Indian Communists included a letter from the Kerala party leader Unni Raja, a member of the Central Executive now in Czechoslovakia. This was a detailed account of discussions of the invasion he had had with Czech citizens in the streets of Prague and also with Soviet soldiers and other sources.

This critical view was further strengthened by a similar account of S. Chatterjee, All-India Trade Union Congress representative in the WFTU, and his wife. The main points made by them were reported as follows:

Within two hours of the Soviet occupation of the official Prague Radio, a new Prague Radio got into action, led and guided by the official leadership, that has managed to stay within Prague itself. It issued directions to the people of what they should do and its messages reached every nook and corner of Czechoslovakia. An interesting incident was that at once, immediately following the occupation, 20,000 students spontaneously rallied demanding withdrawal of foreign troops. They were peaceful but were being provoked. The Free Prague Radio immediately gave a call to the demonstrators to disperse from the gate forthwith.

The Soviet soldiers, according to these reports, "literally went without food except for what they had brought from their own country. No shop in Prague would sell anything to the occupying soldier." According to eyewitness accounts of these Indian Communists, they saw a group of Soviet soldiers offering either rubles or Czechoslovakian currency at a stall, offering any price for food. The shop manager flatly answered: "We do not sell food to the occupation troops. Shoot us dead and take away what you like."

The occupation authorities had come with ready-made lists of Communist functionaries and other influential people to be arrested along with their car numbers, names of streets and houses, but

the Free Prague Radio gave a call to remove the names of the streets and numbers of every house, and it was done throughout Prague and all over Czechoslovakia within half an hour. The Indian Communists saw slogans painted on the walls: "Moscow -- 1,800 KM -- Free food -- Free protection -- Go."

These disclosures evidently changed the relationship of forces within the National Council of the CPI. Party Secretary Rajeshwar Rao announced that the council must disperse because the documents submitted to them so far had become obsolete. He wanted the Central Executive Committee to meet again to take stock of the situation and come forward with a proper line which could serve as a basis for discussion.

Dange and his supporters insisted that sentiments should not have any place in the framing of party resolutions. A compromise resolution submitted by H.K. Vyas of Rajasthan to avoid an open split was found unacceptable to Dange's supporters. The two groups met separately to discuss their respective strategies. Only a day later another compromise statement was adopted by the council.

The Dange faction has suffered a major defeat inside the National Council. In reality, the debate on the Czech events has only begun among the Indian Stalinists, both inside the CPI and in the pro-Peking Communist party of India (Marxist) [CPI(M)]. The upshot of the discussions in the National Council is that it has withheld its judgment on the correctness or otherwise of the Soviet intervention. The public resolution stating both the Soviet and Czech points of view is heavily weighted in favour of Czechoslovakia.

The CPI(M), however, has justified the Soviet intervention as a step "to defend socialist gains in Czechoslovakia against the counterrevolutionary forces inside and the militarist and imperialist forces outside." The leadership of the CPI(M), unlike that of the CPI, has been able to put up more durable "common fronts" on the issue.

Along with the Castroist leadership of the Cuban Communist party, the Polit Bureau of the CPI(M) has argued that "this extraordinary step on the part of the Soviet leaders and their allies appears to be a priceless penalty they are paying with compound interest for their gross right opportunist and revisionist sins. The step will no doubt lead to widespread confusion as it cannot be defended in the commonly understood terms of democracy, independence and equality of nations. That socialism which is the real guarantor of all these values should appear to violate them is only due to the depths of revisionism reached by Soviet policies accompanied

by Czech distortions." (Peoples Democracy, August 25.)

Significantly enough the CPI(M) is the first left-wing party in this country to publish Fidel Castro's speech on the Czechoslovak developments in full. The CPI(M) publishing house has also published recently the Bolivian diary of Che Guevara -- indicating that the CPI(M) is getting closer to the Cuban leadership on several international problems, although on the domestic front it is still pursuing an opportunist policy of coalitions and united fronts with bourgeois parties.

Among the Marxist parties that have condemned the Soviet intervention and demanded withdrawal of Warsaw Pact troops from Czechoslovakia are the Socialist Workers party, Indian section of the Fourth International, and the Revolutionary Socialist party of India, a centrist group.

