



Major General Pyotr G. Grigorenko

**Grigorenko Speaks Out
for Socialist Democracy
in the Soviet Union**

Fidel Castro and Czechoslovakia

Mexico City Daily Assails
U.S. Committee for Aid
to Political Prisoners

**NLF Stand on
Bombing 'Halt'**

Mandel's Impressions of the U.S.

THE STAND OF THE NATIONAL LIBERATION FRONT ON THE BOMBING "HALT"

[Johnson's election-eve "halt" to the bombing of North Vietnam and the participation of the delegation of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation in the Paris negotiations has centered world attention on the question of what Hanoi and the South Vietnamese liberation fighters will consider negotiable. On November 3 the Central Committee of the National Front for Liberation issued a statement outlining the Front's position on the bombing halt, the negotiations, and the future government of South Vietnam. Following is the full text of that statement as it appeared in Informační Buletin, the official news service of the NFL published in Prague.]

* * *

For fourteen years now, in an attempt to materialise their scheme to turn South Vietnam into a neo-colony and a military base of the U.S., the U.S. imperialists have carried out a policy of aggression, the most ruthless in history, against the Vietnamese people, grossly trampling on the independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of Vietnam, which have been recognised by the 1954 Geneva Agreements.

The U.S. imperialists have rigged up in South Vietnam an extremely brutal puppet regime, and have tried by steel and fire to impose their domination on the South Vietnamese people.

However, united millions as one, the South Vietnamese people have risen up valiantly and have fought hard and perseveringly against the aggressors and the traitors. Under the glorious banner of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation and with the wholehearted assistance of their compatriots in North Vietnam and the firm and strong sympathy and support of friendly governments and of the whole world's people, the South Vietnamese people have repeatedly won ever bigger victories in their sacred war of resistance.

In an attempt to stave off their complete collapse, the U.S. imperialists have massively sent U.S. expeditionary troops for direct aggression against South Vietnam, while conducting a war of destruction against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, thus perpetrating innumerable savage crimes everywhere in both zones of Vietnam.

But, no brutal force can save the U.S. aggressors and their henchmen from ignominious failures.

Fighting with matchless heroism, the armed forces and people in North Viet-

nam have shot down over 3,200 U.S. aircraft, defeating the U.S. war of destruction and fulfilling its duty as the great rear to the great front.

The armed forces and people in South Vietnam have foiled all the U.S. plans to intensify its war of aggression and, since early spring this year, have been attacking and rising up continually and simultaneously, dealing thunder blows at the U.S.-puppets right in their hide-outs, recording unprecedented big victories in all fields, changing the war situation, and further driving the U.S.-puppets into a position of passiveness and collapse from which it is impossible for them to get up.

In face of the valiant and unflagging struggle and the victories of great significance in all fields of the people throughout our country, and in face of the strong demand of the world's people including progressive people in the United States, the U.S. Government has been compelled to agree to and effect an unconditional cessation of the bombardments on the whole territory of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. This is an extremely great victory of the people in all of Vietnam and of the peace-loving people in the world.

This, however, does not mean that the U.S. imperialists have as yet given up their aggressive design against Vietnam. They are obdurately stepping up their war in South Vietnam and clinging to the puppet administration in the hope of maintaining their neo-colonialist rule in South Vietnam and prolonging the partition of Vietnam. They are stubbornly carrying on acts of encroachment on the sovereignty and security of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

They keep demanding a price for their stopping the war of destruction in North Vietnam.

The South Vietnamese people and the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation resolutely demand that the U.S. stop for good all acts of encroachment on the sovereignty and security of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, put an end to its war of aggression in South Vietnam, carry out all its pledges at the 1954 Geneva Conference on Vietnam, and respect the imprescriptible national rights of the South Vietnamese people.

* * *

The South Vietnamese people cherish peace. But that must be a peace in independence and freedom. Representing this aspiration and resolve, and basing itself

on its political programme, the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation solemnly declares its stand regarding the political settlement of the South Vietnam problem as follows:

1. South Vietnam is resolved to struggle for the materialisation of its sacred rights, namely, independence, democracy, peace, neutrality, prosperity, and ultimate peaceful reunification of the fatherland.

2. The U.S. imperialists must put an end to their war of aggression against Vietnam, withdraw all U.S. troops and troops of its satellites and all war means from South Vietnam, and liquidate all U.S. military bases in South Vietnam.

3. The internal affairs of the South Vietnamese people must be settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves in accordance with the political programme of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation, without foreign interference, formation of a broad national and democratic coalition government and holding of free general elections in South Vietnam.

4. The reunification of Vietnam will be decided by the people in the two zones of Vietnam, step by step, by peaceful means and on the basis of consultations and agreements between the two zones, without foreign interference.

5. South Vietnam will pursue a foreign policy of peace and neutrality: No military alliance in any form with foreign countries, and establishment of friendly relations with all countries on the five principles of peaceful coexistence. Good neighborhood relations will be set up with the Kingdom of Cambodia on the basis of respect for her independence, sovereignty, neutrality and territorial integrity with her present borders, and with Laos on the basis of respect for the 1962 Geneva Agreements concerning that country.

The U.S. imperialists are the aggressors in South Vietnam. The South Vietnam National Front for Liberation is the organiser and leader of the South Vietnamese people in their war of resistance to U.S. aggression, resistance which is going from one victory to another. The South Vietnam National Front for Liberation is building up and developing a revolutionary administration of the South Vietnamese people. The governments of many countries and the world's people have recognised the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation and given it great support and assistance. The South Vietnam National Front for Liberation is the authentic representative of the legitimate aspirations of the South Vietnamese people and has full competence to settle

all problems concerning South Vietnam.

The South Vietnam National Front for Liberation reiterates its complete unanimity of views with and full support for the 4-point stand of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. This stand embodies the aspirations and will of the entire Vietnamese people, and constitutes the correct basis for the settlement of the Vietnam issue.

Now that the U.S. has unconditionally stopped bombing and shelling North Vietnam, the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation firmly supports the stand of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam as expounded in its statement of November 2, 1968, aimed at finding a political solution to the Vietnam problem. After discussions with the Central Committee of the Vietnam Alliance of National, Democratic and Peace Forces and reaching unanimity of views with it, the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation agrees to the holding of a conference of four parties comprising: the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation, the United States of America and the Saigon administration. At this conference, the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation will represent the voice of the South Vietnamese people, the voice of justice.

The present administration in Saigon is but a clique of traitors and henchmen of the U.S. It runs counter to the legitimate aspirations of the entire people of South Vietnam. It has been strongly opposed by our people and spurned by progressive people in the world. This administration does not represent anybody. The presence of the representatives of the Saigon administration at the above-said conference does not mean recognition of that regime by the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation.

Despite its obvious failure, the U.S. still has not given up its aggressive design against Vietnam. As for our people's resistance, the nearer its victory, the more its difficulties. Warmly responding to President Ho Chi Minh's sacred appeal on November 3, 1968, "so long as there is a single aggressor in our country, we must fight on to wipe him away," let all our compatriots and all the fighters of the South Vietnam People's Liberation Armed Forces strengthen their resolve and fight perseveringly till final victory. Let us hold high the banner of victory, rush forward with heroism and vigour, enhance the mettle of continual offensive and continual uprising to defeat the U.S. war of aggression, overthrow the clique of traitors, wrest back complete power for the people, and fulfill gloriously our sacred mission, namely, to liberate South Vietnam, defend

North Vietnam, proceed toward the peaceful reunification of the fatherland, and contribute to the maintenance of peace in Asia and the world!

Soldiers and officers of the puppet army and personnel of the puppet administration, have a timely and clear appraisal of the situation, go over to the side of the fatherland, join the people in fighting to save the country, your homes, and your own lives, against the U.S. aggressors and their henchmen. The South Vietnam National Front for Liberation and the people are prepared to welcome you.

The central Committee of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation

calls upon all governments, all organizations, all democratic personalities, and progressive people throughout the world, including progressive people in the United States, to give vigorous support to the just stand of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation, and render more active assistance to the South Vietnamese people's struggle against U.S. aggression and for national salvation, till its complete victory.

South Vietnam decidedly must be liberated!

The Vietnamese people's struggle against U.S. aggression and for national salvation will surely triumph!

FNL AND ALLIANCE HOLD JOINT MEETING "SOMEWHERE IN SOUTH VIETNAM"

The leaders of the Front National de Libération [National Liberation Front] and the Alliance des Forces Nationales, Démocratiques et de Paix du Vietnam du Sud [Alliance of the National, Democratic and Peace Forces of South Vietnam] met November 3-5 "somewhere in South Vietnam," according to a press release issued in Hanoi.

They decided "to mobilize all the Vietnamese people and all the patriotic forces" in order "to defeat the U.S. war

of aggression" and "overthrow the puppet Saigon government."

The delegations of the two organizations declared that "a correct political solution to the Vietnamese problem must be based on the five-point position outlined by the FNL, November 3." [See p. 1,034.]

The meeting was said to have been the first to be arranged between the two organizations.

