

# Troops Guard Olympic Games



*Eyewitness Accounts of Massacre:*

**'My Brother Was  
Riddled with Bullets'**

**Caught in the  
Chihuahua Building**

**Support Grows  
for London  
Antiwar March**

**Another Martyr -- Pierre Mulele**

An Eyewitness Account

"MY BROTHER WAS RIDDLED WITH BULLETS"

By María Elena

[The following was written by a young woman who was present at the October 2 massacre in the Plaza de las Tres Culturas. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

It was my fifteen-year-old brother, studying at Vocational School No. 1 near the Noncalco Tlatelolco district, who invited me that day to come to the movement's meeting. It was his second time to attend a political meeting. The first time was when I took him to the Great Silent Demonstration [September 13]. Although he was a very young boy and hardly political at all, he identified with the movement from the beginning, since everybody supports it in his school. At first he was not very active, but little by little he became involved in the work of one of the brigades. He was becoming political.

We left the house at exactly four in the afternoon. We reached the plaza a half hour later. Most of the people were assembling near the flagpoles on the side closest to Vocational No. 7, as the soldiers later testified.

We met Compañero Reyes with whom we stayed throughout the meeting. I saw people I know at the University of Mexico and my brother recognized friends and companions from his school. The meeting had not yet begun at five. The people said nothing, waiting patiently.

At about half past five a compañero of the CNH [Consejo Nacional de Huelga -- National Strike Committee] came to the microphone and started the meeting. All of us applauded. The first thing he said was that the scheduled march to Casco de Santo Tomás would not be undertaken, since military forces were in the streets near that district. We were not going to provide any pretext for a provocation. The gathering was to leave peacefully when the meeting ended. I recall his words very well, "peacefully when the meeting ends." No one, in my opinion, absolutely no one, expected what was about to come.

The speeches of the orators were not very good. They repeated commonplaces already well known by the students. Nevertheless the denunciations of the repressive nature of the measures taken by the army and the police were warmly applauded. There was whistling and hissing when the deputies were named. But the students were paying more attention to what was

happening around them.

For example, when some contingents of workers arrived, all of us moved back, applauding, to make room. Some engineering students tried to form a gigantic human "V," the victory sign of the students, so that the people in the area watching the meeting from the windows of their apartments could see it.

Of course, the two helicopters flying above us could also see it. Some of the compañeros who knew said one was a military helicopter and the other belonged to the press. I think both of them were military planes.

When the military aggression began, we were close to the south end of the plaza where it borders the pre-Spanish ruins and leads to the church of Santiago Tlatelolco. There was a dramatic ripple of uneasiness when those in the rear of the crowd noted the sudden presence of the soldiers. "Hey, here come the soldiers!"

We were immediately caught in the flow of people running toward the center of the crowd. Then we clearly heard the voice of the speaker: "Don't move. Don't yield to the provocation!"

I turned toward the balcony where the speaker was and at the same time I saw two things, heard two things, felt two things. These all occurred within seconds. Some green fireworks floated down through the air overhead, and on the balcony where the speaker stood, a tremendous commotion broke out. The speaker was fighting with an individual who suddenly fired at him. Secret agents in the apartments above were repressing the leaders of the CNH. And behind us began the rattling and crackling of machine guns. All this happened in an instant, along with our being caught up in a crowd running in terror.

We lost sight of Reyes and I heard my brother's shout: "Don't let go of me." We gripped each other's hands. I went toward the right, pushing toward the garden where the ruins are. Many people were already there trying to hide from the terrible spraying of bullets coming from all directions. The whine of missiles cut through the other sounds, and showers of chips flew from the stones of the ruins under the impact of the bullets.

I still had firm hold of my brother's hand, although people had got be-

tween us and I tried to pull him closer. Students caught between us had fallen, some killed, some wounded. At my side was a girl who had been hit in the face with an expanding bullet. What horror! The whole left side of her face had been blown off. You could see her teeth and palate, although she, certainly, was not yet aware of what had happened.

The yelling, the screams of pain, the sobbing, the pleading, and the continual deafening sound of the guns, made the Plaza de las Tres Culturas a Dante's Inferno.

I dragged at my brother's arm. "Julio, what's the matter?" I pulled at him again. His eyes were very sad and half closed and I caught the words, "...it's that..."

I couldn't think of anything. The tremendous packing together of people made it difficult to hear. Later I thought that if I had realized that Julio was already dying, I would have done something crazy right then and there.

Presently some of the soldiers who had been shooting at the buildings around the plaza reached us. The smell of gunpowder was insupportable.

Little by little people made room for us so that I could get closer to my brother. "Julio, answer me."

"He must be wounded," a woman told me. "Loosen his belt."

Gradually, and then all at once, I began to grasp the possible reality. When I loosened his belt, my hand sank into a wound.

Now close together, I was able to lift my head and look around. My first impression was the number of people lying in the plaza. The living and the dead were intermingled. My second impression was that my brother was riddled with bullets. Later I learned in the hospital that he had been hit three times; once in the stomach, once in the neck and once in the leg. He was dying.

Perhaps it was an hour since the firing began.

"Soldier, a stretcher for a wounded person!" I shouted.

"Shut up and lie down flat if you don't want two," answered the "heroic boy," as the president calls his soldiers.

I insisted and insisted. Suddenly a medical student came up. "This boy needs to be taken to the hospital fast," he told a soldier.

"Shut up, you son of a bitch!" came the reply.

All the others around now joined me in insisting, "A stretcher!" Finally they gave in.

A stretcher was improvised with some guns and a topcoat.

"Let me go with him. I'm his sister." I was permitted to follow the stretcher, but the medical student who had helped us was held.

Before letting me get into the military ambulance, a "student" sidled up whom I had seen at the UNAM [Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México]. "Your purse, please?"

"What for?" I asked.

The soldier accompanying me was also surprised. "Who are you?" A sign from the pseudo student convinced him. "Oh, you're one of them!"

He was a student agent. I handed him my purse. He checked it and returned it to me. I still don't know why he asked for it.

In the hospital they took him inside and I waited hours for the outcome of the operation. On one of his appearances, a male nurse asked the women, who, like me, were waiting. "A boy in a blue suit?"

"Yes, yes. Here, here." He took me in to identify Julio's body and to sign the necessary papers.

When we held the wake for Julio, the solidarity of his compañeros touched me still more deeply. All the boys of Vocational No. 1 came to our home as soon as they heard of the tragedy. They had collected 500 pesos [12.5 pesos = US\$1]. My sister said that we did not need the money, that it was better to use it for the movement. "No," they all said, "your brother is the movement. Take the 500 pesos."

On the following day when we went to the Panteón Jardín to bury him, a formation of his compañeros walked behind the hearse, their hands held high, making the sign of the "V" for victory. People who saw the cortege could not help being moved. Some made the sign of the "V" themselves, including some of the traffic police we passed.

My mother is overcome. My father died eight months ago and as a result of the shock she had a heart attack. Now the death of her youngest child and only son has devastated her. "But, why my son? Wouldn't it have been better to shoot Díaz Ordaz?"

An Eyewitness Account

CAUGHT IN THE CHIHUAHUA BUILDING

By Ricardo Ochoa

[The following is an account of the October 2 massacre in Mexico City as seen from within the central building that was attacked by the troops and police of President Diaz Ordaz. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

The meeting in the Plaza de las Tres Culturas October 2 began at five thirty in the afternoon, a half hour late.

The first speaker immediately pointed out that military forces were in the streets bordering the district and that therefore the march to Santo Tomás had been called off. He asked the 20,000 to 25,000 students and others who had assembled to return home after the meeting as peacefully as they had arrived.

Various representatives of the schools on strike -- the School of Mechanical and Electrical Engineering at the Polytechnic Institute, the School of Commerce and Administration and the School of Political and Social Sciences at the University of Mexico, as well as others -- took the microphone.

At the invitation of a friend, after the first speaker finished at 5:45, I went up to the twelfth floor of the Chihuahua building to view the meeting from a balcony.

The microphone had been set up for the speakers on a balcony far below on the fourth floor of a different wing of the same building. The speeches came up indistinctly but the view was perfect. I saw two contingents of railway workers join the assembly to the furious applause of the students. Aside from the police agents assigned to the crowd, no one had any idea of what was impending.

At about 6:15 or 6:30, a girl at my side said: "There's some soldiers coming up from the avenue."

I turned to where she was pointing and at the same time noticed that the crowd was beginning to stir.

My friends on the balcony around me began shouting, "Nothing's happening. Don't fall for the provocation!" At the same time, they signaled with their arms: "No! No!"

In fact, from the avenue that runs through the district to the plaza, at the point where it crosses the grounds of the pre-Columbian pyramids, groups of

soldiers were advancing, bayonets fixed. In a moment we realized that they were attacking us.

Suddenly I saw a green rocket rise into the sky and burst, showering thousands of little lights down upon the multitude.

Immediately the clatter of machine guns, rifles, and pistols began. The green flare, launched from the Foreign Relations Building or from the church at the south side of the plaza, had been the signal to attack.

What followed in the next half hour is etched in my mind in precise detail. With the infernal rain of steel and bullets that fell upon us, our immediate reaction was to run to the stairs.

I had hardly gone down one floor when a plainclothesman in shirt sleeves, with a white handkerchief wrapped around his left hand (it was the mark they used to identify each other) and a pistol in his right hand, cut me off.

"Go back up," he said. "Nobody's moving."

I had to go back up, my eyes on his revolver.

Back at the twelfth floor, the cop ordered me and a hundred others there to lie down on the floor. Many were already there seeking cover from the bullets coming from all directions below and ricocheting from the walls.

It was a curtain of sound, deafening and steady, a rain of bullets sweeping the enormous Chihuahua building from the first to the twentieth floor.

But the pistol in the cop's hand worried me more than the bullets from the soldiers below. The deafening volley came from nowhere; I only heard it. The cop himself had to take cover.

To keep us all in sight, he moved down to the first step of the stairs. There were times when he even pulled his head down.

A mother with two little boys became hysterical and ran with them toward the stairs, bumping into the cop who stood up to stop her.

I didn't wait to see what happened. I don't know whether the cop shot her or not. I was on my way upstairs. I made it

and went up to the roof.

From there, for the first time, I saw that the shooting was coming not only from below but from the two helicopters which had been observing the meeting from the beginning.

I also saw that in some apartments people were shooting back, answering the military and police provocation. But almost all of the fire was coming from below, from the Plaza de las Tres Culturas which by now had been completely occupied by the army. Indistinctly, I could see the soldiers shooting away. I could see the bodies of people who had fallen -- students, women, soldiers. The inferno was at its height.

I decided to go down. Not for any reason in particular but simply because I couldn't find any good hiding place.

I knew that the cops were blocking the stairs on the twelfth floor. I rang the doorbells of apartments hoping to get in. No one answered.

I found an empty apartment, abandoned by its tenants, as had soon happened with many others, and I had a chance for the first time to see what the shooting had done.

The walls were perforated. Bullets ricocheting from the ceiling to the floor had destroyed everything. Mirrors, glass, furniture, curtains, everything had been hit. To stay in any of these rooms was impossible. The only safe place was the bathroom. Located in the center of the apartment it could not be hit directly.

Thinking that the police would soon get around to searching the apartments, I decided to leave. On the way down, I ran into two boys, one eight, the other twelve. The three of us continued together. On the thirteenth floor, a family responded to our appeal for help.

A woman and her sister, two boys and a girl between the ages of eighteen and twenty-one were in the apartment.

"I'm from the philosophy department at the UNAM," I said, introducing myself.

"We're from Voca No. 7," the two boys replied.

"I can't stay here because they're going to search the place," I said.

We discussed possible hiding places.

The mother said right off, "The garbage room."

Perfect. They gave us the key and we went down to the twelfth floor near the elevator where the room was. No one was on the balcony now. The cops must have taken the students they had trapped there out of the building. But the bullets were still coming in from all directions.

It was now 7:30 and it was getting dark. We went in, the two boys and I, locked the door and listened to the shooting going on all around. The older boy said, "The bullets aren't for real." I smiled to myself and said nothing.

Our hiding place was in reality the maintenance room housing the incinerator chute and the electric meters. It was not too narrow and the three of us could easily sit there with our legs stretched out.

At 8:30 heavy smoke began coming through the cracks around the door. Since the balcony was no longer being guarded, we went out to see what was happening.

The apartment in front of us and the one on the floor above, the one belonging to the family that had helped us, were on fire. The shooting seemed as intense as ever; machine-gun bullets continually swept the walls and the screaming of women was as piercing as the shooting.

We went back to our hiding place. About 10 p.m. the machine-gun fire finally became sporadic and by 11 p.m. calm returned.

We had now spent four hours in the maintenance room and I became anxious to let my friends know where I was. I decided to go back up to the apartment on the thirteenth floor.

What a picture of destruction! The walls were punctured by bullet holes everywhere. The furniture was smashed. The fire had destroyed part of the kitchen. The water was off because the pipes were broken. Everything was in chaos.

However, despite their misfortune, the family was not downcast. They said that although this was the worst that had happened in the past month, after what had been going on in the district recently, they had become used to such battles. The woman said they intended to leave the apartment.

Trying to fall in with the humor of my hosts, I said: "That's a pity. It's a very good apartment, overlooking the Plaza de las 'Cuatro' Culturas [Plaza of the 'Four' Cultures], the finest spectacle in the country." They laughed and we began talking about how to get in touch with the

outside world.