As for the bourgeois political par-

ties and press in India, both have fully exploited the Czech events to discredit the name of communism and mount anti-Soviet agitation in a big way. The right-wing parties like the Swatantra party and Jan Sangh, supported by sections of the Congress party and reformist socialists -- Praja Socialist party (PSP) and the Samyukta Socialist party (SSP) -- took the initiative in organising anti-Soviet demonstrations.

The Indian parliament adopted a motion expressing "concern" about the Soviet action and demanding withdrawal of Warsaw Pact troops from Czechoslovakia. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi did not accept an amendment moved by a member of the ruling Congress party -- supported by the non-Communist opposition -- seeking to "condemn the Soviet aggression." She pleaded that the strong word "condemn" was not in the vocabulary used by her government in its dealing with the "friendly" Soviet Union.

ANTIWAR GI WINS ACQUITTAL IN U.S. ARMY COURT-MARTIAL

An important victory for the right of American soldiers to express their opposition to the war in Vietnam was won October 1 when Specialist Fourth Class Allen Myers was found "not guilty" of disobeying an order when he distributed antiwar leaflets to his fellow GI's.

Myers was tried by a summary court-martial at Fort Dix, New Jersey, the base where he is stationed. He was charged under Article 92 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice for having allegedly violated a Fort Dix regulation prohibiting the distribution of leaflets that are "prejudicial to good order" or "subversive."

The antiwar GI, who is a member of the Young Socialist Alliance and the Socialist Workers party, had distributed leaflets, issued by the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam,

which demanded that U.S. troops be withdrawn from Vietnam, and which offered aid to GI's in organizing demonstrations and similar antiwar activities.

The presiding officer at the court-martial came to his "not guilty" decision, he said, "for lack of evidence."

After the court-martial, Fred Halstead, Socialist Workers party candidate for U.S. president, who had observed the proceedings, distributed copies of his campaign brochure, "Open Letter to GIs on the '68 Elections," to off-duty soldiers.

The military police seized him and took him to the Provost Marshal's office. There he was given a formal "Notice of Ejection." Two patrol cars then ushered the socialist presidential candidate off the base.

SOVIET INTELLECTUALS TO BE TRIED FOR PROTESTING CZECH INVASION

Five Soviet intellectuals are expected to go on trial in Moscow soon for having demonstrated against the invasion of Czechoslovakia. The group, which faces three-year sentences, includes Pavel Litvinov, grandson of the former foreign minister under Stalin, and Larisa Daniel, the wife of imprisoned writer Yuli Daniel.

The two were arrested with five others in Red Square August 25 carrying banners reading, "Hands Off Czechoslo-

vakia." One defendant, the mother of two small children, was released. Another, Viktor Fainberg, had several teeth knocked out by police and has been committed to a mental hospital. This is particularly ominous, as several political prisoners have been disposed of in this manner in recent years.

The five are being tried under a law prohibiting "group actions that grossly violate public order."

BRITISH CP CONTINUES TO OPPOSE INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

[The following is the full text of a document that appeared in the September 24 issue of the Morning Star, the official newspaper of the British Communist party. It is described as "Extracts from the report given to the Communist Party's executive committee meeting at the weekend by Mr. Jack Woddis, head of the Party's International Department."

[As will be seen, Mr. Woddis argues rather eloquently in opposition to Moscow's invasion of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. While much of Mr. Woddis's argumentation appears irrefutable, two points call for comment.

[First, he evades saying anything about the invasion of Hungary in 1956. As is well known, the top bureaucrats of the British Communist party supported the Kremlin in that crime. One of the consequences was a deep crisis in the British Communist party in which some of its outstanding intellectuals, accompanied by big contingents of workers, walked out. Perhaps the painful memory of that crisis was instrumental in moving the leadership of the British Communist party to take a different stand in the case of the invasion of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. But the question then arises: How do the top leaders of the British Communist party explain, from the viewpoint of principles, their completely different stands in the two cases? In the current instance, have they really decided to reaffirm basic socialist principles? Or is mere expediency involved? The answer to this hinges on their willingness to criticize themselves for the position they took in 1956. So far, they have given no indication whatsoever of any inclination to reexamine the stand they took in support of Moscow's invasion of Hungary.