HANOI APPEALS TO PEOPLE OF SAIGON TO DEMAND NEW GOVERNMENT

On the fifty-first anniversary of the Russian revolution November 7, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam issued an appeal to the people of Saigon to rise against the puppet government of South Vietnam and demand a new government.

Nhan Dan, the official organ of the Communist party, said that "broad layers of the Saigon population, particularly the students, are preparing to go into the streets in order to demand an end to the Thieu-Ky-Huong clique and the formation of a new government that will nego-

tiate with the Front National de Libération to bring peace to the country."

"Our compatriots in Saigon," said Nhan Dan, "are preparing to carry out their historic national mission. The situation is very favorable. The clique is getting weaker and will not be able to escape going down."

At the time of the Tet offensive, similar appeals were issued by Hanoi. [See Intercontinental Press, March 15, p. 219.]

WITCH-HUNT CONTINUES IN INDONESIA

Continuing its massive campaign of extermination against all the left forces in the country, the Indonesian army claims to have netted thirty more Communists in the capital city of Djakarta since October 25. The Djakarta military authorities reported that most of these thirty are former state functionaries and

that they include several persons of Chinese origin. According to the army, these Communists captured in their latest roundup had been hiding in the Indonesian capital as small merchants, peddlers, or ricksha drivers. Since none of the thirty have been named, it is unlikely that any of them were very prominent in the party.

CZECH STUDENTS OCCUPY SCHOOLS

Student strikes, mass meetings of workers, and protests by intellectuals swept Czechoslovakia during the November 14-16 meeting of the Communist party Central Committee in Prague. First reports on the decisions taken by the Central Committee seemed to indicate a shift to the right in the composition of the leadership and a drawing back from the measures of socialist democratization begun in January.

Student sit-ins began November 15 at the agricultural college at Olomouc, in Moravia. The following day students occupied the agricultural college of Prague University in the suburb of Suchdol. By Sunday the strike had spread to Charles University in Prague and to the Moravian capital of Brno.

The students adopted a ten-point program demanding that press censorship, imposed by the Soviet occupation, not exceed six months; that guarantees be made for freedom of speech, assembly, education, science and art; and that freedom to travel abroad not be restricted.

Workers at the Skoda automobile plant in Pilsen held a weekend meeting to set up a council to "implement the political and organizational democratization process."

Delegates representing 22,000 workers at the Kladno steel mill demanded that pro-Moscow conservatives be removed from the leadership of the party. Prague television interviewed some of these workers while the Central Committee meeting was in progress. One called for expulsion from the Central Committee of conservatives "who long ago lost their mandates. What right have they to sit there? How long are we going to play this funny game?"

Plants in Bratislava passed similar resolutions. In many cities workers threatened to join the students in sit-in strikes if the democratization were reversed.

There were widespread demands that the meeting of the Central Committee be public so that the Czech masses would know what plans were being made for their future behind the closed doors of Hradcany Castle. One worker interviewed on television summed up the popular sentiment when he said, "We want to know the truth."

The Central Committee announced a reorganization of its leadership November 17. The day-to-day functioning of the 190-member committee was previously gov-

erned by the twenty-one-man Presidium. A new eight-member Executive Committee will now act as a "temporary" steering committee of the Presidium.

Although no hard-line pro-Moscow members are included on the Executive Committee, its composition is to the right of the Dubček group. The eight are:

Alexander Dubček, nominal head of the new body; Josef Šmrkovský, one of the leading liberalizers; Gustav Husak, the Slovak party chief, who is said to have called the democratization an error during the plenary meeting; Lubomir Strougal, an important figure in the Novotny regime; President Ludvik Svoboda; Premier Oldrich Cernik; National Front chairman Evzen Erban; and Stefan Sadovsky, reportedly a supporter of Husak.

By the time excerpts from the Central Committee resolution were published November 18, more than 100,000 students were occupying school buildings throughout the country for a three-day strike.

More than 1,000 Czech journalists passed a resolution demanding a meeting with the government "to discuss how to face together the efforts to liquidate the socialist freedom of the press, which is the right of every citizen."

The Central Committee statement made no reference to freedom of the press. It declared only that the mass media are "above all, instruments for enforcing the policy of the party and the state."

The resolution suggested that censorship would be tightened:

"All the workers in the communications media, regardless of their party membership, have the responsibility for the protection of state interests, the fulfillment of the political program and are responsible for the communications media acting in a strictly socialist spirit." This seemed to be an endorsement of the suspension of Communist papers in recent weeks for their lack of "socialist spirit," such as Listy, organ of the Writers Union; Reportér, published by the Union of Journalists; and Politika, the weekly theoretical magazine of the Central Committee itself.

A significant concession to the Stalinists' claim that there was a danger of "counterrevolution" in Czechoslovakia appeared in the section on foreign policy. "As of late," the Central Committee said, "our republic has been one of the exposed areas in this struggle [between socialism and capitalism] and one under a strong imperialist impact."

ERNEST MANDEL REPORTS IMPRESSIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

[Ernest Mandel, the editor of the Belgian socialist weekly La Gauche (The Left), recently spent two months on a lecture tour in the United States.

[Upon returning to Europe, he was asked, in an interview, to give his impressions of the American political scene. This was published in the November 9 issue of La Gauche.

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

* * *

Question: What is the most outstanding feature of American political life today?

Answer: I think that there is a striking contrast between the pessimism which prevails in the traditional, moderate left circles in the United States -- which is what they call the liberal left, the left integrated into the Democratic party, the unions, the traditional black organizations like the NAACP -- a pessimism that goes so far as to predict a police state (the term comes from Walter Reuther, the head of the automobile workers union) in the near future, if not an American fascism...I think that there is a striking contrast between this pessimism and the reality, which is entirely different.

And it is very difficult for foreign observers to comprehend this reality right off. To grasp this reality, you have to get an insight into American society through people who are genuinely linked with what can be called the vital forces of the American nation.

The pessimism of the traditional, moderate left is easy to explain. This left believes in gradual progress. It regarded the Roosevelt coalition, the coalition of the Democratic party with the unions and the most moderate black organizations as eternal. It saw progress in the form of social legislation, in the form of the integrationist legislation which was gaining ground in each congress.

Obviously, this idyllic view does not correspond to what is happening in the United States today. What is occurring today is a process of polarization. And this means that the center-left forces, which were the predominant forces in American political life, are being reduced from both directions. They are losing to the right and they are losing to the left. These are the reasons in brief for their pessimism.

Q: Why doesn't this pessimism cor-

respond to the reality?

A: Very briefly because the center-left's losses to the right, which are summed up in the Wallace phenomenon, and the slight shift of the middle classes toward Nixon is a short-term development produced by complex and contradictory causes. For some, but only a small minority, this is a backlash against the gains and the radicalization of the black people. For others, it is simply a protest against the prevailing kind of politics, against the "establishment," a protest which might be just as much against the war in Vietnam, against inflation, the rising cost of living, and a lot of other things that are not going right in the United States.

But what is striking about all these rightward reactions is their lack of organization and solidity. What is involved is much more a mood than an organization.

What is most conspicuous about the Wallace movement is that it is not an organization, at least not yet. What is most salient is its inability to develop a body of activists. The only Wallace activists are the members of the old ultra-right organizations like the John Birch Society and the KKK. And if you look at these organizations, you realize that they are weaker than in 1962, the time of my last visit. The number of activists there is very low. The surface manifestation of this phenomenon is that the fighting, the brawls, and the confrontations are not between the activists of the right and left, but between left activists and the police.

The only considerable forces the right can lean on are not extralegal forces but the establishment, the police and part of the army. But that's considerable.

Q: Is there an economic crisis with repercussions in the political field?

A: There is no economic crisis in the United States and there is no question of one. There is talk of a recession next year. But I don't want to say anything about that because these are minor fluctuations. The real income of the workers is starting to decline. Real wages are higher than ever in spite of the rise in the cost of living, but the tax increases have produced a slight drop in the net real family income and in wages. However, this is a minimal decline in relation to the heights attained at the end of 1965.

This might be cause for, let us say, irritation. But it is an entirely

minor phenomenon. The prosperity is still such that there are no economic causes to provoke any reaction from the majority of the working class.

It is a different matter for the really poor minority strata. And these poor layers are much larger than generally believed. The poverty in the big cities is shocking. New York and Chicago have slums of the sort no longer seen in half of the cities in Europe. The Scandinavian countries, Switzerland, West Germany, Holland, and even Belgium no longer have the massive concentrations of poverty that you see in various American big cities.

Q: Does this contradiction between the haves and the disinherited masses create only irritation, or is this expressed in a deeper malaise?

A: The political crisis the United States is going through has more complex causes. They cannot be reduced simply to the problem of the antithesis between the rich and the poor. I would go back to the formula I just used. What is beginning to shake the stability of American society is a process of political polarization. For almost thirty-five years this celebrated Roosevelt coalition governed the United States. Even during eight years of the Eisenhower administration it remained unshaken. This coalition was a phenomenon absolutely unique in the world. And its nature, let us say, its unnatural nature, escaped most observers on the European left.