Some moments before, two youths had joined the family -- the girl's boy friend, who showed his faithfulness at a time like this, and a Polytechnic student, a friend of the two boys.

Since the two visitors had their identification cards, they made an exploratory trip, leaving at 11:30 to see what would happen at the bottom of the stairs where police and soldiers were registering those going out.

Within a few minutes they were back. A new furious barrage had opened up. The eight of us huddled in the bathroom for an hour until the shooting again let up.

At 1 a.m. I went back to my refuge with the two little boys and a borrowed blanket. Exhausted, we settled down as best we could for the night. Only occasional bursts of machine-gun fire and sporadic shots broke the ensuing silence. The battle of Tlatelolco had ended.

The two little boys had to go to the bathroom. I held them up to the incinerator chute so they could urinate there, and we finally got to sleep.

At 7:30 we woke up. There was a lot of bustling and coming and going outside our room. Presumably the soldiers were carrying out the dead and wounded on stretchers. The sound of hobnailed boots was unmistakable. No doubt the building was being searched and occupied by the military. It was impossible to return to our friends' apartment.

The next three hours were the most anxious. If I were caught in the maintenance room, the soldiers would certainly take me for a sniper and I would be executed on the spot. This happened, I heard later, to all the young men they found in hiding. What to do?

At nine I made the little boys leave. I was sure nothing would happen to them because of their age. I told them to say that they lived in the building.

At ten a woman knocked at the door of the apartment across the hall from my hiding place. "Carlos! Carlitos! Honey child, open the door!"

She banged and called for fifteen minutes without an answer. The apartment had been set ablaze by the intense concentration of gunfire leveled against windows and balconies where young men had shot back. Neither Carlitos nor any other human being could have survived that rain of fire.

The footsteps of tenants abandon-

ing their apartments grew more numerous. At a moment when the soldiers now stationed on the balcony were out of sight, I ran up the stairs. It was 10:45.

The family was getting things together to leave the apartment. The two young men had already gone. I asked them to let me stay in their apartment instead of my hiding place. They refused, saying that it was likely the soldiers would search the place as they had the apartments below.

"I haven't got my identification card," I told them. "And I'm listed by the police. I can't let them pick me up."

A bold idea occurred to me. Why not leave with them? "All right," I told them; "I'll be Nancy's boy friend."

They laughed at that and we worked out the details.

I emptied out what little I had in my briefcase, including a book I had bought on the way to the meeting -- Memoirs of a Revolutionist by Victor Serge. I hated to drop it in the garbage pail. But a book with a cover displaying a Red Army recruiting poster saying in Russian letters, "YOU, what have you done?" was not the best calling card for the occasion.

The elevator wasn't running, so we started down the twelve flights of stairs, proceeding in three couples -- a son and his mother leading the way, Nancy and her "boy friend" in the middle, and the old aunt with her niece bringing up the rear.

We met no one until we reached the second floor. There we met another procession going up. This was headed by a corporal in baleful green sunglasses, which, together with his green uniform, made him look completely green. Twenty-five or more soldiers, bayonets fixed, filed past us. They were making a final check of the Chihuahua building.

I drew Nancy ardently closer and suggested she put her arm around my waist. No doubt we looked like a "perfect" couple.

A single soldier was on guard at the bottom. There was not a plainclothesman within ten meters.

The groups of soldiers in the gardens let us pass in complete indifference.

I planted a kiss of ecstatic relief on the cheek of my "perfect" sweetheart. "For being so realistic," I said. She smiled.

When we reached the Paseo de la Reforma, which is about 150 meters from the Chihuahua building, we said goodbye. I was safe.

"ARMED FORCES DELIBERATELY OPENED FIRE ON THE MEXICAN DEMONSTRATORS"

In urging that the Olympic Games in Mexico be boycotted, Bertrand Russell and Jean-Paul Sartre cited as evidence of the repressive nature of the Díaz Ordaz government an account of the assault conducted by federal troops at the Plaza of the Three Cultures in Mexico City October 2 which appeared in the October 5 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde.

The report from Le Monde's special correspondent Claude Kiejmann is unusually objective for the bourgeois press, offering details not to be found in the dispatches of correspondents inclined to rely on the official government version.

Le Monde ran the account under the headline, "The armed forces deliberately opened fire on the Mexican demonstrators."

"It was a massacre," Kiejmann begins: "no other word exists to describe what happened in the course of the meeting organized by the students' strike committee at the Plaza of the Three Cultures in the center of the Tlatelolco district, an immense urban center of concrete and glass which will remain celebrated from now on in the sad history of repression.

"The place is well situated for a trap, if trap it was, as some here are prepared to affirm....

"The meeting," he continues, "began at five o'clock. Its aim was to demand the evacuation of the troops still occupying the Polytechnic Institute situated a few hundred meters from there. The project of going afterward from the Plaza of the Three Cultures to the 'Polytechnic' had even been cancelled. Various speakers, men and women belonging to the strike committee, had already spoken. One of them was on the third floor\* of the Chihuahua building on an open balcony serving as a landing and providing access to the apartments. Surrounded by about fifty persons, he was affirming that it was indispensable to 'continue the struggle' and to demand a 'public dialogue with the government in order to uphold the Constitution and the law.' Men, women, children, many sitting on the ground, were listening. Some of the students were circulating among the groups, distributing leaflets. In the major neighboring streets, traffic was normal. The army units were entrenched around the 'Polytechnic.' Overhead a helicopter of the federal district surveyed the city. In the city garden, children swam in the big pool. The fathers of the families were returning home, reading their newspapers. Five minutes

later a second helicopter joined the first one; and then, at 6:20, we saw a double green light, a flare, shoot up above the church of Santiago Tlatelolco. There were shouts: 'Stay calm; don't run!'

"It was already getting dark and it was difficult to understand the reason for the commotion. The speaker repeated the slogans about staying calm; but suddenly he was attacked and throttled by a person standing next to him while at the same time those occupying the platform tried to escape. They were seized by persons in civilian dress who came out of the apartments. In the square, an ancient Aztec pyramid surrounded by moats, the demonstrators tried to flee without comprehending what was happening. They found themselves facing 500 helmeted troops, machine guns and rifles at the ready, advancing in combat formation."

Kiejmann disputes the versions offered in the Mexican press as to what happened next.

"Contrary to the version given by most of the Mexican newspapers, there was no rifle shot at this moment from the buildings surrounding the square, nor from the roofs. On the other hand, one could see men in civilian dress in the crowd, their left hand gloved in white, signaling to the troops, who responded with heavy fire against the demonstrators. That was when the horror began. We scrambled over three-meter embankments. There was general panic."

Kiejmann continues his graphic account:

"The troops advanced toward us, forcing us to retreat up to the church. From the apartment building, men in civilian dress once again seemed to direct the soldiers with sweeping signals. The soldiers came in from all the side streets. There were more than 5,000 with 300 tanks. And they killed. Most of the students helped the women to flee, protecting them. It grew dark and a torrential rain soaked us. The tanks moved toward us. They sought first of all to block the entrance to the Chihuahua building. It was 7:15. The fusillade continued and a shell from a bazooka set fire to the Chihuahua building.

"The lights in the buildings went out and not a living soul could be seen. We learned later that many apartments were filled with refugees, lying on the floor in the dark. Some prisoners went by, their hands behind their necks, prodded by the soldiers, who beat them. Some of them were completely undressed and were held naked on the flat roofs of buildings. The Plaza of the Three Cultures

---

\* Fourth floor in the American system of enumeration.

was littered with wounded and dead, including some children.

"Those who were detained, which included me, were pushed up against the church, hands in the air. The men were ordered to take off their belts and drop them and the women were told to drop their umbrellas. The fusillade stopped between 8:00 and 8:15. What struck one among the detainees was their courage and determination, an impression of anger but at the same time calm. To them, the only person bearing responsibility was Díaz Ordaz, the president of the Republic, the only one having the right, under the Constitution to give the army the order to fire. But all those who were there had already known for a long time that the Constitution is nothing but a decoy.

"At 10:30 the fusillade began again. The firing was directed this time against the buildings on the other side, in the Nonoalco district, where, they said, snipers had hidden out. This second fusillade in turn lasted for twenty minutes. Behind the church, the firing doubled in force. Some women begged the

soldiers to let them go into the church. It was not until two hours later that they let us enter the convent beside the church, packing us in with close to 3,000 persons.

"The whole district was occupied by tanks and soldiers. It was not until 4 a.m. that I and a young French girl were permitted to go, after our identification papers were checked. The screaming of ambulance sirens filled the air."

It appears, says Kiejmann, that not since General Huerta's coup d'état in 1913 has such butchery been seen in Mexico. Nevertheless, the defense minister, General Marcelino García Barragan, declared: "I am the commander in charge. A state of siege will not be decreed. Mexico is a country where freedom reigns and will continue to reign..."

"But the editor of Excelsior, whose photographers were wounded by the army," concludes Kiejmann, "wonders what the reason was for this massacre of the innocents."

#### THE OCTOBER 2 "PACIFICATION"

By Ricardo Ochoa

##### Mexico City

After building up for seventy days, the political confrontation between the students of Mexico City, supported by a large number of universities in the rest of the country, and the government reached a bloody culmination October 2.

The full toll of the Tlatelolco massacre will not become known until the archives of the military intelligence are opened to the public. The Mexican press estimates the dead at 20 to 60 and the wounded at 150 to 300. The president's press secretary told the many foreign journalists, who are here for the Olympics, that there were 20 dead and 75 wounded, a ridiculously low figure.

The irrefutable truth is that the Díaz Ordaz government staged a deliberate massacre at the October 2 meeting in the Plaza de las Tres Culturas in Tlatelolco. Nothing like this has been seen in Mexico City since the "Tragic Tenth" of February in 1913 when Victoriano Huerta staged a military coup d'état and murdered President Francisco I. Madero.

In order to understand what was in the minds of the students the day they assembled at the plaza, it is necessary to go back a bit.

During the week in which the University of Mexico was invaded and occupied by federal troops [September 18], "unknown" persons machine-gunned Vocational School No. 7, Vocational School No. 5, Preparatory School No. 4, and the Colegio de México.

The police proved utterly incapable of either arresting or identifying the assailants. This was not too strange. It was an open secret that the police themselves organized the attacks.

In face of such provocations, the students who felt most directly threatened naturally sought to defend themselves in an organized way and they set up an embryonic defense guard.

On September 21 a clash occurred in the Nonoalco-Tlatelolco district between the students of Vocational School No. 7 and the granaderos [military security police] reinforced by mounted police.

The skirmishing, which began in the afternoon, lasted until the next morning. The people in this heavily populated district participated actively. The battle came to an end when the army moved in and took over the positions lost by the police.

Following another police provoca-





GUSTAVO DIAZ ORDAZ

tion September 23, the students of the National Polytechnic Institute gathered in the Casco de Santo Tomás area determined to do battle. After defeating the granaderos, they put up a heroic resistance to the police and the military which were sent in as reinforcements. [See Intercontinental Press, October 7, p. 830.]

At this point the struggle within the government between the hard-line and the moderate factions seemed to have ended in an impasse. The "hards" -- the president and the military (plus the "civilian" secretaries allied to the military, that is, the secretary of the interior and the head of the Federal District department) appeared at a loss as to what to do next.

Far from "pacifying" the students, measures such as the occupation of the university had only stirred them up all the more. The moderate faction could thus claim some verification for their arguments against such flagrant use of force.

An effort to convert the rector, Javier Barros Sierra, into a scapegoat ended dismally. He resigned September 22, the day before the battle of Santo Tomás. The university community, especially the teachers and heads of departments, rallied to his support; and on September 26

the governing board of the University of Mexico rejected the resignation.

This evident victory for the moderates was due in part to the indirect support which the rector received from a powerful sector of the Mexican bourgeoisie -- those directly involved in the tourist trade who were in agony over the possibility that the student "disturbances" would lead to cancellation of the Olympics. These patriots filled the daily papers with "manifestos" to the youth, raising such slogans as "Don't Forget Our Traditions," "Don't Serve Foreign Interests," "Be Good Mexicans."

The Consejo Nacional de Huelga announced a big protest demonstration for September 25 against the occupation of the university and the subsequent provocations. The troops were called out and they blocked the demonstration, but without using force.

On September 26 a protest meeting was held at the Plaza de las Tres Culturas. There was no violence whatsoever because the police did not intervene and no troops showed up. This was a good illustration of the point that a peaceful demonstration is one in which the forces of "law and order" do not interfere.

The counteroffensive of the students continued during the week beginning September 30. Their course of not giving in to the repression seemed to be succeeding.

On September 30 the army evacuated the university and the students staged a demonstration in the center of the city featuring some of the mothers of the political prisoners crowding the jails and prisons. About 5,000 persons participated in this. Again there was no violence.

On October 1 two more rallies were held on the university campus with some 10,000 students participating. At these rallies everyone was invited to attend the meeting planned for the next day at the Plaza de las Tres Culturas and to participate in a projected march to the Casco de Santo Tomás to demand the withdrawal of the military forces there.

In this context, it can be seen that the students visualized the October 2 meeting as only one in a series of actions protesting the repression.

Why did Díaz Ordaz decide to convert this peaceful meeting into a blood-bath?