[The second point is the loophole which Mr. Woddis leaves open in formulating his demand for withdrawal from Czechoslovakia. "We believe," he said, "that the quickest possible withdrawal of the troops is essential..."

[What does Mr. Woddis intend to convey by his qualifying phrase "quickest possible"? Does he mean that the Kosygin-Brezhnev team should withdraw their troops as speedily as they sent them in? Then why not say so?

[It is to be feared that Mr. Woddis -- as is so often the case with those who have been trained in the school of Stalinism -- is already considering ways and means of backing out of his opposition to the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. The first step is to make the time schedule for the withdrawal of the troops a vague one. The exact time is left up to

the powers that be, in this instance, the Kremlin. "Quickest possible" may thus be interpreted as tomorrow, next spring, or a quarter of a century from now.

[It is worth noting in this regard that in the official statement of the executive committee of the British Communist party, published in the same issue of the Morning Star, other important concessions are made to the Moscow bureaucrats.

[The statement talks, for instance, about the need to uphold the sovereignty and authority of the Czechoslovak party and government to permit them to defeat the anti-Socialist forces and prevent a return to the conditions that existed under the Novotny regime. But these fair words are vitiated by the following comments, which accept at face value the propaganda issued by Kosygin-Brezhnev:

["From this point of view it is important that the Soviet side at the Moscow talks declared its understanding and support for the position and leadership of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

["The Soviet leaders have affirmed their readiness to co-operate with Czechoslovakia on the basis of mutual respect, equality, territorial integrity, independence and Socialist solidarity.

["The Moscow communique states that the troops will not interfere in internal affairs, and that agreement was reached on the terms for their withdrawal."

[Clearly, the opposition of the British Communist party to Moscow's invasion of Czechoslovakia leaves something to be desired in the way of sturdiness. Nonetheless, the arguments advanced by Mr. Woddis offer a welcome contrast to the arguments of other Communist leaders, like Gus Hall of the CPUSA, who decided to repeat in the case of the invasion of Czechoslovakia the wretched stand they took in the case of the invasion of Hungary in 1956.]

* * *

The emergency meeting of our executive committee on August 24 took place four days after the intervention of troops of five Warsaw Treaty countries in Czechoslovakia, and in the midst of the Moscow talks that were held from 23 to 26 August.

We decided at our emergency meeting to deplore the intervention as unjustified, according to the facts then known to us, and as a violation of the accepted prin-

ciples governing relations between Communist Parties and between Socialist States.

We therefore called for the withdrawal of the troops, and for the removal of restrictions on the elected leaders of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and Government, so that they could carry on their normal responsibilities.

At the same time we warned against the attempt of Tories and Right-Wing Labour leaders, as well as of reactionaries throughout the world, to utilise this grave situation to stoke up the cold war and increase the NATO forces.

Everything that has happened since our last executive committee meeting has confirmed the correctness of our position, to which we still adhere.

Today, one month after the intervention, it is possible to survey the course of events since then and to judge whether our analysis was correct or not.

It should be recalled that so far as any official case for the intervention has been made it was the unsigned Pravda article of August 22. There were three main arguments in this article which were used to justify the entry of the troops.

1 That only a minority of the Party leadership supported Dubcek and his position, and that these were "Right Wing revisionist elements" who were in alliance with anti-Socialists in touch with "foreign secret services and imperialist circles abroad," and that this revisionist group in the leadership was "conniving with counter-revolution."

2 That the troops of the Warsaw Treaty Powers had entered Czechoslovakia at the invitation "of the Party and State leaders of Czechoslovakia."

On the question of the invitation, the Soviet representative at the United Nations, addressing the Security Council on August 21, actually declared: "The armed units of the Socialist countries, as is well known, entered the territory of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic on the request of the Government of that State."

He repeated this assertion when questioned by Lord Caradon and George Ball (verbatim record of the 441st meeting of the Security Council, August 21, 1968: S/PV 1441).

3 That things were "heading toward an open counter-revolutionary coup."

All these three main arguments have proved untenable in the light of the subsequent events.

The Soviet estimation of the position in the Party was proved incorrect. Negotiations had to take place in Moscow with the established leadership of the Party and the Government, who had been denounced only 38 hours earlier as "perfidious and base" and "conniving with counter-revolution." And the Czechoslovak working people rallied solidly behind their Party and Government.