What were the components of this coalition? There were three. There was the "liberal" big bourgeoisie -- liberal and imperialist, of course -- the New York bankers. There were the unions, with the small train they still had of liberal black organizations. And there were also the Southern Bourbons, that is the most retrograde, the most reactionary part of the American bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie. The pawns of this coalition were the workers, who though unionized lacked political consciousness, above all the large groups of relatively recent immigrants -- particularly the masses of Italian, East European, and Jewish, and, to a lesser extent, Irish origin, which were kept well in hand by the Democratic electoral machine.

This was a totally disparate coalition. It represented 60 percent of the American electorate. It was sustained by a certain number of totally contradictory factors. In the first place, there was the completely exceptional prosperity of American capitalism, which enjoyed a monopoly of productivity on the world market, enabling it to pay its workers wages two or three times above the level of the workers in Western Europe.

In the second place, it was maintained by the American workers' lack of political class consciousness. The American working class still has a very acute class consciousness as far as defending its wages goes, but it has no political consciousness, no tradition of independent political action. Above all, it has no socialist internationalist political traditions. And as long as its wages are maintained, it is inclined to tolerate American imperialism's foreign policy so long as it does not cause too many tremors in American society.

And in the third place, the coalition was maintained by the continuation of racial segregation in the South and the passivity of the black masses and even of the black youth, whose only desire at the time was integration into American society, thus identification with white rule and conversely nonidentification as blacks.

And in the fourth place, the coalition was maintained by the predominance of the traditional moderate "liberal" left (they could be called Radical Socialists in France) among the intellectuals and students.

These four elements have begun to break down in recent years. This began with the blacks. Blacks who, under the pressure of various factors -- the mechanization of agriculture in the South, the industrialization of the South, the rural exodus, mass shift from the South to the North -- blacks who were urbanized, proletarianized, and radicalized, began to reject the goal of integration pure and simple. They became aware of their identity as blacks, of the dual oppression that weighs on them both as poor people and as blacks. This has been expressed above all in the radicalization of black youth, the birth of the black power movement, etc.

Then a profound cleavage developed in the Democratic party between the Southern Bourbons who wanted to fight any movement for faster integration, and the monopolist bourgeoisie of the North who wanted to stem the black radicalization by speeding up integration somewhat and making concessions to the black vanguard.

It cannot be said yet that the broad masses of black people have broken with the Democratic party. Analysis of the elections may show that the loyalty of the black masses to the Democratic party was greater than that of any other strata of the American population. But this caused a split in the Democratic party in the South, a beginning of a split with the appearance of the Wallace phenomenon and the emergence of the first black radical groupings, which were the

first centers of agitation among the students.

A second factor working against the Roosevelt coalition is the Vietnam war. The war has provoked a very broad reaction among the students and intellectuals. This reaction, whose breadth is underestimated in Europe, is very important. It has completely changed the American political climate and gives the best answer to those who talk about a semifascist danger or police state in the United States. I would say that we have never seen in an imperialist country such a vast and radical opposition to a war in progress as that manifesting itself in the United States today.

We were privileged to see the birth of a new stage in the antiwar movement, which is basing itself more and more on the soldiers themselves. In October there were a series of demonstrations by soldiers supported by the population. In San Francisco, 500 soldiers demonstrated, backed up by 15,000 persons. And similar demonstrations took place elsewhere, and even in the South.

This movement calls for democratic rights for soldiers and especially freedom of speech, organization, and freedom to demonstrate. The soldiers thus are demanding the right to protest against the war and to call for the immediate withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. And it seems moreover that this movement is also spreading among the soldiers in South Vietnam.

The Vietnam war has had considerable weight in the creation of a second center of radicalization among the students and intellectuals. There has been an enormous change in comparison to 1962, when I first visited the U.S. We can say that today the American universities have in fact become centers of radicalism as

never before, except to some extent at the beginning of the thirties. There is no university -- and I visited about thirty -- where there are not radical student groups holding the center of the stage or where there are no professors of radical or advanced socialist opinions.

Still to be considered are the last two components of the split coalition. We can say that the polarization is going to have a contradictory effect on one of them -- Northern big capital. Big capital in general also polarizes when it is confronted with a mass radicalization. One wing will want to go further in granting reforms, the other toward taking a harder line.

The fourth component is left, the most important one, and the most enigmatic one as well -- the mass of workers. The answer to the question of what this mass will do has nothing to do with demonic formulas such as the worker masses being racist, frustrated, moving toward fascism. These factors affect only small minorities.

The future responses of these masses depend essentially on one factor, whether or not the system is able to assure that the high standard of living will be maintained and that it will continue to improve. If the answer is yes, then the outlook for the United States is not fascism but a continuation of the relative stability which this society has known over the last thirty years. If the answer to this question is no, then the outlook by far the most probable is that a third center of radicalization will emerge, a center of radicalization in the unions and among the workers.

That obviously is another question...

MOHAMMED HARBI, FIVE OTHERS, RELEASED BY BOUMEDIENNE

The Boumedienne regime has recently released several political prisoners who have been jailed without trial since shortly after Ben Bella was overthrown in June 1965. Mohammed Harbi, Bachir Hadj Ali, and Hocine Zahouane, all leaders of the Organisation de la Resistance Populaire [Popular Resistance Organization], were freed November 1. Their movements are still restricted and they are banned from entering the Algerian capital.

Mohammed Harbi is a revolutionary socialist, well known as a journalist and the former editor of Révolution Africaine. He was a member of the Central Committee of the Front de Libération Nationale, and

was at one time general secretary of the provisional government of the Republic of Algeria. He went into opposition to Ben Bella in 1962, although he later supported him against more conservative elements in the Algerian government. The ORP was formed after the June coup in resistance to the Boumedienne regime.

Three of Ben Bella's close collaborators were released November 17. These were Hadj Ben Alla, former president of the National Assembly; Mohamed Seghir Nekache, former minister of health; and Abderrahman Ben Cherif, former minister in charge of the president's office. Ben Bella himself is still being held.

NEW ORGANIZATION SEEKS TO REACH U.S. SERVICEMEN WITH ANTIWAR VIEWS

[The widespread growth of antiwar sentiment in the U.S. armed forces -- as shown by the participation of 500 active-duty servicemen in an antiwar march in San Francisco October 12 -- has produced a general turn among peace organizations toward work among GI's. One symptom of this concern is the recent formation in New York of a group called "Serviceman's Link to Peace."

[Initiated by Vietnam veterans, the new organization shares offices with the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, a conservative peace group. One of the first projects of Serviceman's Link to Peace will be a national peace Christmas card campaign for soldiers in Vietnam. The group has asked that signed but undressed cards be sent to: LINK, % SANE, 381 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10016.

[Following is the text of the first press release of the new organization.]

* * *

Marches, demonstrations, and other antiwar actions are a credit to the peace movement, but have not had enough impact on the men in uniform. This is the view of a group of Vietnam veterans opposed to the war who have formed an agency to build communication between servicemen and peace organizations. They call themselves the Serviceman's LINK to Peace.

"The purpose of LINK," says Vietnam veteran Carl Rogers, "is to break through the wall of isolation which separates military life from the civilian community. The average GI lives in a distant world which is predicated on ignorance, fear, and unquestioned obedience to authority. His opinions are neither valued nor sought, and his legal rights are violated often without his knowledge," says the 25-year-old former chaplain's assistant.

"In the case of Vietnam, servicemen fear the unknown of life in combat; they are ignorant not only of their rights but also of the policies which have sent them there."

Rogers feels that Vietnam also presents a special problem of distance since it is unusually isolated from life in the United States and from the peace movement in particular. He and the Vietnam veterans who have organized LINK are attempting to inform, educate, and motivate servicemen with respect to the peace movement.

Vietnam vet Steve Wilcox who is

running the LINK office at 381 Park Avenue South in New York says, "The GI needs to be informed about American policies -- how they arose and where they are leading." Wilcox, an instructor in political science who has taken a leave of absence from teaching to direct LINK's information and education program, believes LINK can inform servicemen of their rights to hold and express opinions -- especially about the war.

"We are already working with a number of lawyers and law students to develop programs that can help men know what they can and can't do while in the service," he says. "Law for the military is controlled under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, but it's neither uniform nor just," Wilcox states emphatically.

"Reform of the UCMJ is possible," he says, "and must come as more and more people learn of the lack of due process in the service."

"Such reform may be difficult to get," admits the 28-year-old army veteran, "but there is no denying that dissension in the ranks has increased tremendously as our commitment in Vietnam has grown." How much it's increased is difficult to assess but the support for a chain of antiwar coffeehouses outside several military bases at home and the increasing membership in a servicemen's union give proof of the sentiment of thousands of disillusioned men in uniform. Wilcox knows that this dissension is leading to action by individual GI's and he and the veterans of the LINK project want to see that it is constructively supported by the peace movement.

LINK has compiled the names of several thousand servicemen who have shown an interest in the peace movement. Many of these men are receiving one or more of the several antiwar newspapers, of which the largest is the Vietnam GI, edited by other Vietnam veterans.