By a thoroughly planned attack, the government wanted to make up for the mistakes committed in the September 18 occupation of the university. The Consejo Nacional de Huelga escaped that raid almost

intact. Only a few leaders were caught. The October 2 operation was intended to rectify things by catching the leaders and cadres in a single scoop of the net.

And the government hoped that a murderous blow would strike such terror in the population as to assure calm during the weeks of the Olympic Games.

This explains the thoroughness with which the government disposed its forces, the way it placed its detectives both in the crowd and the Chihuahua building, the coordinated system of signaling used in directing the troops and the cold-blooded way in which men, women and children were shot down.

The arrests were massive. The papers talked about 1,500 persons taken into custody. But they admitted that the military authorities at Military Camp No. 1, where the largest number are being held, refused to give an exact figure. A conservative estimate would run to about 3,000.

Mexico City is tense and gloomy. The day when the student conflict was a simple "commotion" without much significance is gone. July 26 marked the end of Mexico's long period of relative stability. The history of Mexico is now divided into before and after July 26. Now the meaning of October 2 must be assessed.

The bourgeoisie committed a grave error on that day, an error that will

cost it dear. It unmasked itself. It showed how ferociously repressive it can be. There is no doubt that it has frightened broad sectors of the Mexican people. But this marks a political defeat. Confidence in the regime has now been seriously, perhaps irretrievably, undermined.

This comes on top of the great shift in the Mexican political situation precipitated by the student movement that began July 26.

The perceptive critic Carlos Monsiváis summed up the change following July 26 in the following words: "The phrase, 'Nothing happens here,' is now excluded. Since July 26 Mexico has been changed utterly, fundamentally. And this change became clear the moment the movement changed from a student movement to a popular movement, from a movement in the capital to a national movement...."

"Many of the nation's nerve centers were hit and it has changed at its heart. An irreversible process has occurred which touches all of us without exception, and the best of all is this: a generation has decided not to follow the dreary conformism of its predecessors."

It can be taken for certain that Díaz Ordaz's demonstration of the belief of his circles that power comes out of the barrel of a gun will not cause the new generation to collapse into the dreary conformism of its predecessors.

#### DEMONSTRATIONS IN VARIOUS COUNTRIES SUPPORT MEXICAN STUDENTS

Students demonstrating solidarity with their Mexican comrades clashed with police in Santiago, Chile, October 5. Holding the United States responsible for the massacre in Mexico, the Chilean students stoned the U.S. consulate and defended themselves against the police with sticks and stones, according to the October 8 Le Monde.

In Managua, Nicaragua, students of the Universidad Nacional [National University] and the Universidad Centroamericana [Central American University] stoned the Mexican embassy and carried away its crest. The Mexico City daily El Día reported October 5 that the students said they would keep the crest until Mexico had "worthy representatives."

According to the same source, students in Amsterdam seized the Mexican general consulate and raised the red flag over it.

In Rome 1,000 demonstrators marched in solidarity with the Mexican

students on October 7, according to an Agence France-Presse dispatch.

Thousands of Italian students also demonstrated against the Díaz Ordaz government in Milan, Florence, and La Spezia.

Students demonstrating at the Mexican School of the University of Grenoble in the south of France on October 8 demanded that the mayor and deputy mayor of Grenoble [population about 100,000] cancel their planned trip to the Olympic Games. The trip, said the students, would constitute a kind of support for the Díaz Ordaz government "red with the blood of the Mexican students." The students distributed leaflets asking people to come to the city hall to hear the mayor's answer.

Thousands of students in Paris braved de Gaulle's police on October 3 to march in solidarity with the struggling youth of Mexico. In clashes with the police, four hundred of the marchers were



# MEXICO'S STUDENTS UPHOLD FREEDOM'S TORCH

**The Government of Diaz Ordaz is going ahead with the Olympic Games. Its acts of violence against the flower of its youth and its disregard of elementary liberties mock the ideals of freedom symbolized by the Olympics.**

... Troops, tanks, armored cars and jeeps following them spurting .30 and .50 machine-gun fire on a student rally ... 'they came without warning,' said one man who was there ... 'They just shot at everyone.' N.Y. Times, Oct. 3, 1968.

Over 150,000 high school and university students belonging to 86 institutions have been on strike since July 26. They have been protesting police violence, the virtual abrogation of civil liberties, violation of university autonomy, decreed by law in 1929, by the occupation by 10,000 assault troops.

On Aug. 13, 27 and Sept. 13, hundreds of thousands of Mexicans, professors, parents, and others, joined the students in rallies before the Presidential Palace.

The government's answer has been to suppress the people. Thousands have been arrested, hundreds wounded by arms fire and bayonets. More than 60 students, women and children have been killed.

Despite the brutal behavior of Mexico's government against this popular uprising, the Student Strike Committee has courageously continued to struggle for their six demands. These are:

- 1) removal of the police chief and his assistants
- 2) dissolution of the unconstitutional riot police
- 3) repeal of Article 145 which gives the government extraordinary powers to jail all opposition without trial
- 4) indemnities to the families of the slain students
- 5) an investigation of those responsible for the atrocities
- 6) freedom for all political prisoners

The attitude of the government is: World Opinion Be Damned! The Olympic Games Go On!

The embattled students and political prisoners in Mexico City's jails are asking for international support. Some have been confined for two years without bail or trial. We urge you to respond and speak out against this official brutality.

1. **Send protests to President Gustavo Diaz Ordaz, Presidential Palace, Mexico City, D.F., Mexico. Ask him to halt the killings, persecutions and jailings. Urge respect for university autonomy and democratic rights, and granting of amnesty to all political prisoners.**
2. **Tell President Ordaz why you won't be at the Olympics.**
3. **Ask your organization, club, professional association, campus group, etc., to discuss the Mexican situation and adopt resolutions of protest.**
4. **Hold public demonstrations in all major cities and on campuses in solidarity with the Mexican students.**
5. **Write for a copy of "Mexico 1968—The Students' Side of the Story", a special pamphlet prepared by this Committee.**
6. **Help the USLA Justice Committee provide legal, personal, financial aid to the political prisoners. Send your contribution today to:**

USLA Justice Committee  
P.O. Box 2303  
New York, N. Y. 10001

I want to help the Committee's work in this campaign.

I enclose a contribution of \_\_\_\_\_

Send me \_\_\_\_\_ copies of "Mexico 1968, The Students' Side of the Story", at \$1.00 each.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_

U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners  
Officers: David Dellinger, Paul Sweezy, John Gerassi, Felix McGowan, Richard Garza, Nell Salm

arrested.

Organized by the university, high-school and neighborhood action committees, which played a leading role in the May-June events, the demonstration was estimated by Le Monde to have involved not less than 2,000 persons.

Since hundreds of police had tightly sealed off the area around the Mexican embassy, the originally planned destination of the march, the students changed their route to run from the Gare Saint-Lazare to the Square des Arts-et-Métiers.

Carrying red banners and placards with the slogans "Paris -- Mexico, the Same Struggle!" and "Long Live the Mexican Students!" the demonstrators sang the "Internationale" and chanted the slogans of the May-June days. As the procession marched past the headquarters of the PCF [Parti Communiste Français -- French Communist party], the shout went up "Down with the bureaucracy!" "PCF -- Betrayal!"

The police followed the march at a distance all along the route but did not intervene until the end. As the demonstrators came to the Square des Arts-et-Métiers, the cops suddenly moved in with clubs and tear gas.

They treated the students with their customary brutality. The well-known French philosopher Jean Wahl protested bitterly in a letter published in the October 8 Le Monde that his 19-year-old daughter Agnès was seriously injured. "She was struck ten times very violently with a club. After she fell to the ground they kept on beating her.

"When she had been struck four times," Wahl continued, "and her head was bleeding profusely, tear-gas grenades were fired. Thus she suffered the effects of a tear-gas grenade explosion at ground level, causing a respiratory block and serious burns on her leg."

Wahl writes that after the beating his daughter was unconscious for two hours and that although she was surrounded by police the whole time, no attempt was made to help her. After she recovered consciousness, he writes, she was held another four hours without treatment. Even after they were arrested the demonstrators were systematically beaten. "The line [of prisoners] had to run a gauntlet of police striking with their clubs."

#### PORTUGUESE POLICE BREAK UP STUDENT DEMONSTRATION

Police in Lisbon attacked some fifty students who refused to recognize a ban on demonstrations in celebrating the fifty-eighth anniversary of the overthrow of the monarchy. After placing wreaths on the graves of the republican heroes Octo-

In London, according to the October 5 Guardian, about 100 students marched on the Mexican embassy during the previous evening to deliver a protest against the government violence in Mexico City. The march was given "moral support from the Young Socialist League and the Socialist Labour League." Banners said: "Arms for Mexican workers," "End the massacre of Mexican students," and "Out with Ordaz, all power to Mexican workers."

A big demonstration is being organized in London for October 27 under the auspices of a number of organizations.\* Called to protest the support offered by the Wilson government to U.S. imperialism in its aggression in Vietnam, it will in all likelihood carry banners expressing solidarity with the Mexican students.

"We hope," said Bertrand Russell and Jean-Paul Sartre in calling for a boycott of the Olympic Games, "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."

In the United States, a solidarity campaign was launched by the U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners. The main demand raised by the committee is immediate release of the political prisoners in Mexico.

The committee is appealing for demonstrations in the United States to emphasize protests sent to Díaz over his attempt to suppress the student movement.

Funds can be sent to the committee to help in the legal defense work and to aid the prisoners and their families financially.

Among its actions, the committee took out a prominent advertisement in the October 13 issue of the New York Times [see reproduction on page 891].

---

\* But not including the Young Socialist League nor the Socialist Labour League. In accordance with their sectarian views and predilection for isolated demonstrations involving only their own forces, they refused to participate.

ber 4, the students left the cemetery in a group and raised placards calling for the restoration of civil liberties, abolition of the censorship and free elections. The police, who had been hiding in the vicinity, fell upon them with clubs.

TROOPS GUARD OLYMPIC GAMES

Mexico's President Gustavo Díaz Ordaz proclaimed his devotion to peace and brotherhood to the crowd of 80,000 at the Olympic Stadium October 12. Outside, heavily armed soldiers ringed the arena, rifles at the ready, prepared to fire at the sign of any gathering of students.

Half a billion people were believed to have watched the spectacle of the opening of the Games of the XIX Olympiad via television, and the grim contrast must have been apparent.

Student leaders announced a few days before the ceremony that at least 300 students had vanished without a trace after the army massacre of a demonstration in the Plaza de las Tres Culturas October 2. More than fifty youth were known to be dead.

The October 21 Newsweek held that the "most serious danger was of further massive student demonstrations and riots with harsh police reaction." The somewhat liberal American weekly went on: "Mexico City is preoccupied with the specter of the disorders of Oct. 2...."

The editor of Le Monde observed in the October 11 issue of the prestigious Paris daily:

"The games in Mexico will be held from October 12 to October 27 under the protection of the police and the army, although the National Strike Committee of the students seems to have decided to observe an 'armed truce.' The presence of helmeted men is not exactly the most desirable décor with which to celebrate the great fraternal festival of the world's youth, a few hundred meters from prisons where hundreds of students are being held."

A total of 7,886 athletes from 107 nations marched in the opening parade under overcast skies. Even the sports writers, who have an occupational aversion to anything political, could not escape commenting on the situation. New York Times sports reporter Robert Lipsyte noted October 12, "This Olympics has been shrouded with more troubles than most," referring to "the murderous snuffing-out of Mexican student rioting."

The initial impulse of Díaz Ordaz was to justify the slaughter of the students by claiming a "Communist plot" had been involved. This became difficult when the obvious target of such a charge, the Soviet Union, was a major participant in the Olympics. The Soviet bureaucrats chose to ignore the struggle of the students. Its delegation did not even so much as protest the brutal repression taking place on the very campus where the Olympic Stadium is located.

This calculated silence may have served to ingratiate the Kremlin among those capitalist regimes with whom it seeks "peaceful coexistence," but it was extremely damaging to Soviet prestige among the revolutionary youth of Mexico and the world.

As for Díaz Ordaz, he was compelled to fall back on one of the extravagant, cooked-up plots for which his government has become notorious.

A little-known student leader who had been held prisoner in a military camp was brought forward October 5 to "testify" to the involvement of several well-known bourgeois politicians in a "plot" against the government. Socrates Amado Campos Lemus, a 24-year-old National Polytechnic Institute student, held a press conference under police guard. He allegedly told the papers that money for supplies and "arms" had been given to the students by Carlos A. Madrazo, former president of the ruling Institutional Revolutionary party; Humberto Romero Perez, private secretary to President Adolfo López Mateos from 1960-61; Braulio Maldonado, former governor of Baja California; Victor Urquidi, director of the College of Mexico; and Elena Garro, a writer.

Madrazo, the best-known of those named, accused the government of carrying out a witch-hunt. Members of the National Strike Committee had warned previously that twenty jailed committee members were being tortured by the police and "could be made to say anything." In political arrests in 1966 similar "confessions" were extracted by police through the use of beatings, torture, and threats of death to prisoners and their families.

MEXICAN GOVERNMENT INDICTS 15 STUDENT LEADERS

The Mexican government announced October 11 that it had indicted 113 persons for "sedition and homicide" in the most recent "disorders." Among them were 15 leaders of the National Strike Commit-

tee. The government claimed that it had "evidence" of a "plot" to kidnap one of the leading Olympic Games athletes in order to "attract publicity" for the student cause.