As regards the appeal for Warsaw Treaty troops, all official reports from the Czechoslovak side indicate quite clearly that neither the Government, nor the National Assembly, nor the President, nor the presidium of the Communist Party issued such an appeal.

Intervention took place against the wishes of the State and Party bodies of Czechoslovakia, and was therefore a violation of their sovereignty.

Similarly, the actions taken by the intervention forces after their entry, including the arrest of Party and Government leaders, the occupation of Party and State premises, and interference with the normal functioning of the Government, the State and the Party, were gross violations of the rights of a brother Party and a Socialist State.

As to the internal situation, no convincing evidence has been brought forward to demonstrate that there was a counter-revolution.

Most of the arguments advanced in support of this claim have, on examination, been found to be exaggerated or unsubstantiated, and, in a number of cases, based on misleading reports in capitalist newspapers.

The arguments about tens of thousands of armed counter-revolutionaries, hidden caches of arms, loans from the West, moves to leave the Warsaw Treaty, tourists, the radio, the alleged low working-class composition of the Congress delegates, and so on, have all been countered or refuted by the Czechoslovaks and can in no way amount to a counter-revolutionary situation.

The intervention forces may have arrested some counter-revolutionaries, although we have no facts -- but it is clear that they detained the Party and Government leaders.

It is significant that the Moscow Communiqué makes no mention of a counter-revolutionary situation.

An effort is now being made to show that the Czechoslovak leaders, in recognising the mistakes made, had more or less admitted that the situation was getting out of hand and thus justified the inter-

vention.

An examination of what has actually been said does not bear out this new argument.

The speeches of Comrades Dubcek and Cernik recognise that they misjudged what would be the reaction of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact members.

The Czechoslovak leaders have also drawn attention to their own mistakes, Comrade Cernik referring to a certain "haste and imbalance" in the way some things were done, and Comrade Husak also indicating that there were shortcomings in the way they had reacted, especially with regard to the mass media.

But the point is that whatever criticisms they make of their own weaknesses, none of this adds up to a counter-revolutionary situation or justifies military intervention.

In fact, as Comrade Husak said on September 17: "The determining political factor was the healthy core in the post-January development, but negative tendencies existed."

He added that "what happened in August happened without the consent of the political and State leadership."

The Moscow meeting between the Soviet and Czechoslovak leaders was regarded by the political committee of our Party in its statement of August 27, as a "first step" toward overcoming the crisis.

It provided a basis for discussion and for agreement on certain principles which were indicated in the Moscow Communique of August 27.

It included support by the Soviet comrades for the policy of the January and May meetings of the central committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, and the statement by the Czechoslovak comrades that they would direct their work to serve Socialist power, ensure the guiding role of the working class and Party, and strengthen relations with the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries.

The holding of the Moscow talks and the restoration of the Party and Government leaders to their posts made it possible to avoid a catastrophe.

The main thing now is to solve outstanding questions by political discussion, and to remove the troops so that the Czechoslovak Communist Party and Czechoslovak Government are able, in full enjoyment of their independence and sovereign rights, to pursue once again their own policy for strengthening Socialist democracy, defeating the anti-Socialist

forces, and preventing a return to the pre-January situation.

The discussion has raised many important and fundamental questions. These include:

- 1 The question of the rights of Communist Parties to decide their own policies and the sovereign rights of Socialist States; and the relationship between these rights and the common defence of Socialism everywhere.
- 2 The question of Socialist democracy and bourgeois democracy.
- 3 The so-called "new" theory of the "peaceful counter-revolution."

The principle of the rights of individual Parties is connected with our Marxist understanding that each country will find its own road to Socialism.

This principle was expressed in the Statement of the 81 Parties attending the world conference of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow in 1960: "All the Marxist-Leninist Parties are independent and have equal rights."

The same principle was also overwhelmingly endorsed by our 30th National Congress in November 1967, when it adopted the resolution on the international Communist Movement with only eight votes against, and one abstention.

As regards the relations between Socialist States, this is a new question which has only arisen since the end of the Second World War, with the emergence of a number of Socialist States.

Mistakes in this regard were committed after 1945, and for that reason the 20th Congress of the CPSU in 1956 resolved that the Soviet Union should conduct its relations with other Socialist countries on a basis of equality.