"By working with the Vietnam GI and the other servicemen's papers," says Rogers, "we expect to increase the number of men being reached through the mail, but to demonstrate more visible support for the men LINK plans to open a number of information centers in the cities of Southeast Asia where servicemen take their R and R (Rest and Recuperation) holidays from Vietnam."

Rogers points out that while men are in service they are exposed not only to what he considers the "one-sided position of the military" but also to such "para-military organizations as the American Legion, the V.F.W. [Veterans of For-

eign Wars] and the U.S.O. [United Service Organizations] -- all of which maintain contact and support through letters, publications and celebrity tours." "Our LINK Information Centers can serve to counteract this sort of activity," he says, "and more importantly, they can be our means of highly visible support for the troops."

The first of the centers is soon to open in Hawaii and will be staffed by Vietnam veterans, under Rogers' direction, and will have American girls serving as hostesses. Rogers gives all of the hostesses an extensive training program so they will be able to demonstrate a clear understanding of the GI's problems and show that they have a knowledge of how he thinks and speaks.

"We want each center to have a relaxed and informal atmosphere," says 24-year-old hostess Judy Dome, who taught seventh-grade history in Colorado before joining the LINK staff. She says the centers will not be blatantly antiwar.

"We just want a place where servicemen can have a chance to exchange information, discuss what sorts of action can be taken, and in general, serve as a means of convincing the individual serviceman that his opinions are worth something and that his own experience in Vietnam has value."

Rogers believes that some of the GI's coming into the centers can be encouraged to discuss their opinions when they return to their units, and he is prepared to provide them with books and literature they can take back.

One of LINK's most important services will be the arrangement of speaking tours across the United States by veterans who have just returned from the war. These tours will be arranged for some of LINK's sponsoring peace organizations.

"To enroll the veteran in this sort of activity after he is discharged is a far more difficult task than to convince him of its importance while he is still serving," says veteran Jan Crumb of New Jersey, another LINK organizer and founder of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War. "There are 18,000 men returning each month," he reports, "and it seems reasonable to assume that we can have a significant number ready to speak out on the war if they are contacted in advance

of discharge and if they have been assured how important the peace movement -- and the public -- considers their views."

Mr. Crumb admits that many GI's are readily suspicious, if not downright hostile, towards anyone who seeks to involve him in "being" against the war -- particularly if he gets the impression that being against the war is being against soldiers, but he believes that constructive dialogue can take place when each "side" understands and supports the other.

"Creating that understanding is our job at LINK," says the former army specialist who was the first serviceman from Vietnam to be granted an appointment to West Point, from which he later resigned in opposition to the war.

LINK makes it explicit that they propose a strictly legal operation, advocating only actions that are within each GI's rights. On the question of desertion Rogers is quick to point out that they will do nothing to promote such action and will not assist those men who do plan to desert.

"Last year 40,000 men were listed as deserters," he reports, and he knows that most GI's who desert from Vietnam do so while on R and R, but he hopes that the staffs in the LINK Information Centers will be able to convince any man of such a mind of the long-term value of completing his service and working constructively and legally within the military to oppose the war.

"We want to motivate men to action," says Rogers, "but this action can take many forms -- ranging from discussion and greater willingness to talk with the individual's unit, to commitment to an active role in the peace movement when the serviceman gets home."

"The great potential strength of this project lies in its opportunity for the peace movement to show visible support for the GI's now," says Rogers. Ultimately he feels the hope for new life in the peace movement and for its continued growth in the future may very well depend on how successful they are in getting the men who've experienced Vietnam committed to joining with them in acting against not only this war but also future wars and their causes.

MOBUTU SENDS TROOPS AGAINST FOLLOWERS OF PIERRE MULELE

New evidence of opposition to Congolese dictator Mobutu was revealed by Radio Kinshasa November 11. The government station said troops had been sent to deal with several thousand followers of exe-

cuted rebel leader Pierre Mulele. The rebels had come out of the forest at Kilembe near Gungu in Banudngu (formerly Kwilu) province. The censored broadcast did not report any details of the action.

SATO GOVERNMENT "SHOCKED" BY SOCIALIST VICTORY IN OKINAWA

Premier Eisaku Sato of Japan -- and his supporters in Washington -- was dealt a stunning setback November 10 when the candidate of his Liberal-Democratic party went down to defeat in the election for chief executive of the Ryukyu Islands.

When 94 percent of the vote had been counted, the clear victory was Chobyo Yara, 65. Yara, who was backed by the Socialist and Communist parties, polled 227,400 votes to 201,236 for Junji Nishime, president of the Liberal-Democratic party of Okinawa and former mayor of Naha, the island's capital.

The central issue in the election was the popular demand for an end to the United States occupation of Okinawa, its return to Japan, and the dismantling of American military bases in the Ryukyus. Yara had campaigned for immediate reversion of the island group to Japan, while his conservative opponent had supported Sato's plan for drawn-out negotiations on the question with Washington, with an implicit guarantee that U.S. bases would remain even if formal control were restored to Tokyo.

A mass movement opposed to the American occupation has mushroomed in Okinawa. The recent election itself was a concession won by the mass mobilization of the Okinawan people. It was the first election for chief executive since the U.S. administration began.

The Japanese press described the Sato government as "shocked" by the leftist victory. Takeo Fukuda, general secretary of the ruling Liberal-Democratic party, nervously expressed the hope that Yara would follow "realistic and constructive policies."

The Japan Socialist party, in a victory statement, declared: "The conservative Government of Premier Eisaku Sato is trying to strengthen an Asian anti-Communist military alliance under the guidance of President-elect Richard Nixon. It should be the responsibility of the Japanese people to block this scheme and attain the immediate return of the islands to Japan."

Yara announced that he would set up a committee to study the gradual closing of American bases.

The outcome of the election was a special blow to Sato. The premier's popularity has been sagging badly in the last year due to his close identification with U.S. policy in Vietnam. He had staked a lot on the election. Campaigning began as

early as May even though the election was not officially announced until October 21. Political parties in Japan were deeply involved in backing the candidates of their affiliated parties in Okinawa. Takeo Fukuda himself went to Naha to campaign for Nishime.

Nishime's defeat creates a new difficulty for Sato in his bid to retain leadership of the Liberal-Democrats in the biennial election for party leader coming up later this month. The winner there will become premier.

Sato is not the only one who was worried by the radical victory in Okinawa. The New York Times pointedly commented November 12 that it "may also affect the long-range planning of the United States military commanders in Asia and the Pacific, who regard Okinawa, the largest island in the Ryukyu chain, as a forward base of vital importance to the American defense posture in Asia...."

"American military commanders have recently termed the big air bases in Okinawa vital to the air defense of Taiwan and of South Korea..."

The "defense" the generals are talking about includes the use of tankers from Okinawa to refuel Guam-based B-52 bombers used to rain death on Vietnam. Nuclear weapons are stockpiled on the island for possible use against China. They could be delivered via Mace-B missiles or F-105 jets.

The Times pointed to another concern of the Pentagon: the difficulty of finding as convenient a base somewhere else in Southeast Asia if the U.S. should be forced to get out.

"In addition to Okinawa's strategic location, its value has been great because the military has had almost complete freedom of movement of American forces in and out of the islands, subject to none of the political restrictions imposed on bases on another country's soil."

Although the political will of the Okinawan people has been made clear in the election, their new chief executive will be severely limited in the effective action he can carry out. His proposals must be approved by the real ruler of the one million people on the island, the United States High Commissioner.

The election represents a preliminary victory in the big battle shaping up over the renewal of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty in 1970.

WEST BERLIN STUDENTS SUPPORT LAWYER WITH DEMONSTRATION

Protesting an effort to disbar a lawyer who has defended many young dissidents, students in West Berlin staged the most militant demonstration in that city since those which followed the attempted assassination of Rudi Dutschke last March.

Equipped for the first time like their Japanese counterparts with helmets, protective clothing, and poles, about 1,000 students showed up at 9:30 a.m. on November 4 near the state courthouse where the lawyer, Horst Mahler, was scheduled to be tried by a "court of honor." A sympathizer of the SDS [Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund -- German Socialist Student Union], Mahler was charged with inciting young people to commit illegal acts.

Roadblocks had been set up by the police at every cross street in the en-

tire district of Charlottenburg where the trial was to be held.

Shortly after the students arrived, foot and mounted police, backed up by water cannon, charged the students' lines, using clubs and tear gas.

The demonstrators resisted the police attacks. They even managed to capture a water cannon and turn it on the police. Finally they retreated toward the bridge over the River Spree. They held out there for a time, throwing paving stones at their attackers.

Of the 150 persons reported injured in the fighting, 120 were police. Four mounted police were unhorsed. Twenty-eight students were injured, some seriously, and 48 were arrested.

STUDENT REVOLT FLARES IN PAKISTAN

Four people have been killed, dozens of students arrested, and a number of prominent politicians have been jailed after a week of student demonstrations in Pakistan. Troops were called out in Rawalpindi, the country's interim capital, November 8, the third day of major protest actions. A dusk-to-dawn curfew was imposed on the city, and all schools and universities were closed "indefinitely" throughout the country.