CANADIAN CP REVERSES STAND ON CZECHOSLOVAKIA

By Dick Fidler

Toronto

The Central Committee [CC] of the Communist party of Canada has reversed the criticism of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia registered by the Central Executive Committee [CEC], the party's top administrative body.

The CC statement, in the October 9 Canadian Tribune, "rejects those aspects of the Central Executive statement of August 22nd which gave expression to the false position that the entry of the Warsaw Pact troops into Czechoslovakia was not in the interests of socialism."

It would appear that among the minority opposing this statement is the staff of the Canadian Tribune, the CP's national weekly, and its youth leadership. Until the invasion, the Canadian Tribune had been generally sympathetic to the "democratization" process in Czechoslovakia. Reports from Prague by its correspondent, John Boyd, a former Canadian Tribune editor, were a major feature of its coverage. Boyd stressed in his articles that the direction of the reforms in Czechoslovakia was toward strengthening socialism, and that no significant section of the population sought the restoration of capitalism.

The invasion took the party by surprise. After three days, the CEC issued a statement which, while not actually condemning the Soviet action, called for "the early withdrawal of all foreign troops from Czechoslovakia, the upholding of her sovereignty and independence, pursuit of the policy deepening and extending socialist democracy embarked upon by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia in its decisions of January, 1968."

The CEC pointedly noted that the Kremlin's claims to have intervened at the request of Czech leaders "were at variance with the estimation and declaration

of leading bodies in Czechoslovakia."

This statement did not satisfy the old Stalinists in the CP, who have insisted on uncritical support to the Kremlin. The CP's west coast paper, the Pacific Tribune, in contrast to the Canadian Tribune, gave consistent public expression to the views of the old-line Stalinists.

In its version of the CEC statement of August 22, the Pacific Tribune even went so far as to omit the section which stated that the Czech party had not invited the Warsaw Pact intervention. (This omission was "corrected" in a subsequent issue.)

Since the invasion, a number of letters highly critical of the invasion have appeared in the CP press, particularly the Canadian Tribune. Among the letter writers have been leading youth spokesmen of the Communist party.

Besides its difficulties over Czechoslovakia, the CP is in crisis over its policy of running candidates against those of Canada's labor party, the New Democratic party [NDP]. In the federal election last June, the CP candidates helped defeat one sitting NDP member of parliament, and came close to providing the margin to defeat two others.

In his report to the recent Central Committee meeting, CP leader Kashtan acknowledged considerable "resistance to our electoral policy among some sections of the party." Some members, he said, "believed we should not run at all and [instead] limit ourselves to working for the election of NDP candidates."

This growing opposition within the party to CP policies, which are in shambles everywhere, is unlikely to be silenced. It is not excluded that the party may soon face a split among its top leadership similar to the resignation of the Salsberg faction in 1957.

90 GREEK POLITICAL PRISONERS CONDEMN SOVIET INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Ninety Greek political prisoners in the concentration camp on the island of Leros issued a statement August 21 condemning the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. The September 20 issue of Le Monde reported their declaration: "The invasion cannot be justified in any way.... e express our complete solidarity with the Czechoslovak people and their leaders. We

call on the governments of the five socialist countries to withdraw their armies and allow the Czechoslovak people to freely determine their own destiny." Signers included Manolis Glezos, Resistance hero and Lenin peace prize winner, and other leaders of the Enosis tes Demokratikes Aristeras [Union of the Democratic Left], and of the Lambrakis Youth.

HUGO BLANCO INDICTS PERU'S PRISON SYSTEM

[On September 12, the Lima Ojo published a letter from Hugo Blanco, the Peruvian Trotskyist now serving a 25-year sentence at El Frontón because of his role in the peasant struggle in the Cuzco region, describing how two prisoners were tortured to death by the security forces at the penal island. (See Intercontinental Press, October 7, p. 838.)

[Blanco has now followed this up with another statement, this time indicting Peru's entire prison system and the economic and social order of which it is an expression. Fears have been expressed in Peru that the prison authorities may take reprisals against Hugo Blanco, possibly murdering him. The brutality is so extreme in the prison, however, that a political leader of Blanco's caliber finds it impossible to remain silent.

[The statement, reproduced below, is being circulated in Peru in mimeographed form. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

Massacre!

Against the Massacre in El Frontón.  
Against All the Massacres.  
Against Systematized Massacre.  
Against the System Based on Massacres.

In 1967 some prisoners escaped from the launch that was bringing them to this inferno. Immediately the Guardia Republicana [Republican Guard] unleashed a brutal repression against the entire prison population and subjected the recaptured prisoners to the most horrendous tortures. At the very start of the general repression the two political prisoners Blanco and Creus were beaten.

In 1968 a group of prisoners escaped from the El Sexto prison. Those recaptured were taken to El Frontón again to be massacred. Once again the most extreme brutality was unleashed against the prison population as a whole. This time two were murdered.

The fact that different guards acted in an identical way under two different administrations shows the premeditated and systematic nature of this procedure. The Guardia Republicana wanted to provoke a "mutiny" in order to murder with impunity the ex-escapees and others whom they wished to present as "ringleaders." This was what they did in 1963 when they murdered "Negro" Caycho in front of everybody, shooting him in the back while he kneeled with his arms out.\*

---

\* Like a cross. In our October 27 issue this was mistranslated to read with "his arms crossed."

Such attitudes are not exceptional for the Guardia Republicana. These cowards murdered Huanca in the Sepa prison, Arcadio Hurtado in the Cuzco jail, etc., without being punished. Torture and brutality of all kinds are permanent features in all the prisons of the country.

Prisoners are brought to El Frontón through a gauntlet of the most unimaginable taunts and brutality without any excuse. Prisoners come to El Frontón on their knees, with their manacles imbedded in their flesh, with their heads on the ground, stamped on, spat upon, and reviled -- and all this to a chorus of sadistic laughter from their guards.

Peru should not forget that at its birth the Guardia Republicana murdered eight of our greatest heroes -- the eight sailors. But it is not only the Guardia Republicana. The history of the Guardia Civil [Civil Guard], the army, the Policía de Investigaciones de Perú [Investigation Police of Peru], etc., abounds in tortures, massacres, craven murders, mysterious disappearances, and so on. And revolutionists are their specialty.

Among the revolutionists who have been murdered in cold blood in recent years we can cite: Luis de la Puente Uceda, Guillermo Lobatón, Javier Héraud, Luis Zapata, Guillermo Mercado, Simón Oviedo, Benito Cutipa, Arcadio Hurtado, Enrique Amaya, etc.

The list of revolutionists who have been tortured is endless: José Bustos, Miguel Tauro, Carlos Cardeña, Eduardo Creus, "Che" Pereira, José Martorell, Vicente Lanado, Meza, Abraham Lama, Andrés González, Fortunato Vargas, Aniceto Muñoz, José Zuñiga, Gerardo Carpio, Humberto Carazas, Lucio Beingo-lea, etc., etc. And there is also the case of my codefendant Fortunato Torres who was tortured during his preliminary trial in front of the judge and his "lawyer," both of them police officials.

If we add all this to the massive massacres of workers, peasants, etc., we can see that brutality and barbarism on the part of the repressive forces are the norm, not the exception, in the country. This is standard operating procedure for these bodies.

The reason for this is that the objective of the armed forces and their auxiliaries is to maintain the rule of an exploiting minority over an exploited majority. This minority needs the brutality of its repressive forces to maintain the system of exploitation of man by man. The massacres, torture, disap-

pearances, murders, etc., represent precisely the exercise of repression, which is the function of these repressive forces.

It is natural that the system defends its guards. It is natural that the exploiters, through their executive, legislative, and judicial powers, etc., take care of their defenders, of the prime guarantors of their rule, like best-loved children. It is natural that they bless and applaud the barbarism which maintains their exploitation. It is natural that the crimes committed in exercising the repressive function are covered up for the most part through the complicity of the capitalist press.

It is not to be wondered that the country's special "antisubversive" force "Llapan Aticc" ("those who can do anything") are in permanent charge of bringing prisoners to El Frontón. The exploiters know that even more than the physical fitness of their repressive forces they must maintain their "morale." These forces must be kept in "readiness" to massacre women and defenseless children without a moment's hesitation.

Nor is it surprising that notorious murderers like Asambuja and Díaz Selari have come up in the world, or that wholesale murderers like Díaz and Arteta Torzi sit on commissions investigating the massacre in El Frontón. All this is as natural as the repression's specializing in revolutionists, because revolutionists attack directly this system of the exploitation of the poor by the rich. The exploiters know that the revolutionists are the irreconcilable enemies of their barbarism in all its forms, who will not stop until they have torn it out by its roots. They know that they cannot satisfy us with crumbs or deceive us with masks. And therefore they have marked us.

We do not believe that a "prison reform" will solve this problem. That would be rather like asking for a "moderate repression" or "honest corruption." The jails simply mirror Peru; the prisons are the reflection of the system, its image, its manifestation. Repression is the expression of the system, the way it maintains itself.

The "crimes" which the exploiters describe and condemn in their "codes" are practiced by them with impunity. They practice them enthusiastically, massively, and constantly, both personally and through the state. The big smugglers are not in prison. The big thieves of the IPC [International Petroleum Company], the Cerro de Pasco, Toquepala, and their government accomplices rule the country. The great traitors, swindlers, and forgers of

Taldra run the country. I have already spoken of their other crimes above.

Who fills the prisons? First of all innocent people and secondly people driven to steal because of the hunger that exploitation creates, people driven to crime by the desperation and degradation that accompanies the poverty created by the exploiters. They are all from the humble classes. Because the rich run afoul of the law only in exceptional cases and then they go into a clinic for a few months and the matter is taken care of.

Secondly, we revolutionists have the honor to be frequent residents of the Peruvian jails, because we cannot adjust to a system which represents robbery, exploitation, poverty, and massacre. And because the exploiters know that our war against corruption is a war to the death.

Although we do not believe that in this system "the mass murderers will be punished," that there will be a "prison reform," or any other such naive notions, we believe that the growing campaign against the repressive brutality inflicted on the prisoners is very positive. It is positive to show the crying contradictions between the written "law" and the way it is applied (or not applied). It is positive because it unmasks the hypocritical "defenders of the law." It is positive because it awakens the humanity of the people and brings it into opposition to the inhumanity of the exploiters' system.

The more conscious the people become of the brutality and the repression, the more ready they will be to demand its elimination. The more stubbornly the exploiters refuse to eliminate it, the more rapidly the people will realize that inhumanity is inherent in the system of exploitation and that to eliminate inhumanity they must eliminate the system.

The development of our people's consciousness will triumph over bureaucratic or electoralist promises of "prison reform," "judicial reform," or any other farce in an attempt to cover up the root of the problem. It will not be fooled by the promises of future deputies or presidents who use this theme to gain votes.

The struggle against all forms of repression is no more than a part of the struggle of the exploited against the exploiters and as such it must be intimately linked to it.

Hugo Blanco

The Prison Island  
of El Frontón

September 1968



INTERVIEW WITH AN EDITOR OF "LITERARNI LISTY"

[The following interview given to P.H. Zoller by Igor Hajek, an editor of the Czech Writers Union weekly Literární Listy, just before the Soviet intervention, was published in the Swiss La Gazette Littéraire of August 17-18. A specialist in modern American literature, Hajek was in charge of his paper's international section.

[The editorial by Milan Kundera referred to in the first question was published in the August 1 issue of Literární Listy and was a ringing defiance of the Kremlin's pressure on Czechoslovakia and a bold affirmation of solidarity with the Soviet nonconformist intellectuals.

[The translation of the interview is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

Question: Despite all we know about the liberalization of your regime, an editorial like this one on the front page of a very widely read paper is a bit surprising.

Answer: Not at all. Everybody knows that. A lot of people may write this in a less intense, less penetrating way. But that is Kundera's style. Basically there is nothing new about it.

Q: At a certain point in May and June in France people demanded very definite things. Is there any chance that will happen, for example, in the Writers Union, clear definite demands?

A: At this point it would be difficult to demand anything at all. It would be ridiculous. We have lived through months of hope and anxiety. Our leaders have not let us down. The censorship has been abolished since March. We must see what we can do now. For the time being this is enough. Since the beginning of the year, no one has had time to write, like before if you wish. The publishers are panicked over the possibility that there will be nothing to publish in the fall.

Q: Has the abolition of the censorship radically changed your possibilities for expression?

A: No. Everything that is being said today was already being said but with greater caution in the presentation of ideas and choice of words. You had to read between the lines. The censorship didn't always operate in a direct way. It was more subtle, Kafka-like. For example, a film would be banned at its official viewing, causing a stir in the circles concerned. Six months later it would ap-



MILAN KUNDERA

pear in the movie theaters, but the critics would find themselves forbidden to speak favorably about it. Then, they just noted that they saw the film and everyone knew that they had thought well of it.

Q: What will be the chief concern of your paper in the immediate future?

A: Politics, politics above all. We will try to find a way of establishing a permanent dialogue inside the socialist structures. We want more democracy not only from the political point of view but from the point of view of the producers. We want to maintain the thoughtful climate that has developed and help give everyone the feeling that his opinion counts.

Q: All that resembles Western leftist idealism.