Later that year, in a special resolution after the events in Hungary, the Soviet Government proclaimed that relations between Socialist countries can only be built on positions of "absolute equality, respect for territorial integrity, State independence and sovereignty and non-interference in each other's affairs."

The same resolution added that "the stationing of troops of this or that member-State of the Warsaw Pact on the territory of another member-State of the Warsaw Pact takes place through agreement among all the member-States and only with the consent of that State on whose territory, by its request, these military formations have been, or are to be, stationed."

These same principles governing re-

lations between Socialist States were set out in the Declaration of the 12 Socialist countries attending the 1957 World Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties, and repeated in the 1960 Statement of the 81 Parties.

In the Bratislava Declaration of August 3, 1968, only 17 days before the intervention in Czechoslovakia, these same principles were repeated.

It is therefore clear that the sovereign rights of Socialist States is an accepted principle of the entire international Communist movement.

It cannot be emphasised too strongly that there is no known document of the international Communist movement, nor of our own Party, nor for that matter of any other Party, which declares that this principle is permitted to be broken by the decision of one or several Communist Parties.

It has been argued by some people that this principle is only relative.

It is said that there is a more important principle, and that when one conflicts with the other, "the part must give way to the whole."

Those using this argument sometimes point to the example of the Soviet action in 1940, when Soviet troops entered Finnish territory in order to destroy the Mannerheim Line system of military installations poised for attack on the Soviet Union.

But apart from this being in exceptional circumstances, in the midst of war, this was a case of a Socialist State taking action against a capitalist State -- and a fascist one at that -- in order to safeguard Socialism.

This example has nothing in common with the relations between Czechoslovakia and other Socialist States, which are governed by quite other considerations and principles.

We fully recognise that counter-revolutionary forces existed in Czechoslovakia and that they were active, as the Czechoslovak Party leaders stressed more than once.

We not only understand the menace of West German imperialism, the rise of neo-nazism, the aggressive anti-Socialist role of NATO, the aims of US imperialism, and the dangerous actions and policies of our own Government in this regard, but we recognise that these factors are now even more important than ever.

Therefore, as long as these dangers exist, the Warsaw Treaty organisa-

tion is essential and needs to be constantly strengthened, as was emphasised in the Moscow communique of August 27.

The Czechoslovak Party and Government leaders have reaffirmed this, and have themselves killed stone dead the theory that they were seeking neutrality.

But the defence of the Socialist community must rest on the voluntary co-operation of Socialist States, militarily, economically and politically, backed by the solidarity of the international working-class and progressive movement.

It is therefore wrong to pose the principle of the sovereignty of Socialist States against the principle of the common defence of Socialism. These are not opposing principles but complementary ones.

The sovereignty of each Socialist State requires the solidarity of all Socialist States and all Communist Parties; but conversely, the common defence of Socialism rests on the voluntary co-operation of Socialist States and Communist Parties.

This whole problem raises another fundamental point. If the right to break this principle is conceded, who is to decide when the duty to intervene exists? Who decides whether the situation in a country is endangering Socialism? Has any Party or Socialist Government the right to intervene in the affairs of another, if in its own opinion, there is such a danger?

If such a so-called principle was to be accepted, then it would have universal validity and could be acted upon by any Communist Party and any Socialist Government.

This is an impossible proposition and one that could never be accepted by the international Communist movement, since it could provide a theoretical basis for war between Socialist States.

If, on the other hand, it is argued that such a right to intervene belongs only to some Parties and some Socialist States, then this is equally inaccurate and completely alien to every established principle of the Communist movement.

A second major field of argument has been in connection with the democratic changes initiated in Czechoslovakia in January 1968.

The mistakes, trials and repressions associated with the Novotny regime weakened the functioning of Socialist democracy, lowered the prestige of the Party, weakened its links with the masses, and weakened the Socialist ideology of sections of the people.

It therefore became necessary, in the opinion of the leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, to carry through a renewal of Socialist democracy, and this was decided on in the January 1968 plenary meeting of the central committee which, in April, produced its draft Action Programme as a basis for the proposed changes.

In his speech to the May plenum of the central committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, on May 29, 1968, Comrade Dubcek pointed out: "The present process of development is essentially a process of the revival of Socialism.