On November 7 police fired on a crowd of 3,000 in Rawalpindi, killing one student.

In Karachi police used clubs to break up a demonstration of several hundred students who were demanding reforms in teaching and in examinations, and better organization of public transportation. About twelve students were arrested. Four student leaders had previously been jailed for "inciting" their comrades to renew a strike which began in October when students stoned the Radio-Pakistan building.

At Hyderabad, police arrested three students for participating November 4 in an attempt to occupy the office of the vice-chancellor of the University of Sind.

The decision to call out the army was made when students in Rawalpindi staged a mass demonstration November 8 at the funeral of their comrade who had been killed by the police. The students threw pieces of brick at the police, who replied with tear-gas grenades. Three police cars were burned. Three students were killed.

Authorities closed the university at Peshawar following a demonstration there in solidarity with the Rawalpindi students, and a similar incident took place in Dacca, in East Pakistan.

Police with heavy clubs charged a protest march in Lahore November 11. The students were coming from a district court where former foreign minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was addressing a meeting of lawyers. The demonstrators were demanding the repeal of a 1960 law giving the government the right to revoke diplomas of students who violated the internal security of the state. They also called for the reestablishment of the union of students and the release of their leaders.

The day before, a 22-year-old student was arrested in Peshawar for allegedly firing two shots at President Mohammad Ayub Khan during a public meeting.

Mohammad Musa, the governor of West Pakistan, declared, in a November 11 radio broadcast, that the disorders were caused by "elements of the opposition conspiring against the integrity and the very existence of Pakistan."

The government responded to the student unrest with a wave of arrests aimed at prominent opposition politicians. On November 13 Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was arrested in Lahore on a charge of inciting the people. Fourteen other political figures were also arrested, two of whom belonged to the ruling Moslem League. Most were members of Bhutto's Pakistan People's party. Five were members of the National

People's party, including its president, Khan Abdul Wali Khan.

Bhutto is expected to run against Mohammad Ayub Khan in the presidential election scheduled for 1970.

The arrests continued as new demonstrations broke out November 14. In Karachi ten persons were jailed, including Mahmudul Haque Usmani, general secretary of the pro-Moscow wing of the National Awami party. Lawyers staged peaceful dem-

onstrations in at least six cities calling for the release of the politicians.

As foreign minister, Bhutto had advocated close diplomatic and trade relations with the People's Republic of China.

Bhutto was dropped from the cabinet in 1966, almost simultaneously with an announcement from Washington that full-scale economic aid to Pakistan, halted after the 1965 war with India, would be resumed.

12,000,000 WORKERS STAGE GENERAL STRIKE IN ITALY

Twelve million workers held a nationwide general strike in Italy November 14 demanding major reforms in the social security program. Thousands of students, engaged in a struggle for university and high-school reform, joined the workers movement.

The general strike marked the highest point to date in a wave of actions by workers and students that has swept the country in recent weeks. Workers in Rome demanding wage raises clashed with police and with nonstrikers November 8.

Naples was paralyzed the same day by a general strike called by all the union federations to demand government intervention to revive the economy in the area. At Ancone on the Adriatic, as well as Udine and Frioul, workers struck for higher wages.

A thousand high-school students marched in Venice asking for more classrooms and more teachers. Similar demonstrations took place in Florence and Rome.

The student protests mushroomed into a national movement November 12, when tens of thousands demonstrated across Italy for a voice in school administration and better facilities.

In Rome a two-day sit-in closed the University School of Education, postponing entrance examinations. At the University of Padua, students cabled the Minister of Education, protesting the examination system, while at Bari 1,000 students from the technical schools held a march to demand an assembly hall. Demonstrations took place in Florence and Ferrara.

Minister of Education Scaglia was finally forced to announce the indefinite postponement of examinations on a national scale.

The students, like their counterparts in France, maintain the examinations serve to exclude students from the

universities who have completed the necessary requirements.

In Pistoia, high-school students demonstrated against the arrest of two of their fellows in a previous march. The extension of the protest movement into the high schools marked a new step forward for the student strikes.

The strikes continued and deepened as they entered their second day. Thousands of high-school students demonstrated in the streets of Rome November 13. Leaders of the "Student Movement" in Florence declared their support for the workers' general strike. Their statement said, "The battles that workers carry forward against the exploitation of one class by another are the same battles that the students carry on against the class schools."

Leaflets were distributed in Milan criticizing the administration of the Catholic University. Elsewhere in the city, police were used to remove forty students from the halls of a high school.

In Ferrara police broke up a sit-in of 800 students at one high school. A hastily called meeting of the city's high-school principals voted to grant the students' main demand, for the right to political assemblies.

Students in Bologna and Bari demanded more departments in the high schools and technical schools, and more state scholarships.

When the massive workers' general strike began at midnight, November 13, the students declared their solidarity.

The strike, approved by all the major unions, called for higher retirement pay, greater workers control of social security funds, and bigger government contributions to the program. Workers and students held joint demonstrations in many cities. Genoa, Trieste, and several other port cities were

closed by the strike.

Public transport was struck in many cities, usually for several hours. Workers held a rally in Milan that stopped traffic in the Piazza del Duomo for more than an hour, while in Turin police attacked demonstrators in front of the Fiat plant with tear gas. Several young workers and students were injured

in clashes with police in Cagliari and Sassari in Sardinia.

The student struggle continued during the day of the general strike. In Bologna, 4,000 students held a march protesting the closing of a vocational school that had previously been occupied by the students. The march concluded by joining a workers' rally.

GRIGORENKO SPEAKS OUT FOR SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY IN SOVIET UNION

More than 300 people braved official disapproval in Moscow November 14 to pay a last tribute to Soviet writer Aleksei Y. Kosterin, member of the Communist party since 1916 and a veteran of 17 years in Stalinist labor camps. Kosterin died November 10; he was 72. The writer resigned from the Communist party in October to protest what he called the party's return to Stalinism. He was secretly expelled from the Union of Soviet Writers October 30, and his death was not reported in the Soviet press.

The funeral ceremony made front-page news around the world when a former major general of the Soviet army, in eulogizing his comrade's fight against Stalin and his heirs, bitterly denounced the "bureaucratic machine" and called for a return to "Leninist democracy."

Major General Pyotr G. Grigorenko called for an end to the "totalitarianism that hides behind the mask of so-called Soviet democracy." According to reports in the Western press, Grigorenko told the crowd of mourners, "In farewells, it is usually said, 'Sleep quietly, Dear Comrade.' We shall not say this. In the first place, he will not listen to me. He will continue to fight anyway.

"In the second place, it is impossible for me without you, Alyoshka. You sit inside me and you will stay there. Without you, I do not live. Therefore, do not sleep, Alyoshka! Fight, Alyoshka!

"Burn all the abominable meanness with which they want to keep turning eternally that damned machine against which you fought all your life. We, your friends, will not be far behind you. Freedom will come! Democracy will come!"

Officials of the Moscow crematorium, where the funeral was held, twice interrupted General Grigorenko's ten-minute speech by demanding over the loudspeaker that he hurry and finish. In the middle of the ceremony, officials intervened to seal the coffin and consign it to the flames. The lights were turned out to force the mourners to leave quickly.

Aleksei Kosterin resigned from the party when he learned that expulsion proceedings had been initiated against him for his anti-Stalinist views. In July he signed a letter with four other writers protesting the impending Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. He was also among the twelve Communist intellectuals who sent a letter to the Budapest meeting of the pro-Moscow Communist parties in February protesting "the trampling on man in our country."

In returning his party card after fifty-two years, Kosterin wrote:

"As in Stalin's time, freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, of meetings, demonstrations and street processions only exist in the form of declarations written in the Constitution.

"In practice, those who try to use their constitutional rights are arrested, and anyone who protests against this arbitrariness is expelled from the party, dismissed from work, followed everywhere by agents of the K.G.B. [the secret police] and have their mouths closed in other, including the most revolting, ways."

Kosterin said the Soviet party had become a kind of job trust for people who carried out orders without thinking. "In our party at present one is forbidden to argue, and one is not permitted to think." He condemned the invasion of Czechoslovakia as an example of Stalinism in foreign policy.

Kosterin was not told that he had been expelled from the Union of Writers. After his death a notice of his expulsion was shown to his family and friends by a functionary of the union named Ilyin. The writer's friends denounced the expulsion as illegal because he had not been present to defend himself, was not even notified of the proceedings, and the action was not voted on by the branch of the union of which he was a member, as prescribed in the statutes.

General Grigorenko had harsh words

for the union officials in his funeral speech:

"Did it never occur to them that they were not capable of removing someone from the ranks of writers? They forgot that neither Pushkin nor Tolstoy was a member of the Union of Soviet Writers, and Pasternak was expelled.

"They wanted to expel Solzhenitsyn, when it is Solzhenitsyn who conferred honor on the Union of Writers by being its member and the union adds nothing to Solzhenitsyn. Do they not understand that it is more honorable for any real writers to share the fate of Pasternak than to sit in meetings alongside the Voronkovs and the Ilyins?"