A: Yes and no. But more no than yes. The democrats, the leftists in the bourgeois countries can do nothing against

the system, absolutely nothing. In any case, only verbally. Let's say that we are socialist democrats. The system established for twenty years [in Czechoslovakia] makes our action possible; it is its precondition. Your system condemns intellectuals to inaction. Since 1945 a class has disappeared, has been removed. But what came in January could have and should have come much earlier. It came at the last minute.

Q: To what extent have you followed and been sensitive to what the students have been saying and expressing in France, Germany, and Italy?

A: We kept up with events; we kept abreast of everything! We got all the periodicals we might need, Der Spiegel, Le Monde, the Sunday Times, etc. So we knew about it. But it is only now that these ideas are becoming comprehensible to us. When Rudy Dutschke came to speak in Prague last March and accused the Czech students of betraying the revolution, there was sympathy perhaps but a lack of understanding on both sides. We should remember Marcuse's answer last year in London to a question that I myself wanted to ask him: "What difference can there be between the East European and West European countries?" The question is not a foolish one since Stokely Carmichael for example talks about the "decadent West," including the United States, Europe, and the USSR. Marcuse's answer, which I agree with, was that an economic revolution is necessary in the West but in the East only a political and antibureaucratic revolution. We have been making this political revolution since January. The ideas of the extreme left students are becoming more understandable to us.

How long will we continue, how far will we go? For us a more radical challenge to the system is not called for because the challenge to the system has come from within it.

Q: (With the timid tone of one who is about to ask a question completely off the top of his head, I murmured) A Euro-  
pean Cuba?

A: (The answer was not a shaking of the head but a smile.) I don't know. For some time our economists have been proclaiming loudly that moral stimuli weren't enough, but for six months it has been moral stimuli that have moved the people. For example, two weeks ago a movement began in a factory in Bohemia to create a Fund for the Republic, financed by the wages for extra hours worked. This movement spread throughout the country. The money collected was to go to the government in case of difficulties. I don't say whether or not such a movement serves a useful purpose, only that it is interesting.

But what will happen when the pressures we are under now diminish? Then, in the present state of our economy, such a movement could have the aberrant result of producing goods which we don't need, which would not be sold. This is not a vicious circle, it is a Kafka-like situation. There has also been an effort to collect a gram of gold per head to create a national gold reserve. It is touching but not realistic.

Q: And now?

A: And now -- Marcuse has said that "socialism only justifies itself when it aspires to exist in its most utopian form." So we are going to try to keep our leaders from forgetting these ideas.

(The smile that accompanied this statement was the smile of someone who felt he had won and knew that the victory was only beginning.)

(Intellectuals get the role that they deserve.)

#### A SPLIT IN THE CZECH LEADERSHIP OVER CONCESSIONS TO MOSCOW?

Eric Bourne, writing from Prague in the October 8 Christian Science Monitor, claims he received inside information on a split in the leadership of the Czechoslovak Communist party over conditions proposed by the Kremlin for the withdrawal of its troops.

Bourne said that Alexander Dubček at first refused to sign the communiqué issued after discussions in Moscow October 3-4. Dubček had been accompanied by Czech Premier Oldrich Cernik and Gustav Husak, leader of the Slovak section of the Czechoslovak Communist party.

Referring to "a reliable and extremely well-informed source," the Monitor correspondent said that Dubček "stoutly defended the reform movement against the Soviet leaders' attacks. And he resisted further concessions to the Russians, demanded as the price for only a partial withdrawal of the Warsaw Pact invasion forces.

"He yielded only, this same source said, when his two colleagues...indicated their own belief that there was no realistic alternative to acceptance of Russia's harsh demands for 'normalizing' the

country's internal situation."

Bourne expressed the view that Dubček, as well as Josef Smrkovský, who was not invited to Moscow for the recent meeting, would soon be removed from their posts. He discounted the rumor that they planned to resign. As evidence to support his contention of a split in the Czech leadership, the Monitor correspondent pointed to Dubček's silence for several days after returning from Moscow, during which the burden of defending the new agreement fell on Cernik.

Since Bourne's article was written,

Dubček has broken his silence. On October 11 he told a television audience, "Democracy needs a certain discipline.... Everything is harmful that disrupts our alliance with the socialist community, everything which undermines the leading role of the party..."

He declared that unpopular measures were necessary and proposed tighter press censorship. His statement suggested he favored the promotion of old-line Stalinists within the Czech CP as a concession to the Kremlin. The evidence would indicate that at least publicly Dubček has chosen to accept the Moscow agreement.

#### SOVIET INTELLECTUALS SENTENCED TO EXILE AND PRISON FOR PROTESTING CZECH INVASION

Five Soviet intellectuals, including Pavel Litvinov and Larissa Daniel, were sentenced to exile and prison by a Moscow court October 11 for protesting the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia.

Litvinov was sentenced to five years in exile in some remote place in the Soviet Union yet to be announced. Larissa Daniel was exiled for four years. Konstantin Babitsky, a 40-year-old scholar at the Russian language institute of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, was sentenced to three years of exile.

Vladimir Dremlyuga, 28, was given a three-year prison term -- the maximum under the law. Vadim Delone, 23, a student and poet, received a two-and-one-half-year term. He was also ordered to serve four months of a year suspended sentence he had been given previously for taking part in another demonstration.

The five were arrested in Red Square August 25 carrying banners reading, "Hands Off Czechoslovakia," "Freedom for Dubček," "Long Live Free and Independent Czechoslovakia," "Shame on the Occupiers," and "For Your Freedom and Ours."

They were charged with "disturbing public order" and interfering with traffic in the vast square. [The square, however, is barred to vehicles.]

The trial became the focal point for further protest by supporters of the victims of bureaucratic injustice. The public and the foreign press were not permitted to observe the trial, but friends and relatives gathered outside during the three-day proceedings. Immediate members of the families, allowed inside, relayed the developments to the group in the street from time to time.

Henry Kamm, writing from Moscow in the October 10 New York Times, described one incident:

"Some friends had come prepared with a typed petition protesting denial of access. Turned down by the policeman at the courthouse door, they withdrew across the street to a small park to put the petition up for signatures.

"Sympathizers and watchful agents [of the secret police] mingled around the table. Soon a scuffle ensued in which the petition was torn. The friends of the defendants turned against the last hostile youth to have touched the petition, accusing him of hooliganism and threatening to call the police.

"Former Maj. Gen. Pyotr G. Grigorenko, an advocate of civil liberties, was in the middle of the scuffle, swinging his cane over his head. He demanded that the hostile youth identify himself. The neatly dressed young man...refused."

The youth said he had been sent by the Communist youth organization to keep watch on "enemies of public order." "My soul belongs to the party," he reportedly said, to which one of the protesters replied, "How much did you sell it for?"

During the trial all five defendants reportedly stood by their convictions. Pavel Litvinov is said to have declared, "The freer each of us is in a great socialist country, the better it will be for all of us."

Despite frequent interruptions from the judge, who refused to hear testimony from the defendants on their political beliefs, Larissa Daniel reportedly told the court:

"I was protesting against the entry of Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia and demanding that they be withdrawn. I believed then and I believe now that the sending of troops into Czechoslovakia was a mistake on the part of our government..."

From Czechoslovakia

WHERE DOES THE POWER LIE?

By Václav Slavík

[One of the main axes of the Kremlin's propaganda campaign against the democratization in Czechoslovakia has been that the "liberalizers" there wanted to eliminate the leading role of the Communist party in the state and society in order to prepare the way for a restoration of capitalism. A major article in this campaign, "On the Role of the Communist Party in Building Socialism," in Pravda of September 19, expressed the Kremlin line in these words:

["The strategic design of the opponents of socialism lies in an attempt to drive a wedge between the Communist and workers parties, to sow distrust in the Communists, to weaken their influence in public life. Convinced that naked and open anti-Communism has less and less chance of success, many bourgeois propagandists are trying to operate more cleverly, more elusively. They carefully package their anti-Communist wares in 'democratic' wrappings. Socialism, they assert, might not be a bad system if it could be made more liberal, if it would admit a 'free' contest for power among several political parties. In short, the aim of all this is to strike a blow at the leading force for socialism -- the Communist parties -- and thus to block the process of world socialist renewal.

["This was the goal the imperialist-supported, right-wing counterrevolutionary forces in Czechoslovakia set themselves. Demagogically misusing the slogan of 'democratization,' these forces waged a malicious campaign against the CPC (Communist party of Czechoslovakia) and its honest and devoted cadres with the obvious aim of liquidating the leading role of the party, of bringing Czechoslovakia into conflict with the other socialist countries."

[In the weeks before the Kremlin and its allies moved in to put a stop to it, the Czechoslovak liberals carried on a rich discussion of the party's role in building socialism. Although these anti-Stalinist Communist party intellectuals were not revolutionary Marxists -- they were generally products of the Stalinist system themselves, as Václav Slavík, the writer of the article below, is honest enough to admit -- they did go a long way in exposing the Stalinist and post-Stalinist distortions of this concept and in restoring its authentic meaning.

[The article by Slavík, "Where Does the Power Lie?" is a good example of this discussion in the Czechoslovak press.

It appeared in the Czech Writers Union paper Literární Listy on July 25. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

In the conditions in our country, the question of where the power lies has been raised in practice three times. Where does the power lie? That is not simply a theoretical question, but one which arises with special force in the work of the organs of the state and society and which concerns the activity of the KSC [Komunistická Strana Československa -- Communist party of Czechoslovakia]. The very fact that this question has been raised again and again in such a short space of time is testimony that no satisfactory or real answer has been given to it.

The recent development in connection with the letter of the five Communist and workers parties to the Communist party of Czechoslovakia and the campaign that has arisen around it in these five countries shows that an international aspect to our problem cannot be excluded. This does not mean of course that this aspect and these influences were not present in previous attempts to answer this question.

We need only reread the minutes of the December-January plenum of the CC [Central Committee] of the KSC to see clearly that those who were seeking an immediate and definitive separation between the posts of First Secretary [of the Communist party] and President had more on their minds than this apparent aspect of the power question. They were not interested just in weakening the power of the vulgar Marxist, A. Novotný [who held both posts].

If those of us who were "in on it" can be blamed for anything -- which is quite in order -- then it is because we did not move against A. Novotný earlier. Because a number of important danger signals had already shown up both in our own experience and that of the party and the broader public. The fact is that we were then more or less in the pay of the system in which we worked, and there is no point in hiding the fact. In that system it seemed hopeless to make any attempt individually or collectively to end the practical concentration of party power in the hands of one person who then, in the name of both the party and the state, stood above society. But at the same time

such attempts brought about an accumulation of forces and a ripening of the process which came to a head at the end of 1967.

The essence of the December and January developments was to return the Communist party to its real mission, that is, a new attempt to answer the question of its proper relationship to the society and the state. The continuity of the Czechoslovak spring with the preceding development lies then primarily in the fact that similar questions are being posed and an attempt is being made to find an adequate answer to these questions free from superstitions or illusions. Thus, Marx's precept that socialist revolutions must be constantly criticized, their failings exposed, and the people aroused to new tasks is being fulfilled in practice. This must be the proper method in every revolution and this holds true for our post-January reality and development.

The question of where the power lies was first raised by Gottwald at the beginning of the fifties, which marked our greatest postwar crisis. His answer to this question was to justify personal power. He made it clear that power did not lie in the neighborhood of the Prague Gate (the Central Committee of the KSC) or in Strakovka (the government). He reminded us of Stalin and the Kremlin, stressing that the locus of power should be as clear for us in our country as it was for him in Moscow. This conception not only obscured the relationship between the party and the state but excluded the people from it, although the May 9 Constitution then in force proclaimed the sovereignty of the people.

This does not mean that the practice conformed entirely to the theory proclaimed. There was not even any sovereign power in the Castle [the seat of the executive]. The baseless repressions of Communists and other citizens, which the theory proclaimed (with all its implications) did indeed justify, weakened the party, the state and the entire society.

Five years passed after the Twentieth Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union and the same question came up again. This was because -- it was claimed -- the Political Bureau and the Central Committee of the KSC had totally failed (!) to assimilate what was said in 1951 on the question of where the power lies in this country and who rules. "Ambiguities in this sphere caused great harm in the areas of security, the armed forces, culture, the economy, and elsewhere. It must be clearly stated that our Communist party, as the leading party, has to struggle vigorously against all attempts to weaken or reduce its leading role in the state structure or in our po-

litical, public, economic, and cultural life as a whole." (A. Novotný at a meeting of the CC of the KSC in March 1956.)

Our concern here is not to investigate how this formulation originated or how failings arose. It was certainly not because there was no deeper understanding at the time. This answer was deformed in every respect. Moreover, it is by no means clear what the Central Committee had failed to assimilate, what attempts were made to reduce its role against which the party had to defend itself.

In fact, at that time efforts were being stepped up to get the entire party and its members to participate in a real way in the formulation of party policy. The ramifications of this would have led to settling accounts with the illegalities of the early fifties.\* The CC plenum would have come to play the role of the leading party body between party congresses. In the answer given to our question at this time, however, the party was henceforth identified with the state and the society, which in fact prevented it from playing a leading political role in reality.

This answer and subsequent practice led to a bureaucratic-administrative concept of governing, which in the following years was not confined to the realm of theory but prevailed more and more in real life. This tendency was reinforced at that time also by international influences and support. No solution to the crisis was found, and the essential reason for this is to be found precisely in the fact that the question of the locus of power which was raised was not answered.