"To speak only of a process of democratisation without this clear-cut Socialist content would amount to a distortion of the underlying efforts of our Party to develop Socialist democracy."

There is plenty of room for argument about some of the formulations in the Action Programme.

And there is no doubt that advantage was taken by anti-Socialist forces, after the initiation of changes in January, to spread confusion and anti-Party concepts which were a danger to Czechoslovakia.

But, as has been pointed out by the leaders of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, the decisive political factors in the developments in Czechoslovakia since the beginning of the year were positive and in favour of Socialism.

At no time, in their opinion, did the negative factors become the decisive element in the country's political life.

It has been argued that the democratic changes introduced in Czechoslovakia were of a bourgeois democratic character; even the slogan of "a renewal of Socialist democracy" has come under fire.

Those who argue this way are losing sight of certain basic Marxist ideas.

It has always been the aim of Marxists to bring about an expansion of democracy under Socialism.

A major criticism of bourgeois democracy by Marxists has always been that while certain democratic forms have been won by the people under capitalism, the exercise of these has been limited by the fact that basic economic power has been in the hands of the big capitalists who thereby wield the decisive political power, and this, of course, is even more true today in the major capitalist States.

The aim of Communists is not to do away with or limit the democratic forms

won by the people under capitalism but to underpin them by a change in the economic system, and to build on and adapt the existing democratic forms, breathe new life into them, and introduce new, additional forms of democracy in conformity with the need to consolidate working-class power, construct a Socialist order and defend it.

It would be a distortion of Marxism to emphasise only the establishment of a new economic system and the breaking of the power of capitalism, but to neglect the conscious involvements of the working people in deciding policy and managing society, and fail to utilise the appropriate democratic forms for that purpose.

As long as the ownership of the means of production remains in the hands of the Socialist system, and as long as the working class retains political power, steps to expand and improve democratic forms can only strengthen Socialism, and in no sense signify a return to capitalism.

Every Communist is against counter-revolution, but there can be no real development of Socialist democracy if those striving for such improvements are labeled as counter-revolutionaries.

It is absolutely vital to the health of Socialism to distinguish between counter-revolution and positive improvements in a Socialist society.

This brings us to the theory of "the peaceful counter-revolution," which is described as a "new" method of imperialism.

This term is not entirely new to the Czechoslovak people. Comrade Dubcek has used it to describe the events of 1948, when the Czechoslovak bourgeoisie tried to thwart the march of the people to Socialism.

But this was only three years after the defeat of fascism; a united working-class Party had not yet been built; a capitalist class, with economic strength and political and ideological influence, was still in existence. Conditions today are different.

No serious person would disagree that the Western Powers, on the basis of their experience, are striving to find new methods of weakening Socialism, and to evolve new ways of conducting psychological warfare.

They camouflage their intentions behind false slogans and try to find a basis for their activities in the disgruntled elements that remain in Socialist societies, playing on nationalist feelings, seeking out the remnants of the former exploiting classes and so on.

Such elements undoubtedly exist,

but their whole economic and social basis has been greatly weakened by the construction of Socialism. As was pointed out in the statement of the 81 Parties in 1960:

"Historic changes have taken place in the social structure of society. The classes of landlords and capitalists no longer exist in the Peoples' Democracies.

"The working class has become the main force of society; its political consciousness and maturity have increased.... A new, Socialist intelligentsia, flesh of the flesh of the working people is arising."

As far as Czechoslovakia is concerned, there were clearly forces at work which were opposed to Socialism and wanted a return to capitalism. Such forces naturally concealed their aims at first.

The question is, however, were they strong enough to take over, or had they secured control of the Communist Party, or were they on the point of going over to a non-peaceful counter-revolution?

The article on "Peaceful and non-peaceful counter-revolution," by S. Kovalyov, which appeared in Pravda on September 11, 1968, does not say this. Nor, significantly enough, did the Moscow communique.

But this is precisely what the argument is about.

The resolution of the central committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party, adopted on June 1, 1968, declared:

"If anti-Communist elements... should try to lead astray the development of our nation, the Party will mobilise all the forces of our people and of the Socialist State, and will repel and suppress such an adventurous attempt."

The Communist Party, the Government, the State, the army, the police and the People's Militia were available to act if required.