Grigorenko declared his solidarity with the victims of recent trials of political opponents of the bureaucracy, such as Yuri Galanskov, Aleksandr Ginzburg, Vladimir Bukovsky, and many more "whom for understandable reasons I cannot name."

Kosterin had been an impassioned defender of the rights of national minorities, particularly the Crimean Tartars, who were fiercely persecuted by Stalin. Many of the mourners were representatives of national minorities.

Major General Grigorenko, now 61,

was formerly a lecturer at the Frunze Military Academy in Moscow. He became an open critic of the bureaucracy in 1961. He was dismissed from the academy, and in 1964 was imprisoned in a mental hospital for eight months, a common way of dealing with dissident political views in the Soviet Union. While detained, he was reduced to the rank of private and discharged from the army.

The former major general said he believed official harassment had hastened his friend's death. Reprisals had been aimed at Kosterin even after his release from the labor camps in 1953 because of his defense of socialist democracy:

"For this he was terribly hated," Grigorenko said, "by those who believe that people exist to create a backdrop for 'leaders,' to applaud and shout 'hurrah' for them, to believe in them blindly, to pray for them, to endure without murmur all scorn of themselves and to quack with pleasure when into his trough they pour more fodder and richer fodder than into the other troughs...."

"He hated not only them but also the order they had created. He tirelessly repeated Lenin's words, 'There is nothing harsher and more soulless than a bureaucratic machine.' Therefore he believed that a Communist had no higher task than to destroy this machine."

GUERRILLA SKIRMISHES IN VENEZUELA

Some fifteen guerrillas attacked the police station in the small town of San Vicente in the state of Apure, the Venezuelan authorities reported November 12.

The guerrillas set fire to the building in which court is held. They also staged a rally and painted the walls of the town with slogans.

Troops and police were sent to the region to track down the freedom fighters.

Two days later, the military reported that a different group of guerrillas ambushed a force of the National Guard at a place called Los Naranjos in the state of Sucre.

Three soldiers were wounded and an officer was killed.

According to the Ministry of Defense, three guerrillas were captured. The others succeeded in escaping, abandoning their arms as troops pursued them.

STUDENTS IN PUEBLA BATTLE POLICE

Some 500 students, demonstrating against a decision of the state government to end a subsidy to the university, were attacked by police in Puebla, Mexico, November 11.

The government decision meant an increase in tuition fees.

The students took refuge in a news-

paper plant from which they threw stones at the "granaderos."

The police finally managed to dislodge the demonstrators.

During their demonstration, the Puebla students shouted slogans in solidarity with the student movement in Mexico City.

MEXICO CITY DAILY ASSAILS U.S. COMMITTEE FOR AID TO POLITICAL PRISONERS

By Ricardo Ochoa

Mexico City

NOVEMBER 12 -- After the "Olympic truce" ended, the striking students decided on November 4 to continue their movement, maintaining that the strike was "the only means left to pressure the government into releasing our imprisoned comrades."

As so many other times, the campaign orchestrated by the Díaz Ordaz regime in this country's abject capitalist press drew ridicule from all sides. Its eight-column headlines exhorting the university and polytechnic students to "resume their classes" were rejected by the students. In the three months of conflict with the government, they have learned not to give the slightest credence to the fabrications of a totally corrupt press.

But the crudest and most ridiculous bit of effrontery came from the secretary of public education, the writer Agustín Yáñez, who dared to make this statement: "Showing the Olympic spirit, Mexican youth will resume their classes today." This assertion, made November 4, was spread all over the country via radio, press and television.

The ridiculous appeal was rejected. In assembly after assembly, the university and polytechnic students reaffirmed their determination to struggle. The government failed in its demagogic attempt to utilize for reactionary aims the excitement over the Olympic Games which fifteen days of constant propaganda by all the mass media had succeeded in infusing into forty-eight million Mexicans throughout the length and breadth of the country.

And, in passing, it should be noted that in view of the public response to the Olympics, the students were correct not to boycott them. The constant dinning on the theme that "the eyes of the world are on Mexico" finally convinced broad layers of the population that the Nineteenth Olympic Games were almost a matter of "national honor."

Thus, while the "Olympic truce" was a hard blow for the popular cause represented by the student movement, it also served as an occasion for taking time out, for drawing up a balance sheet.

After the fifteen days of competition, the bourgeoisie tried to capitalize on the "magnificent organization of the Olympic Games." (This was a bit exaggerated, according to the European press. Three days after the athletic competition had begun, the reporters still did not

have an adequate program for the events. But, according to the Mexican press, there has been "a campaign of defamation against Mexico" in the world press and especially in the European press.)

Today, the radio, television, and movies are ridden with clichés like "the eyes of the world are still on Mexico."

This is true, in fact, but for different reasons than those alleged by the bourgeoisie. The world got a look at the barbarism of the Mexican government in the Tlatelolco massacre, whose repercussions are far from over.

That the dominant faction of the government is concerned about the bad impression its brutal and bloody acts have produced even in liberal circles is shown in La Prensa's November 10 Sunday political column "Granero Politico" [Political Granary]. Signed by "Sembrador" [Sower], this slander-filled diatribe dealt with the campaign which the U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin-American Political Prisoners (USLA) is carrying on in the United States in defense of the victims of the Díaz Ordaz regime's repression.

The anonymous "sower" of slander says: "Another of the unquestionably improper activities of the so-called 'Consejo Nacional de Huelga' [National Strike Council], as reported by Agence France-Presse, is the visit of two of its members, the students Enrique Estrada and Ricardo de la Luz to universities in California, the Pacific Coast, Columbia, New York, Cornell, and others, to describe the 'climate of repression' which according to them exists in Mexico. These youths, together with two French journalists, Dominique Izoard and Jean Claude Leveque, have used their peculiar tour to give public lectures accusing their own country's government for the tragic events in Tlatelolco which were caused in fact by the irresponsible armed action of their 'Columnas de Choque' [Shock Columns], as has been well verified. The attempt of these Mexican students to get American public opinion to support a 'movement' by distorting the facts and presenting the attackers as the victims is reminiscent of the 'Comision de Notables' [Commission of Notables]. This body brought the internal affairs of Mexico before the European courts in the last century and invited Napoleon III to use his armies to impose Maximilian von Hapsburg as 'emperor' in order to defend the anti-national interests of a faction defeated by the great Juárez. Even one of the names sounds familiar. There was a Gutiérrez Estrada on this commission of traitors that went out to blacken the good name of

their country and sell its future to foreigners." [Emphasis added.]

You don't know where to begin. There is nothing but slander and calumny in this paragraph. How many lies there are! According to this "sower," the French -- they had to be French -- journalists joined the tour of these two "traitors." But what do we find when we read the news account?

The French journalists who were at Ricardo Luz's press conference in New York only confirmed the version he gave of the October 2 events...Because they were in Mexico City at the time to report the Olympic contests. Many journalists said the same thing in their publications -- Le Monde, Le Nouvel Observateur, the New York Times, Time magazine, and many others.

All of them agreed that the army fired point-blank at a peaceful and defenseless crowd. Even Time magazine spoke of the "arrogance of power" of the Díaz Ordaz government -- a nice way of describing the dictatorship which has been imposed on Mexico. All the daily papers have "verified the facts well" that the army fired without warning into the crowd. That is, according to all the versions reporting the incident in a less tendentious way than the official account, the government was responsible for the massacre of Tlatelolco.

The most cynical part of the report, however, is the statement that "the attackers" (the students) "are distorting" the facts and making the government -- the poor, weak government which was assaulted by the bad students -- into the "attacker." This reminds me of the placard some students carried in the silent demonstration of September 13 which alluded to the Mexican press version of the police onslaughts -- "Heroic Granaderos [military security police] Attacked by Students Armed With Clubs and Tear Gas."

But the real whopper is the reference to the "Comisión de Notables" in the last century. The Mexican students have no right to appeal for solidarity from the students of the world because this would be betraying the fatherland like the conservatives who supported the French intervention in the nineteenth century. They have no right to give their own version of the events which involved them most of all!

This reminds one of Díaz Ordaz' reference in his Presidential Report to the "big propaganda campaign" cooked up by the students. What complaint could a government have on this score which controls 99.99 percent of the press in the country and 100 percent of the radio and TV? The students' version was able to win

over public opinion because of its simplicity and lack of demagoguery, despite the fact that they did not have the mass media at their disposal as the government did.

According to this peculiar way of defining loyalty or treachery to the fatherland, the government -- which has slandered a popular movement without let-up, which has called the Consejo Nacional de Huelga "Communist," which has fomented terroristic attacks on schools and committed the crime of mass murder on October 2 -- according to this definition, such a government is the authentic representative of the fatherland. In the face of so much corruption, so much dishonesty, so much shamelessness, the students have every right to tell their version to the world.