In both examples, it can be clearly shown that these theoretical questions, their formulation, and the dispute over them had a fundamental importance. A policy which parades itself as scientific and boasts of its Marxism but diverges from it even in words cannot fail to diverge from it in acts also. This was what happened in the early and late fifties.

As Marx and Lenin conceived it, the Communist party is primarily a political force. It cannot be more than this because it is only a part of society. It strives to be the vanguard of the working class and the working masses in general. This obviously does not mean that the Communist party is not a very definite force. It is a force by the power of its program, its influence on the public, and by the role of Communists in state and public offices. It should not have power, because it stands above the society, because it not only does not recognize but in fact

---

\* Presumably the purges and frame-up trials of that period. -- I.P.

suppresses all political initiative outside its ranks and inside its ranks outside the top circles, because it does not seek dialogue and a well-defined interchange between the power "at the base" and "at the summit."

We cannot fail to recognize that even in a developing socialist society there are leaders and the led, the governing and the governed. This is true on various levels of social life. Yet recognizing this fact does not mean that we should reconcile ourselves to it. We must work to make democracy real in socialist society.

We must return to the sources of the Czechoslovak spring and take a critical attitude toward our own reality, especially as regards the basic questions. I think that the Action Program of the KSC by its spirit and especially in some of its passages gives a definitive answer to the question of "where the power lies." It makes clear that those elected to bodies which represent the society as a whole must be the elected representatives of this society and its various layers. It stresses that state functionaries are responsible to all citizens.

The Action Program introduces a quite consistent separation of the party from the state. In real life this will enable the party to play the key role in the state structure and to criticize weaknesses in the work of the state. This separation does not mean that the Communists have abandoned their efforts to play a vanguard and leading political role in the life of the society.

"The leading role of the party was often understood in the past as meaning the concentration of all power in the hands of the party bodies. This accorded with the false assumption that the party was the instrument of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This harmful notion weakened the initiative and responsibility of the state, economic, and social institutions. It damaged the authority of the party and made it incapable of fulfilling its most important function."

The state obviously cannot be the mere instrument of the Communist party's will. It can implement the will of the Communist party only insofar as this will represents the most progressive essence in society and only insofar as it accords with the will of the broad layers of the

working class, the peasantry, and the intellectuals.

Projects and proposals by the Communist party which involve the society in general can only be assured of implementation when they get the support and arouse the real initiative of the decisive strata of society, above all the workers. To this end, a real vital alliance between the intellectuals and the working class, between the city and the country, is also necessary.

A full answer to the question of where the power lies in our society has many sides to it which can scarcely be explained in the limits of a journalistic article. At present I see three obstacles which must be eliminated so that our answer to this question can produce a flourishing of Marxist principles in real life.

The political questions in the life of the society, that is the questions involved in the relationships between groups and layers of citizens, between organizations developing within a socialist framework, cannot be resolved by any but political means. The tendency to stress the administrative side of things, the tendency toward cabinet politics -- residues of which survive from the pre-January relationships -- is a danger to our future progress.

In socialist society power at the top -- no matter how democratic this society may be, power must always be concentrated in central bodies -- is counterbalanced by the steady and important counterweight of the lower links in the chain of authority. Especially important in this is supervision, understanding, will, and activity by the broadest levels of society. The top bodies cannot merely reflect these elements of power at the base and take them into consideration. They must participate with them in a dialogue leading to the consolidation of socialism from top to bottom.

Finally, the higher bodies especially must always be clearly aware that they are governing a specific country, this country. This does not mean that they should fail to give the proper attention to the necessity for unity among the socialist countries. But our country can contribute to the development and reinforcement of this unity only when its sovereignty -- that is the sovereignty of the people and the leading political and state bodies -- is assured.

#### "CHE'S EVERYWHERE"

On October 9, the anniversary of Che Guevara's death, guards at the Eiffel tower in Paris hastily tore down a huge

red flag which they found floating from the first floor. An inscription on it read: "Everyone now sees Che's everywhere."

## THE YUGOSLAV LEADERSHIP AND THE INVASION OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

By David Riddell

The invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Warsaw Pact countries has enabled the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia to postpone a growing crisis in their own country.

Since the institution of the current economic reforms -- involving ever greater reliance on market mechanisms and competition, with the increasing decentralization of funds, and attacks on the social security provisions -- the country has experienced growing unemployment; export of labour; increase in wage differentials between jobs, and between developed and less developed areas; the growth of the private sector in service industries; and a proliferation of antisocialist attitudes (some firms have even put forward proposals to raise capital by selling shares).

Industrial growth has been exceptionally poor (1966, 4 percent; 1967, 0 percent; 1968, about 5 percent is expected).

This had worried some sections of the leadership itself, but they have put forward no alternative policy, and increasing dissatisfaction in the population has been articulated by student groups, especially students in the social sciences.

In June they took over Belgrade University, and put forward ten demands, including "Make the self-management system real," "Provide jobs for the unemployed," "Stop the export of labour," "Increase the wages of the lower paid," "Remove privileges and high incomes of bureaucrats and political leaders," and "Improve student grants and conditions to enable more workers' children to go to the university."

In an astute political move, President Tito accepted the students' demands and praised the quality of Yugoslav youth. Some increases were made in the lowest wages and in student grants.

Meanwhile, strenuous efforts were made to isolate the students from the workers, and the papers completely misrepresented the events, referring to them as the "noise" at Belgrade. As the summer wore on, the bureaucracy expressed its fear in a number of measures. The editor of the critical review, *Praxis*, was expelled from the party and his associates were threatened. The magazine, *Delo*, which carried a detailed report and discussion of the June events, was banned. And the branches of the League of Communists in the faculties of philosophy and

sociology at Belgrade University were dissolved. The unusual step was taken of doing this in August when no one was at the university.

In this context, Tito's initial reaction to the invasion of Czechoslovakia was highly significant. Yugoslav papers all carried on their front pages the following statement:

"The entry of foreign troops into Czechoslovakia...has caused us deep anxiety....I think, and other comrades around the president agree, that above all we must keep calm and cool headed. For this reason demonstrations will not be allowed, as they could degenerate into various provocations..."

However, as the Central Committee met, telegrams began flooding in from all over the country, and the position of opposition to the invasion became firm. A spontaneous demonstration took place outside the Czech embassy in Belgrade, and a huge official rally was organized. Very quickly the party began to use the situation to reinforce its own position.

Telegrams from party branches everywhere tended to take the form, "We support the stand of Comrade Tito and the Central Committee..." rather than "We condemn the invasion of Czechoslovakia..." At a great rally in Sarajevo, the main chanted slogan was "We are Tito's; Tito is ours," a slogan that appeared to evoke popular support.

Great emphasis has been placed in the press on the close relations that were developing between Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. The fact that Czech economists were trying to move toward "market socialism" is pointed to as a justification for the Yugoslav system -- it is demagogically claimed that the only alternative to "market socialism" is bureaucratically centralized planning along Stalinist lines.

These arguments are not, of course, new, but in the wave of genuine emotional popular support for the Czech people, the Yugoslav leadership has been able to solidify its position, against the developing opposition from the left.

How far the student movement will be able to resist this in the short term remains to be seen; after years of political "nonpolitics," there is much catching up to do. What is clear is that the Russian action has made the progress of left opposition inside Yugoslavia more difficult.

BELAUNDE OUSTED BY MILITARY COUP IN PERU

Acting to forestall the rapid deterioration of the political situation in Peru, the military high command toppled the Fernando Belaúnde Terry regime October 3. Belaúnde was hustled onto a plane and flown to Buenos Aires.

Belaúnde came second in the 1962 elections with 543,800 votes. Víctor Raúl Haya de la Torre of the Alianza Popular Revolucionaria Americana [APRA] was first with 558,000 votes. The former dictator Manuel Odría received 481,400 votes. Refusing to accept Haya de la Torre as president, the army staged a coup d'état and annulled the elections. Under pressure from the State Department, which prefers that its "client" countries maintain a democratic façade, the army promised to hold new elections. Belaúnde won these in 1963 by a vote of 708,000 to 623,500 for Haya de la Torre.

Belaúnde promised many reforms but proved to be a willing servant of the oligarchy, the military caste and their imperialist backers. In face of increasing unrest, particularly among the peasantry, Belaúnde engaged in witch-hunts and harsh repressive measures. Several guerrilla uprisings were put down with particular savagery.

Repeated social, economic and political crises increasingly undermined the Belaúnde regime. A recent rise in social tensions led to a series of cabinet crises. The tanks rolled into Lima only fourteen hours after Belaúnde had sworn in his seventh cabinet in five years. The previous cabinet resigned October 1 in a scandal over concessions to an American oil company.

The new military junta, headed by Gen. Juan Velasco Alvarado, army chief of staff and president of the joint chiefs of staff, appointed an all-military cabinet. By resorting to open military rule in this fashion, the junta hopes to stabilize the situation. They attempted to give the coup a popular image by denouncing "foreign intriguers" and posing as champions of the "national interest." This is an old dodge of the militarists in Latin America when they stage a coup.

The junta announced October 4 that the scandalous contract Belaúnde had signed with the International Petroleum Company, a subsidiary of Standard Oil of New Jersey, was being canceled. The contract, presented as an agreement to return land held by the company to Peru, was exposed as a fraud when Carlos Loret de Mola, former head of the Peruvian Oil Agency, revealed that the last page of the contract had "disappeared." Thus it could not be made public.

Various rumors were current in Peru as to the contents of the famous missing page. One version had it that Belaúnde agreed to pay in U.S. dollars for future deliveries of oil from the company instead of Peruvian currency. According to another version, Belaúnde waived tax claims against the company going back to 1924. Loret de Mola accused the regime of having agreed to let the IPC exploit its holdings until the end of the year and of granting the company a forty-year monopoly after that on the refining of oil from the La Brea and Parinas oil fields.

The junta's announcement that it was canceling the contract brought a prompt response from Washington. On October 7, the State Department stated that it wished to see the junta pay "full compensation" to Standard Oil.

Two days later, Maj. Gen. Juan Velasco Alvarado announced in a broadcast speech to the nation: "At this moment the armed forces are entering Talara, site of the refinery, and are taking possession of the entire industrial complex."

The new dictator no doubt counts on establishing through this dramatic gesture that in contrast to Belaúnde he genuinely intends to represent the "national" interests. The pressure on Standard Oil and the State Department may also help bring some badly needed concessions from the real masters of the country.

Standard of New Jersey responded the same evening by saying that its legal counsel had advised the company that the abrogation of the contract and the seizure of the properties were "a clear violation of international law and the laws of Peru."

Students took to the streets of Lima to protest the coup. Troops opened fire on the youthful demonstrators the night after the coup, killing two students and wounding dozens more. Over 300 were arrested.

One of the first acts of the junta was to issue a manifesto closing the congress and suspending the constitution. This document was strikingly similar, even in wording, to the manifestos issued by the generals in Brazil and Argentina when the Goulart and Illia regimes were overthrown.

The U.S. government did not break diplomatic relations with the new dictatorship. A temporary suspension was announced as is the custom of the State



Department in such situations.

The military's decision to act was based on a series of convergent crises. On the political plane, new alignments had undercut the parties acceptable to the army. The Christian Democrats withdrew from the government last November. More recently, Belaúnde's own party, Acción Popular [Popular Action], already in a minority in congress, split into two factions. Vice-President Edgardo Seoane, who seeks the presidency in 1969, sought to establish his independence from the increasingly unpopular Belaúnde although he is a member of the same party.

More important than Belaúnde's weakening parliamentary support was the rising discontent of the working class, especially evident in the recent actions undertaken by the masses in the slums around Lima. Runaway inflation has sharp-

ly reduced the standard of living of the Peruvian masses. Belaúnde's answer to the financial crisis was a drastic devaluation in September 1967. This was followed by an even steeper rise in prices.

The threat of thousands of homeless people, who had seized plots in the barren outskirts of Lima, to march on the presidential palace as part of their campaign to gain legal ownership of the land they had occupied, caused Belaúnde to concede. On September 21 he granted them the title they demanded.

Coming in the wake of new ferment among the peasants [see Intercontinental Press, September 30, p. 814], the rise in militancy in the barriadas of Lima must have appeared ominous to the generals, a development obviously demanding that there be no delay in putting a firmer man than Belaúnde in the presidential palace.

#### IRANIAN REVOLUTIONISTS PUBLISH NEW MAGAZINE

A group of Iranian internationalists have published the first issue of a bimonthly named Marxism in the Persian language.\* The editors invite all Marxists interested in working out a revolutionary program for Iran to participate in the open forum provided by the publication.

The seriousness of intent of the editorial board is evident in every article of the publication. These include an editorial analyzing the dynamics of the world revolutionary movement at the present stage of capitalist decay; a report on the crisis in France; an article discussing the need to work out a Marxist platform for the revolutionary movement in Iran; an article on the rise and evolution of the bureaucracy in the Soviet Union; and a translation of Lenin's "last testament."

This is the first time some of the fundamental Marxist ideas presented in this publication have appeared in Persian. Thus the magazine opens a new chapter in the history of the Iranian working-class revolutionary vanguard.

The Marxist movement of Iran began early this century among the Iranian workers in the Baku oil fields. Social Democratic\*\* organizations soon appeared in

the northern cities of the country. Social Democrats were in the forefront of the struggle for a constitutional government, the main demand of the revolution of 1905-09 which shook the monarchy.