But at this stage the Party was pursuing its course of conducting an ideological battle against the wrong ideas, while preparing the necessary laws to outlaw anti-Socialist organisations.

The theory of the "peaceful counter-revolution," however, not only argues that the imperialists are striving to restore capitalism in the Socialist countries by this process of a "quiet" counter-revolution -- it also develops the concept that agents for this plot to overthrow Socialism are to be found in leading circles of the Communist Parties themselves.

It is this theory which lies behind the extraordinary charge in the Pravda article of August 22 that Dubcek and his colleagues were "conniving at counter-revolution" and were in alliance with forces which "had connections with foreign intelligence."

There may be new refinements in the methods used by the imperialists, but this whole concept is not so "new."

We have heard it before. The point is that once you embark on this type of argument there is a danger of it degenerating into the events which took place under Stalin and Beria.

The result was that thousands of Communists were falsely accused of "conniving with counter-revolution" and acting as "agents of foreign intelligence services," and many were executed.

This also led to the trials of the 1950s, to the execution of Slansky and others in Czechoslovakia, Kostov and others in Bulgaria, Rajk and others in Hungary.

As a result of this type of argument carried to extremes under Stalin, Gomulka was imprisoned in Poland and Kadar in Hungary.

Actions against counter-revolution are always essential but this must never be confused with ideological arguments about the best way to develop Socialist society, which have to be dealt with by ideological discussion and the adoption of correct positions on the basis of such a discussion and our basic Marxist-Leninist understanding.

The big question now is how can a satisfactory solution be found to the continuing problems in Czechoslovakia.

The Czechoslovak Party and State leaders have made it clear that they will continue to base their policies on the Action Programme.

Some modifications have had to be introduced, such as the introduction of Press censorship, but it has been emphasised by Dubcek and others that such measures will be only temporary.

Other measures, such as the outlawing of political clubs and organisations not in the National Front, were already envisaged in the Action Programme itself.

Certain economic reforms, too, will now be modified; but again, it is said, these modifications will be only temporary.

Some changes in personnel have been made, both in the presidium of the Party

and in the Government, as well as in the propaganda media and in the National Front.

Included in these changes are some of those who have been regarded as not wholly in favour of the changes after January 1968, and, on the other hand, some to whom the Soviet Union takes exception. But the main leaders of the Party and the Government still remain at their posts.

In our view, it is absolutely essential, if the Czechoslovak Communist Party is to fulfil its role, that the Party leadership is backed by the Party members, and the Party itself as well as the Government is supported by the working people.

This means that not only must the authority and sovereignty of the Party and the Government be upheld, but they must be seen to be upheld, in charge of their own affairs, and conducting their policy in accordance with the principles of their Action Programme.

Nothing should be done to interfere with the work of the Party or the Government.

The continued Press attacks on individual Czechoslovak leaders and the continued distortions of events in Czechoslovakia, which find expression in the Press of some Warsaw Treaty countries, do not, in our view, assist in overcoming the difficulties.

On the contrary, they cause new problems, provoke difficulties within the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, and bring about a sense of grievance of the Czechoslovak people against the papers which make such attacks.

We declare our full support for the Czechoslovak Communist Party in its present difficult tasks.

We believe that the quickest possible withdrawal of the troops is essential so that the Czechoslovak working people, the Communist Party and the Government are free to act, in complete enjoyment of their sovereignty and independence, to develop their Socialist system

and evolve their own democratic forms of Socialism in accordance with their own wishes and their own decisions.

Whatever differences there may be in the international Communist movement on the events in Czechoslovakia, there is an overriding necessity and common interest for all Communist Parties to establish the closest fraternal relations and the firmest unity in order to check the aggressive acts and plans of imperialism, defend world Socialism, assist the National Liberation movements, and safeguard peace and democracy.

Here in Britain, we need to step up our campaign against those who want to return to the anti-Soviet cold war and produce new tensions in Europe and the rest of the world.

All attempts to break off cultural, economic and other links with Socialist countries should be resisted. Moves to reinforce NATO should be opposed.

We welcome the campaign against NATO bases in Britain, and call on the Government to withdraw from NATO by the due date in August 1969, and to press for the abolition of military blocs in Europe and their replacement by a system of collective security covering the whole continent.

We congratulate the several hundred British delegates on the peace boat to Boulogne to meet the Vietnamese delegates.