Further on, this Sower adds: "In this disgraceful conduct of the 'Consejo Nacional de Huelga,' the total lack of patriotism of its members, their lack of dignity, their evident complicity with, or dependence on foreign forces, on those who have participated in all the student disturbances, is clearly revealed. But the greatest contradiction is that this so-called 'student movement' calls itself 'left' and has gone to 'beg alms' in the United States."

To "beg alms," to ask for aid from the United States, is a sin which the Mexican government has freely indulged in for decades. You have only to look at the government's enormous indebtedness to the U.S. banks. And foreign investments are other very important means by which the U.S. government has intruded itself into the country. There is no need to recall the servility of the president of Mexico himself toward Johnson, nor can we forget the frequent demonstrations of approval by the ruling groups for any triumph whatever of Yankee imperialism. In reality, if anyone has "sold the future to foreigners," it is the Mexican bourgeoisie, who have chained themselves to the cart of U.S. imperialism through their economic policy of an open door to U.S. capital.

In reality, the Sower's heavy-handed efforts to link the Mexican students to "foreign forces" (including two French journalists) only conceal the frustration and rage aroused in the Mexican government by the vigorous and continually expanding solidarity which the student movement in Mexico has received from the progressive and revolutionary sectors in the United States.

In fact the students have found an ally of the greatest importance. From now on they will be able to carry the truth about their movement to the country of the Mexican government's most powerful ally. Thus, the Mexican students can answer the Díaz Ordaz government's provoca-

tion by hitting at its tourist business, which is vital to the pockets of the hotel-, restaurant-, and cabaret-owning bourgeoisie.

But the government's own Olympic policy caused it to be unmasked. The hundreds of foreign journalists who came to Mexico for the Nineteenth Olympic Games were unwilling witnesses to the barbarism of Díaz Ordaz. Many journalists totally free of suspicion of being Marxists, liberals of the purest water like John Rodda of the London Guardian Weekly, became the most important propagandists for the student struggle in Mexico.

Rodda was in Tlatelolco on October 2 near the Italian woman journalist, Oriana Fallaci, who was wounded, and the students who were murdered at her side. And he wrote a very revealing article entitled "A Postscript to the Olympic Games." [In the November 7 Guardian Weekly.]

"Without the Olympic Games," he wrote, "the Government could probably have crushed the student movement in their own effective manner without any nasty publicity. But, as the pictures of tanks and troops opposite the main Olympic Stadium were published throughout the world with stories of deaths in riots, the Government became trapped.

"To ensure the peace of the Games they have had to expose their ruthless oppression to the world. October 2 shocked the world and stunned Mexico....

"The conflict has long ceased to be just a student uprising. When the students make their demands to President Díaz Ordaz, the professors and the teachers are behind them on the one side, and on the other are the peasants, who find things are more easily gained by turning to the student movement."

After pointing to some examples of the students' solidarity with the peasants, Rodda says that the president was the one who ordered the attack to thwart any attempt by the students, whether or not they had any intention, to take their cause to the Olympic arena.

Then he adds: "If it was clumsily executed as a military operation, it was wholly successful in attaining its object -- a peaceful Games. It was, I suspect, the bloodiest massacre of civilians in the last quarter of a century in a country not involved in war or civil war. An accurate figure of the deaths will never be known but the 500 I reported on the following day is not likely to be far off the mark."

And he ends with this harsh indictment of the ruling class in Mexico: "In Europe this might sound like fantasy. So too might the burning of bodies, the stripping of others and replacing their clothes with army uniforms to boost the military casualty lists. But Mexico is a corrupt country in which the secret agent is a crucial arm of Government power. This is the challenge that the newly educated face."

SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR SOUTH KOREAN AGRICULTURE

Osaka

The September 7 issue of the Tong-Il Choseon reports a serious crisis in the agricultural districts of the Republic of Korea [ROK -- South Korea], due to two years of dry weather.

The total rice crop target figure of 5,615 million quarts will reportedly be cut by at least 950 million quarts.

As a result of the crisis, many farmers have left their villages, going to the already overcrowded cities.

The drought is especially serious because the ROK, like other Asian countries in the U.S. military system, has suffered from chronic agricultural problems even in good weather. This is due in part to the sharp disparity between the standard of living in the cities and in the countryside. The U.S. government has propped up the South Korean economy with massive transfusions of American dollars, very few of which find their way to the villages. From 1954 to 1967 more than

\$2.2 billion was "donated" by Washington.

This has allowed the ROK to maintain an impossible balance of payments. In 1966, for example, exports amounted to \$250,000,000 while imports were almost three times as high at \$736,000,000. The chief beneficiary of this artificial expansion has been the thin layer of supporters of the dictatorship concentrated in the cities.

Some figures on the real income disparity were made public August 29 by the Social Welfare Department. The average monthly income for a farming family is under 5,000 wong [US\$19.6], less than half the average income of city dwellers. The percentage of low-income families [less than 5,000 wong per month] is 18.7 in the urban areas, while it is 62.5 in rural districts.

The two-year drought has deepened the already existing poverty in the agricultural districts into an economic and political crisis, which is now beginning to affect the cities as well.

FIDEL CASTRO AND THE EVENTS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

By Joseph Hansen

What has happened to Fidel Castro's speech of August 23 in which he supported the invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia by the Warsaw Pact countries?

Is it being hailed by Moscow? Has the Soviet command tried to put a copy in the hands of every citizen of Czechoslovakia, the better to explain why foreign troops have been stationed in their country? Have the Czechoslovak communications media opened a public discussion of the questions it raises?

If the speech is not being widely circulated, has it at least been placed on the agenda for discussion at a governmental level, or among the leaders of the Communist parties of the "socialist camp"?

The truth is that even the Communist Party, U.S.A., one of the few pro-Moscow parties in the West to support the invasion wholeheartedly, has displayed an ambiguous attitude toward Castro's speech. While utilizing the fact that Castro approved the action of the Warsaw Pact countries, the top CPUSA leaders have refrained from disseminating or discussing Castro's speech as a whole.

The silence over what Castro said -- one might justifiably call it a conspiracy of silence -- is all the stranger in view of the fact that the Cuban leader remains the only one of all those who backed the action of the Warsaw Pact governments whose position can be characterized as internally consistent, if you accept the basic premise advanced by the Kremlin to justify sending troops into Czechoslovakia.

What led the Warsaw Pact allies to decide to block Castro's contribution from being discussed on a broad basis? Why did they decide that it was politically discreet to ignore it? To answer these questions, it is necessary to examine Castro's arguments closely.

Castro's Basic Premise

The Cuban leader states his basic premise as follows:*

"We...were convinced -- and this is very important -- that the Czechoslo-

vak regime was dangerously inclined toward a substantial change in the system. In short, we were convinced that the Czechoslovak regime was heading toward capitalism and was inexorably heading toward imperialism. Of that we did not have the slightest doubt."

Castro, of course, is referring to the regime of Alexander Dubček although he does not refer once to Dubček by name.

The reasons advanced by Castro for coming to this conclusion include the interest displayed by imperialism in the ferment in Czechoslovakia, a certain responsiveness by some circles in the country to this interest, the slogans that were advanced concerning democratization of the political structure, the pressure for establishment of freedom of the press, "a process of seizure of the principal information media by the reactionary elements" which began "to develop," "a whole series of slogans of open rapprochement toward capitalist concepts and theses and of rapprochement towards the West."

He agrees that not everything was bad about the situation. Some of the slogans were "unquestionably correct." He also agrees that responsibility for precipitating a situation so allegedly favorable to the restoration of capitalism must be ascribed to the previous (Novotny) regime, to "incorrect methods of government, bureaucratic policy, separation from the masses..."

Various "tendencies were developing simultaneously, some of which justified the change and others of which turned that change toward an openly reactionary policy."

It should be noted that Castro does not contend that the counterrevolution had reached the point of launching an armed struggle for power. It was the Dubček regime itself that was in question, that was "dangerously inclined toward a substantial change in the system." Castro says at another point: "Provisionally, we reached this conclusion: we had no doubt that the political situation in Czechoslovakia was deteriorating and going downhill on its way back to capitalism and that it was inexorably going to fall into the arms of imperialism."

I do not propose to argue here whether Czechoslovakia was going downhill and on its way back to capitalism. The accumulating evidence more and more confirms the opposite view -- that a political revolution was maturing in Czechoslovakia which, if Moscow had not intervened, would have succeeded in bringing a revolutionary

* All quotations are from the official translation released by the Cuban government. Slight variations may be noted from the text published in Intercontinental Press, September 2, 9, and 16 (pp. 694, 720, 759), which was taken from the first version that became available.

socialist regime to power.*

Justifies Violation of Sovereignty

On the basis of his premise, that "Czechoslovakia was moving toward a counterrevolutionary situation, toward capitalism and into the arms of imperialism" (which, of course, coincides with the justification advanced by the Kremlin for intervening with troops), Fidel Castro considers one of the main bits of propaganda used by the Warsaw Pact allies at the time to explain what they had done. They said they had received an appeal from prominent Communists in Czechoslovakia asking them to intervene. Out of international solidarity, they had responded to this request.