Social Democrats were active in the organization of the "anjoman," the instrument of dual power that arose during the revolution. They and the armed Social Democratic workers of Baku and other industrial towns participated in the heroic struggles of the Iranian people against the counterrevolution of 1908 organized by the shah and the Czarist Cossack Brigade.

Out of those struggles came the cadres of the Communist Party of Iran (or the Persian Communist Party [PCP] as it was called then) which was organized after the Russian revolution of October 1917.

The young party gained a certain influence within the ranks of the developing working class of Iran, and within a decade its membership included oil workers in the south. The leaders of a strike in the spring of 1929 in the British-controlled industries of the south were discovered to be members of the Persian Communist Party. Subsequently, in 1931, an anti-Communist wave of terror was unleashed by Reza Shah, father of the present ruler.

The PCP reorganized for underground activity. But Stalinism was already rampant in the Third International and its sections. Iranian Communist leaders, like Sultan Zadeh, who managed to escape the shah's prisons and torture

---

\* For information about Marxism write: I.I.Publications, 1A Herber Road, East Dulwich, London, SE 22, England.

\*\* At the time, the Socialist Democracy represented revolutionary socialism, counting among its members such figures as Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg, and Trotsky.

chambers and who sought refuge in the Soviet Union, were executed during the purges conducted by Stalin.

The entire leadership of the Iranian party was destroyed. As a result of this and later Stalinist betrayals, the continuity of revolutionary-socialist leadership was broken, with devastating consequences for organization of the working class in a revolutionary party and

for development of a revolutionary working-class program in Iran.

It is against this background that the publication of Marxism must be viewed. It marks the advent of a new period for the working-class revolution in Iran. It is a promising attempt by young revolutionists to break out of almost four decades of stagnation and demoralization.

#### THE MURDER OF PIERRE MULELE -- A BLOW TO AFRICAN FREEDOM

Pierre Mulele, the well-known Congolese rebel leader, is dead. He was executed by the reactionary Mobutu regime apparently the morning of October 9.

ville in the former French Congo to Kinshasa September 29, accompanied by Justin Bomboko, Mobutu's foreign minister.

Bomboko evidently convinced Mulele that the amnesty was genuine. Bomboko's record of treachery is well established; as foreign minister in the Kasavubu government he was one of the conspirators in the assassination of Lumumba.

Mulele was the Congo's first minister of education under Premier Patrice Lumumba in 1960. After the murder of Lumumba in 1961, Mulele became a minister in the pro-Lumumbist government of Antoine Gizenga in Stanleyville [now Kisangani]. He was that government's representative to the United Arab Republic. When Gizenga was jailed by the Leopoldville [now Kinshasa] government in 1962, Mulele formed a rebel army to oppose the neocolonialist regime.

When Mulele arrived in Kinshasa he was arrested. Mobutu said the amnesty applied only to political prisoners, not "war criminals." Journalists and the public were barred from the mock trial which began October 7. Mulele was denied a request for a lawyer. The government announced October 9 that the rebel leader had been shot by a firing squad. He was 39 years old.

In 1963 and 1964 the rebels made heavy inroads into the power of the Leopoldville puppet government. Pierre Mulele led a guerrilla force in Kwilu province; another force was commanded by Gaston Soumialot in the eastern province of Kivu, and a third unit fought in Northern Katanga. The revolutionaries suffered a severe defeat in November 1964 when U.S., Belgian and British forces parachuted into the rebel capital at Stanleyville and carried out a bloody massacre to aid the white mercenary troops of Tshombe.

The former French Congo immediately broke diplomatic relations with the Kinshasa regime. The Brazzaville radio mourned Mulele as a "national hero," and compared him with Che Guevara and Patrice Lumumba. General Mobutu was accused of having gone back on his word as a government official in drawing the leader of the rebel Simbas into a snare.

Reports have appeared from time to time of sporadic guerrilla activity in remote areas of the Congo.

Captain Marien Ngouabi, chairman of the National Committee of the Revolution, said in Brazzaville October 10 that Mulele's death resembled that of Lumumba in 1961. "Mulele was certainly killed like a dog. He was certainly killed like Lumumba."

Mulele made a fatal error in trusting the assurances of the dictatorial Mobutu regime that he was included in a general amnesty. Mulele returned from Brazza-

#### VENEZUELAN ARMY CLAIMS DECIMATION OF THE GUERRILLAS

In view of the projected elections in Venezuela, the Leoni government has been following a double-edged tactic against the left. Those willing to abandon the armed struggle have been granted minor concessions; those who refuse to give up have been hit with a massive military campaign. The army claims major successes. After almost all their men were

killed, says the army, Douglas Bravo and Luben Petkoff, two main guerrilla leaders, escaped to Cuba. Freddy Carques also went there after his unit was destroyed, and Jesús García was captured.

The claims have not been verified. Perhaps the army is fishing for a reply, the better to locate the guerrillas.

NEW REVELATIONS ON AFL-CIO, THE CIA, AND LATIN-AMERICAN LABOR

By Les Evans

For several years there have been sporadic reports of heavy infiltration of Latin-American trade unions by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency and the State Department -- through the intermediary of top AFL-CIO officials. A recent congressional report has made public for the first time some of the operations of the organization reputed to be the major CIA front in Latin America.

The revelation came in the form of a study by the Subcommittee on American Republic Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee dated July 15, 1968. Subcommittee chairman Senator Wayne Morse put the study into the Congressional Record, September 25, along with several other committee documents.

The report, drafted for the Senate subcommittee by Robert H. Dockery, former research assistant in the Department of Economic Affairs of the Pan American Union, was entitled "Survey of the Alliance for Progress -- Labor Policies and Programs." It dealt primarily with the activities of the American Institute for Free Labor Development [AIFLD]. The president of the AIFLD is George Meany, president of the American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The AIFLD is a peculiar organization. Meany describes it as a "voluntary organization, an auxiliary of the AFL-CIO." Its stated aim is the encouragement of the growth of "democratic" trade unions in Latin America. It deals on a "union-to-union" basis with Latin-American labor organizations. Yet its ruling bodies include representatives of the biggest U.S. corporations doing business in Latin America, and all of its projects are admittedly contracted and paid for by the U.S. State Department through the Agency for International Development [AID].

In addition to Meany, officials of the AIFLD include businessman J. Peter Grace, president of W.R. Grace & Co., chairman of the board; Joseph Beirne, president of the Communications Workers of America, secretary-treasurer; and William C. Doherty Jr., former regional representative of the Postal, Telegraph and Telephone International, administrator.

The AIFLD's thirty-member board of trustees includes four representatives of U.S. corporations chosen for their heavy investments in Latin America.

In a nationally syndicated column February 24, 1967, Drew Pearson described the AIFLD as a CIA front. He also charged that the CIA paid out as much as

\$100,000,000 a year to organized labor, much of which went through the hands of union bureaucrats connected with the AIFLD. Pearson specifically named Joseph Beirne. The most important figure in these operations was reported to be Jay Lovestone, international affairs director of the AFL-CIO and Meany's foreign policy adviser. Pearson wrote, "Lovestone takes orders from Cord Meyer of the CIA. No CIA money for labor is spent without Lovestone's approval...."

The Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee report neither affirms nor denies the widely reported AIFLD-CIA link. The CIA and its operations are immune from congressional investigation and the subject is not discussed. Other aspects of AIFLD activity are outlined.

The "institute" was set up in 1961 as a private, nonprofit foundation of the AFL-CIO. Its creation was "primarily in response to the threat of Castroite infiltration and eventual control of major labor movements within Latin America." Previously U.S. efforts in this field were channeled through the Organización Regional Inter-Americana de Trabajadores [ORIT], the now discredited affiliate of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions [ICFTU].

ORIT endorsed the overthrow of the Arbenz regime in Guatemala and the Goulart regime in Brazil. It opposed Cheddi Jagan in Guyana and gave its approval to the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic. While it continues to exist, its budget has remained stationary at about \$323,000 a year for the last six years, while AIFLD, beginning with \$640,000 for 1962, spent \$5,273,365 in 1967.

The AIFLD professes to be jointly financed by union, corporation and government grants. In reality the State Department, through AID, is its chief source of funds. Since 1962 this agency has provided 89 percent of the institute's declared income. In 1966 and 1967 the figure rose to 92 percent (\$3,969,000 and \$4,500,000 respectively for the State Department's share). From 1962 through 1967 AID pumped \$15.4 million into AIFLD. The organization's total declared income in this period was \$17,438,000.

In addition to the Dockery study, the printed report of the Subcommittee on American Republic Affairs also contained a review of AIFLD's activity prepared by the U.S. General Accounting Office [GAO] at the request of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. This report frankly described the aims of the "private" union

institute:

"We noted that AIFLD had been granted a high degree of flexibility, by design rather than by accident, for the stated reason of obtaining effective union-to-union cooperation expected to accomplish results that could not be achieved directly by the U.S. Government. In this manner, AIFLD is to help carry out in every way possible the foreign policy objectives of the United States in the labor field in Latin America."

The GAO report added:

"We noted that certain AIFLD activities in Latin America directed at assisting free and democratic trade unions brought charges from opposition forces that it was involved in subversive activities and divisionist training.

"Also we were aware throughout the period of our review that attempts were being made primarily through the press to link AIFLD activities to Central Intelligence Agency operations and funding. These charges have been repeatedly denied by all concerned...."

The GAO report volunteered the information that they had noticed no secret funding or agreements, but hastily added, "our review was not directed to this area."

The Dockery study, however, revealed direct ties between the activities of the American Institute for Free Labor Development and such CIA operations as the overthrow of the Goulart regime in Brazil:

"Despite its insistence on apolitical unionism, the AIFLD took pride in the role of its trainees in overthrowing the Goulart administration in Brazil in 1964.

"In a panel discussion on July 12, 1964, on the Mutual Broadcasting System, the following exchange took place between Mr. H. Conn, editor, Press Associates, Inc., and Mr. W. Doherty, Jr., then director of the social projects department of AIFLD and now administrator of the entire AIFLD operation.

"Conn. Mr. Doherty, this may be just a drop in the bucket, but I know that there have been a number of Brazilian trade unionists who have come up here for training classes conducted by the AIFLD, and I believe there have been some schools in Brazil, have there not? What has happened to these individuals who learned the techniques and the programs of free trade unionism, in recent developments?

"Doherty. Well, very frankly, within the limits placed upon them by the administration of Joao Goulart, when they

returned to their respective countries, they were very active in organizing workers....As a matter of fact, some of them were so active that they became intimately involved in some of the clandestine operations of the revolution [the military coup] before it took place on April 1.

"What happened in Brazil on April 1 did not just happen -- it was planned -- and planned months in advance. Many of the trade union leaders -- some of whom were actually trained in our institute -- were involved in the revolution, and in the overthrow of the Goulart regime.

"In Brazil itself, we have the Cultural Workers Institute, with headquarters in Sao Paulo. It has been operating for some 2 years under the able leadership of both American and Brazilian trade union leaders from all walks of life, and in all unions, and they are exercising increasing influence in favor of democratic trade union development, and in the democratic development of Brazil."

One of the major public activities of the AIFLD today is the training and indoctrination of Latin-American union officials in the principles of "democratic" unionism. Some idea of the axis of these classes can be gained from a statement of administrator Doherty that appeared in the June 1966 AIFLD Report:

"In Latin America, the key question of our times is the future road of their revolution: Toward Communist totalitarianism or toward democracy. For the American

DECLARED EXPENSES OF THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR FREE LABOR DEVELOPMENT IN 1967

(From the September 25, 1968, Congressional Record.)

Washington headquarters	\$1,790,362
Washington training school	
(Not yet announced. Was \$462,202 in 1966.)	
Dominican Republic housing project	69,377
Labor economist program	111,086
Latin American centers:	
Argentina	250,900
Bolivia	196,250
Brazil	499,961
Central America (Honduras)	568,197
Chile	197,079
Colombia	214,799
Dominican Republic	230,865
Ecuador	226,560
Guyana	238,039
Jamaica	39,705
Mexico	34,341
Peru	279,683
Uruguay	226,748
Venezuela	97,563
Caribbean seminars	1,859
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$5,273,365</b>

labor movement this is one of the paramount, pivotal issues; all other questions...must remain secondary."

The AIFLD carries out operations and maintains offices in eighteen Latin-American countries. It operates a major training school for Central America in Honduras which had a declared budget of \$568,197 in 1967. Its organization in Brazil claims forty-six full-time agents, and smaller units function in Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guyana, Jamaica, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela, El Salvador, and Nicaragua.

The AIFLD central headquarters are in Washington, D.C., where it has a staff of eighty-five. It also operates a training institute in Front Royal, Virginia, where handpicked Latin-American trade-union officials are brought for three months of intensive training. The Dockery study comments that the course at this "school" puts "particular emphasis on the theme of democracy versus totalitarianism."

Since June 1962 the Front Royal school has graduated more than 500 students. In some cases the graduates are returned to their home countries under a nine-month "internship" program through which they are paid \$250 a month by the U.S. agency while operating as union functionaries. The number of internships has been scaled down recently in response to charges that participants in the program operate as full-time U.S. agents inside their unions. Emphasis has now been placed on a smaller number of select graduates becoming direct paid employees of the AIFLD on a more permanent basis.