In carrying with them the demands of the mass organisations for stopping the bombing, an end to the British Government's support for the US aggression, and for the withdrawal of the US troops, they represented the true voice of Britain.

The new sordid manoeuvres between the British Government and Ian Smith must stop. Britain must act, in solidarity with the liberation fighters, and in association with the African States, to remove this racist regime and allow the people to enjoy majority rule.

The achievement of all these aims requires the unity of all Left forces in Britain.

"PRAVDA" PLAYS UP MINORITY VOICES IN BRITISH COMMUNIST PARTY

The Soviet press has been featuring statements by groups and individuals in the British CP supporting the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

On September 28, Pravda reported that R. Palme Dutt contributed an article

to the party's theoretical magazine, The Labour Monthly, defending the intervention. On September 16, Pravda praised the old Stalinist head of the Scottish miners union, E. Moffat, for criticizing the way the Morning Star, the party's official newspaper, covered the Soviet take-over.

ISAAC DEUTSCHER -- A KREMLIN TARGET IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

In the October 4 New York Times, Henry Raymont reports from Prague on the pressure being placed on the Czechs to revise the list of books scheduled for publication before the August 21 invasion. The Dubček government is trying to go ahead with the schedule, but has made one concession: "That was a translation of Isaac Deutscher's 'The Unfinished Revolution,' a criticism of the Soviet system, which Mlada Fronta, the publishing house of the Communist youth organization, was to issue this winter."

Deutscher had already been singled out by the Kremlin as a special target. In a long editorial August 22, immediately after the invasion, Pravda, attempting to justify the Soviet action, declared:

"The Czechoslovak press willingly opened their columns to writings of outright adversaries of Marxism-Leninism. It is enough to recall the publication in many Czechoslovak periodicals of articles by the well-known Trotskyite Isaac Deutscher, as well as excerpts from his book."

In June or July of this year, according to Tamara Deutscher, two of the government publishing houses in Czechoslovakia approached the Oxford University

Press for permission to translate and publish Isaac Deutscher's Stalin and The Unfinished Revolution. They proposed to serialize the books before publication.

Last April the weekly Student began to run excerpts from Stalin. They were accompanied by various illustrations, most often by photos of Trotsky, Bukharin, Zinoviev, Lenin, and Stalin. Excerpts from The Unfinished Revolution appeared in Literární Listy illustrated by similar photos of Trotsky and others. There were also plans to publish Deutscher's Ironies of History.

To the Moscow bureaucrats it was obvious that if they were to permit the works of Deutscher to be printed in Czechoslovakia, it would be difficult to deny their publication in the other countries of the Warsaw Pact. Still worse, if it was no longer a crime to read Deutscher, why shouldn't the ban on Trotsky's works be lifted?

To start down this road would inevitably open the floodgates to socialist democracy. With the fate of the privileged bureaucratic caste in the Soviet Union clearly at stake, the Kremlin did not hesitate. The troops were ordered into action.

In this issue

Page

Mexican Students Appeal to Bertrand Russell	858
Russell and Sartre Urge Boycott of Olympic Games in Mexico	858
Mexico's Political Prisoners Include Well-Known Figures	859
Silo-Nowicki Sentenced in Warsaw	860
Would-Be Fuehrer Gets Hot Reception in Bonn	861
DRAWING: Adolf von Thadden	861
What the War in Vietnam Is About	861
Mexican Students Demand an End to Police Violence	862
Massacre Stuns Mexico City	862
From Czechoslovakia:	
Who's Pulling Whose Leg? -- by Alexandr Kliment	865
Wallace Picks LeMay as Fellow Leader of the AIPs -- by Joseph Hansen	868
DRAWING: George C. Wallace	868
DRAWING: Gen. Curtis E. LeMay	869
Communist Party of India Divided Over Czech Events -- by Kailas Chandra	870
Antiwar GI Wins Acquittal in U.S. Army Court-Martial	872
Soviet Intellectuals to be Tried for Protesting Czech Invasion	872
Documents:	
British CP Continues to Oppose Invasion of Czechoslovakia	873
"Pravda" Plays Up Minority Voices in British Communist Party	879
Isaac Deutscher -- A Kremlin Target in Czechoslovakia	880

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.