AIFLD claims to have graduated more than 60,000 unionists from local seminars in various Latin-American countries. These range in length from one week to three months.

In addition to its "educational" activity, the AIFLD is involved in "social projects," primarily housing construction. While this aspect of the institute's operations is much publicized by Meany and the AFL-CIO bureaucrats, it is more shadow than substance. In most cases the housing is in the form of high-priced cooperatives for the upper strata of union membership, aimed at buying off union officials. Few of these projects have reached completion. The Senate subcommittee study reports:

"In many instances it seems that AIFLD has not been able to deliver housing projects as promised to Latin American trade unions...."

The U.S. General Accounting Office describes specific cases. In Chile the

AIFLD housing project was begun in 1963 and has not yet been built. The situation in Colombia and Guyana is similar.

These projects evidently do not have a high priority in relation to other AIFLD operations.

The GAO report takes up the activities of AIFLD in several, although not all, of the countries where it has offices. Senator Morse described the document as an unclassified version of "a classified report submitted by the Comptroller General." Even with the "classified" sections deleted, the public version makes instructive reading.

In Brazil the AIFLD continues to flourish under the military dictatorship its trainees helped bring to power. It operates through the Instituto Cultural do Trabalho [ICT], created by AIFLD in 1963 with headquarters in São Paulo. In March 1965 the ICT added a Northeast Department in Recife which carries out indoctrination programs among campesinos. The ICT has "schooled" more than 7,000 union officials and members.

The AIFLD began training Guyanese union members at its Washington school in 1962, and carried out a heavy "internship" program aimed at the Jagan regime. It was not until 1965, however, that it set up a headquarters in Guyana. The AIFLD's proposed budget for 1968 in Guyana is \$391,000.

In collaboration with the Guyana Trade Union Council [GTUC] the AIFLD has established a training school to be operated by representatives of management, the government and the unions, to administer vocational training to union members.

One of its more standard political indoctrination schools is run in Georgetown through the Critchlow Labor Institute. This front is used by the AIFLD to train unionists selected by the GTUC leadership. Through July 1967, 791 unionists had attended the school. Graduates with the particular attributes found desirable by the State Department are sent to the Front Royal school in Washington for further training. The GAO report describes these regional schools as teaching "methods of strengthening their unions against totalitarian infiltration and tactics."

"The AIFLD conducts its activities in Honduras through the Estudios Sindicales Centro Americanos (IESCA) which has offices in San Pedro Sula." This headquarters operates both a Honduras program and a regional program for Central America and Panama. Nearly 6,000 attended IESCA seminars through July 1967, although this figure may be somewhat inflated. (The AIFLD generally counts enrollments as the number attending each class. Since one person may attend more than one class, there may be

considerable duplication in their statistics.)

"In August 1954," the GAO states, "the Sindicato de la Tela Railroad Co. (SITRATERCO) was created....Between 1957 and 1962, two federations of unions and a national campesino organization were founded, which have merged to form a national confederation. The Federation of Workers of the North of Honduras (FESITRANH), which joined SITRATERCO and other north coast unions, began in 1957.

"In 1959 the Federation of Free Unions of Honduras (FECESITLITH) was established....And in 1962, subsequent to six campesino seminars conducted under AFL-CIO sponsorship, the National Association of Honduran Campesinos (ANACH) was formed. In 1964, FESITRANH, FECESITLITH, and ANACH formed the Confederation of Honduran Workers (CTH)....

"The AIFLD activities in Honduras have been associated with the CTH and its three-member federation. The most concentrated assistance, however, has been to SITRATERCO and FESITRANH."

In Chile the AIFLD has conducted seminars attended by 3,378 participants, according to its figures. Unions affiliated with the Central Unica de Trabajadores [CUT], the largest national labor federation, rejected cooperation with AIFLD.

"One of the most prominent individual unions which is not affiliated with CUT in Chile is the Maritime Confederation of Chile (COMACH). The AIFLD social projects activities have been associated mostly with COMACH...."

No information is provided on AIFLD operations in Peru, Bolivia or Argentina, other than the budget for those countries. One example from Colombia is cited in the Dockery study, quoted directly from AIFLD correspondence:

"...in Colombia the local union in Celanese Colombiana S.A. (a subsidiary joint venture of the Celanese Corp. of America which is a contributor to the AIFLD) had been debilitated by its Castroite orientation. Within a few months several illegal work stoppages had taken place, plus a sympathy strike in favor of Castro. The company retaliated with mass firings. AIFLD graduates, together with other democratic leaders, were able to gain control of the union. Since that

time the union has affiliated with the UTC (one of Colombia's two major trade union confederations) and achieved some of the best collective contracts in Colombia."

The Senate Foreign Relations subcommittee itself felt compelled to raise several criticisms of the AIFLD -- from the standpoint of its effectiveness as an instrument of U.S. government policy.

"Even to some U.S. labor leaders," Dockery writes, "management's participation in AIFLD is unacceptable, because it smacks of company unionism. These same leaders point out that U.S. labor's own educational activities and programs have never included management's participation." The "preoccupation" of the AFL-CIO-State Department front with anti-Communism, he continues, "has tended to give AIFLD the appearance of being little more than an instrument of the cold war."

The Senate investigator is particularly sensitive to the criticisms of the Latin-American Confederation of Christian Trade Unionists [CLASC]. "CLASC," he says, "sees the AFL-CIO/AIFLD as an agent for the State Department (and more recently, the CIA)."

The solutions proposed by this study, as might be imagined, do not approach the heart of the problem. Dockery and the GAO survey urge tighter government surveillance over the AIFLD, to insure that State Department contracts are being carried out to the letter and the imperialists are getting their money's worth from the union bureaucrats.

In passing, Dockery remarks that "covert funding of labor activities must be rejected," although he has avoided stating whether AIFLD is covertly funded beyond its already bloated budget.

Even these minor criticisms drew a blast of professed outrage from George Meany in which he came close to accusing Dockery of being a Communist agent. Meany cited a radio Moscow broadcast quoting from the Senate subcommittee study as evidence of its seditious character. Meany concluded by declaring, "The report, if not repudiated, would be a great disservice to the American people..."

Morse announced that further hearings would be held on the subject after Congress reconvenes in November.

DEBRAY'S SENTENCE "NOT OPEN TO REVIEW"

A French lawyer, Georges-Maurice Piret, is seeking to have the International Court of Justice at The Hague review Régis Debray's 30-year sentence. Upon Pi-

ret's arrival in La Paz, Gen. Aniceto Rios, head of Bolivia's Supreme Court of Military Justice, told the court October 6 that the case is not open to review.

SUPPORT GROWS FOR OCTOBER 27 LONDON ANTI-VIETNAM-WAR DEMONSTRATION

Support is building in Britain for the massive demonstration against the war in Vietnam scheduled for October 27 in London. An October 2 press conference by leading organizers of the demonstration, which was widely reported, outlined the present stage of preparations for the action.

Taking part in the conference were Tariq Ali and Ernest Tate of the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign; Alan Harris of the October 27 Ad Hoc Committee; Barney Davis, secretary of the Young Communist League; Fergus Nicholson, secretary of the Communist party National Students Committee; and Henry Wortis, representing the Stop-It Committee.

The London Evening News reported October 2, "Half a million 'pieces of literature' were being printed and distributed. Fifty thousand posters were being pasted on walls throughout the country.

"Mr. Ali said that demonstrations, to coincide with the mass rally, would be held in France, Germany and Italy.

"Speaking of the massive organization behind the demonstration, he said the Ad Hoc Committee had seven committees working in London and there were other committees in Birmingham, Manchester, Bristol, Liverpool, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Cardiff, Newcastle, Leeds and Sheffield.

"They had received letters from people all over the country asking for information."

It was announced at the conference that students at Oxford University had rented a train to bring people to London for the rally and march.

In a prepared statement the Ad Hoc Committee said, "Already all signs point to this demonstration being the biggest ever to be held in Britain against the Vietnam war. Reports from ad-hoc committees and organizations all over the country indicate that it will be much bigger than the March 17th demonstration.

"We are convinced that the increase in numbers will not necessarily be due to our own organizational abilities, but will be due to the increasing anger and frustration which more and more people feel about the Labour government's support for the Americans in Vietnam. It is also clear that hopes that the Paris negotiations would end the war were an illusion, as the Americans are now clearly increasing their attacks on Vietnam.

"Our hope is to bring this anger out onto the streets....We hope to show

the world that the criminal policy pursued by the Labour government does not have the support of the British people."

Alan Harris said, "People want to do more than write a postcard to their M.P. They want to show everyone they are with Vietnam."

Tariq Ali took up the witch-hunt attack directed against the October 27 demonstration by the British press.

On September 4 the Evening News ran a front-page story claiming that "Molotov cocktails" would be used during the mass march as part of a terrorist plot by "extremists." These far-fetched allegations were repeated by the staid London Times, which advocated that the demonstration be banned.

The October 3 Daily Telegraph said Tariq Ali denounced these witch-hunt charges as "a conscious attempt designed to divide the march and discredit the organisers in the eyes of the public."

"If there are people planning to take over buildings and use Molotov cocktails," Ali reportedly added, "flush them out. Let us see the evidence and let us see who these people are."

Fergus Nicholson said, "The threat of violence comes from the people raising the question of violence, not from the committee which is organising the demonstration."

The Ad Hoc Committee formally demanded that the police "stay away from the demonstration and rally so that there will be no arrests and provocations."

The Times, however, reported, "It is known that as many as 6,000 police will be on duty."

Tariq Ali commented, "If they do not want any trouble they should leave the marchers alone."

The October 3 London Times listed the following organizations as participants in the October 27 Ad Hoc Committee:

"Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, Young Communist League, Young Liberals, Stop-It Committee, Australians and New Zealanders Against the War, International Socialist Group, International Marxist Group [affiliated to the Fourth International], Independent Labour Party, Radical Students' Alliance, Revolutionary Students' Socialist Federation, and nine branches of Plaid Cymru [Welsh Nationalist party]."

OCTOBER 26 ANTIWAR MARCH CALLED IN MONTREAL

A broad coalition of organizations met in Montreal, Canada, October 2 to plan a mass demonstration against U.S. aggression in Vietnam to be held in that city later this month. The "Mobilization Committee for the October 26th Demonstration" in a statement to the press said:

"The Montreal march will be part of a world-wide 'International Week of Protest,' from October 21st to 27th, with demonstrations projected across North America on the 26th. The protest is being organized in response to a call issued by the Japanese trade union movement, the British Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, and the Student Mobilization Committee in the United States..."

The themes of the march adopted by the committee are, "Immediate Withdrawal of U.S. Troops from Vietnam," "End Cana-

dian Complicity," and "Vietnam for the Vietnamese."

Sponsors of the march include the Union Générale des Etudiants du Québec, the Voice of Quebec on Vietnam, McGill Association to End the War in Vietnam, Committee for a Free University at Sir George Williams University, and the Front de Libération Populaire.

Individual sponsors include Roland Morin, Laurier Lapierre, and Donald Boyle of the New Democratic party; Michel Chartrand of the Confederation of National Trade Unions; Paul-Marie Lapointe, editor of Le Magazine Maclean; Jacques Larue-Langlois, of the Comité d'Aide au Groupe Vallière-Gagnon; Marion Scott, artist; Paul Kirby of the newspaper Logos; and Dr. Margaret Andersen, chairman of the Loyola College Faculty Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

In this issue

Page

DRAWING: Pierre Mulele .....	881
Eyewitness Accounts:	
"My Brother Was Riddled with Bullets" -- by María Elena .....	882
Caught in the Chihuahua Building -- by Ricardo Ochoa .....	884
"Armed Forces Deliberately Opened Fire on the Mexican Demonstrators" .....	887
The October 2 "Pacification" -- by Ricardo Ochoa .....	888
DRAWING: Gustavo Díaz Ordaz .....	889
Demonstrations in Various Countries Support Mexican Students .....	890
USLA Committee Advertisement .....	891
Portuguese Police Break Up Student Demonstration .....	892
Troops Guard Olympic Games .....	893
Mexican Government Indicts 15 Student Leaders .....	893
Canadian CP Reverses Stand on Czechoslovakia .....	894
90 Greek Political Prisoners Condemn Soviet Invasion of Czechoslovakia .....	894
Hugo Blanco Indicts Peru's Prison System .....	895
Interview with an Editor of "Literární Listy" .....	897
DRAWING: Milan Kundera .....	897
A Split in Czech Leadership Over Concessions to Moscow? .....	898
Soviet Intellectuals Sentenced to Exile and Prison for Protesting Czech Invasion From Czechoslovakia:	
Where Does the Power Lie? -- by Václav Slavík .....	900
"Che's Everywhere" .....	902
The Yugoslav Leadership and the Invasion of Czechoslovakia -- by David Riddell .....	903
Belaúnde Ousted by Military Coup in Peru .....	904
Iranian Revolutionists Publish New Magazine .....	905
The Murder of Pierre Mulele -- A Blow to African Freedom .....	906
Venezuelan Army Claims Decimation of the Guerrillas .....	906
New Revelations on AFL-CIO, the CIA, and Latin-American Labor -- by Les Evans .....	907
Debray's Sentence "Not Open to Review" .....	910
Support Grows for London Anti-Vietnam-War Demonstration .....	911
October 26 Antiwar March Called in Montreal .....	912

INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS

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

New York, N. Y. 10010

126

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.