Castro notes that the names of the signers of the appeal had not been made public up to the time he spoke. However, he does not make much of that; he goes to the heart of the question.

The intervention, in his opinion, "unquestionably entailed a violation of legal principles and international norms." It "cannot be denied," he contends, "that the sovereignty of the Czechoslovak State was violated." To say otherwise would be "a fiction, an untruth. And the violation was, in fact, of a flagrant nature."

"From a legal point of view, this cannot be justified....Not the slightest trace of legality exists. Frankly, none whatever."

Castro argues that the sole justification for the invasion was political necessity. "In our opinion, the decision made concerning Czechoslovakia can only be explained from a political point of view, not from a legal point of view."

As he sees it, the political situation had become so alarming "that it was absolutely necessary, at all costs, in one way or another, to prevent this eventuality [the restoration of capitalism] from taking place."

"The essential point to be accepted, or not accepted," he insists, "is whether or not the socialist camp could allow a political situation to develop

which would lead to the breaking away of a socialist country, to its falling into the arms of imperialism. And our point of view is that it is not permissible and that the socialist camp has a right to prevent this in one way or another. I would like to begin by making it clear that we look upon this fact as an essential one."

Castro puts up a strong case for dismissing the appeal of the unnamed "group of personalities" as immaterial. Is a certain embarrassment detectable in his stress on this point?

Only last January Anibal Escalante was put on trial for suggesting that the Kremlin intervene in Cuban affairs and utilize economic pressure to compel Fidel Castro to change his orientation. This was held to be a grave crime against Cuba's sovereignty, and Escalante was sentenced to fifteen years in prison. Others in his group were sentenced to terms ranging from two to twelve years.*

It would have been somewhat inconsistent of Castro to have considered the appeal of the Czechoslovak personalities to be legal while maintaining that the appeal of the Cuban personalities had been correctly condemned as illegal.

He could have argued that the Czechoslovak personalities were within their rights in making their appeal, for it was directed against the allegedly procapitalist Dubček regime, whereas in the case of Cuba the appeal of the Escalante group was directed against the revolutionary regime of Fidel Castro. But this is a political argument, hinging on the political aims of the two groups -- the appeal of the faceless Czechoslovaks being revolutionary, Escalante's appeal being counterrevolutionary.

This line of argument would have run into complications when it came to explaining why the appeals of such disparate groups were in each instance directed to the same address -- the Kremlin. Why would both the criminal Escalante group and the heroic Czechoslovak group each count on a favorable response from the Kremlin unless all three had something in common?

Castro avoided these quicksands by subordinating the issue of sovereignty to political necessity and frankly admitting that the action of the Warsaw Pact allies

* Those interested in the point are referred to a resolution of the Fourth International criticizing Castro's position published in Intercontinental Press, September 16, p. 766; and the editorial in the November issue of Quatrième Internationale, the official magazine of the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International, "Czechoslovakia -- First Balance Sheet, First Lessons," published in English in Intercontinental Press, October 7, p. 849.

* For Raúl Castro's report on this, see Intercontinental Press, February 23, March 1, and March 8 (pp. 158, 184, 202). See also "The Case of Anibal Escalante" by Livio Maitan in Intercontinental Press, February 23, p. 155; and "The Escalante Case" and "Escalante and Foreign Policy" by Harry Ring in The Militant, September 27 and October 4.

did not have the "slightest trace of legality."

Gus Hall Tells It Like It Is

Perhaps the Kremlin regretted that it had not been as outspoken as Castro on this point. The famous appeal of the discreet personalities turned into the opposite of what its originators had intended. It served to expose the fraudulent nature of their arguments.

To this day (November 17), the Warsaw Pact allies have felt it inadvisable to reveal the names of the signers. The ones to whom suspicion pointed denied any association. Thus, as no personalities, prominent or otherwise, stepped forward to claim the honor of having asked for foreign troops to be sent in, it became more and more evident that the population and the Communist party were solidly opposed to the intervention. Even the few in the regime willing to serve as puppets were afraid to identify themselves! Consequently, within a few days the Kremlin dropped all references to the appeal.

But instead of acknowledging what a fraud had been perpetrated, the spokesmen of the Warsaw Pact sought to brazen it out.

Some quarters, secure in the knowledge that the reimposed censorship prevents the Czechoslovak Communists from replying, are even arguing that the invasion was intended to safeguard the sovereignty of Czechoslovakia.

Thus Gus Hall, the general secretary of the CPUSA, asks rhetorically in his pamphlet, Czechoslovakia at the Crossroads: "Does anyone really believe that the five powers were really violating national sovereignty?" They were, he contends, only protecting their own sovereignty. "The intervention," he adds, "is a temporary one." He caps this reasoning with the following assurance: "It will leave Czechoslovakia's sovereignty intact and able to defend itself."

This is reminiscent of the famous defense put up by the rapist when he was hauled into the frontier court. "First of all, judge, does anyone really believe I am capable of really raping a defenseless woman? Secondly, I was only protecting my own virginity. Thirdly, it was only a temporary situation. And, last but not least, afterwards she still had her virginity intact and able to defend itself."

The fact is that Moscow prefers Gus Hall's reasoning to Fidel Castro's frankness. The Cuban leader's open recognition of the illegal nature of the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia was highly embarrassing to those in charge of justifying the operation. That was one

reason why they sought to dispose of the speech as quickly and as quietly as possible.

It would be interesting to know what the real thinking of the Cubans is now on this point. How could the Moscow leaders have come in the first place to use such a clumsy and fraudulent device as the appeal from anonymous persons? And why have they said nothing about arguments like those thought up by Gus Hall, maintaining that Czechoslovakia's sovereignty was preserved by the intervention?

Has Communism Lost Its Attraction?

More needs to be said about this issue, but let us first follow Castro's reasoning after he assumes as his basic premise the contention of the Warsaw Pact governments that Czechoslovakia had to be saved from going capitalist.

It is not enough, he says, to simply accept as a fact that "Czechoslovakia was headed toward a counterrevolutionary situation and that it was necessary to prevent it." Something more is required.

"We must analyze the causes," he continues, "and ask what factors made this possible and created the necessity for such a dramatic, drastic and painful measure." We must "analyze the causes, the factors and the circumstances" that brought about a situation leading a group of personalities "to appeal to other countries of the socialist camp to send their armies to prevent the triumph of the counterrevolution in Czechoslovakia and the triumph of the intrigues and conspiracies of the imperialist countries interested in tearing Czechoslovakia away from the community of socialist nations."

The question is of immense importance to Fidel Castro.

"Gentlemen," he continues, "is it conceivable that a situation could occur, under any circumstances, after 20 years of communism in our country, of communist revolution, of socialist revolution, in which a group of honest revolutionaries, in this country, horrified by the prospect of an advance -- or rather a retrogression -- to counterrevolutionary positions and toward imperialism, could find themselves obliged to request the aid of friendly armies to prevent such a retrogression from occurring? What would have happened to the communist conscience [consciousness] of this people? What would have happened to the revolutionary awareness of this people? To the dignity of this people? To the revolutionary morale of this people? If such a situation could arise some day, what would have happened to all those things which, for us, are the essentials of the Revolution?"

What Castro is saying here, with

complete consistency, is that if you adopt the position that Czechoslovakia was about to fall like a ripe plum to capitalism, then you must draw certain conclusions about the attractive power of communism. How is it to be explained that capitalism has such an ideological grip on the people of Czechoslovakia? And not only after twenty years of living under a workers state in Czechoslovakia, but fifty-one years after the Russian October and ten years after the Cuban victory.

That's capitalism in its death agony, too. A capitalism that has given the world two global conflicts, a major depression and any number of minor ones. It is a capitalism that has given the world fascism, and, in the case of Czechoslovakia, the Nazi occupation. A capitalism, moreover, that has already wiped out two cities with nuclear bombs and that threatens to destroy all mankind in a nuclear holocaust. A capitalism that has won universal hatred and contempt because of such aggressions as the current one in Vietnam. A capitalism that has aroused a mood of deep rebellion among the youth living under it. A capitalism which in the United States has touched off repeated explosions in the ghettos.

In the face of all this, the Kremlin is compelled to say -- in deeds if not in words -- that capitalism is more attractive to the people of Czechoslovakia than communism!

It is hard for Fidel Castro to accept that. It is hard for any revolutionist to accept it. Yet the conclusion is unavoidable if you admit the premise that the counterrevolutionary danger in Czechoslovakia was so great that foreign troops had to be sent in to crush it.

A completely opposite conclusion follows if the truth of the matter was that a political revolution was maturing in Czechoslovakia. For this signifies that instead of wanting to go back to capitalism, what the people of Czechoslovakia wanted was to go forward to socialist democracy. If that is the case, capitalism cannot possibly be restored in Czechoslovakia. The battle is with bureaucratism -- the pattern of Stalinist bureaucratism imposed on the country from the outside.

Neglect of Communist Ideals

But let us follow Castro's reasoning further. He insists that "it behooves the communist movement as an unavoidable duty to undertake a profound study of the causes" that gave rise to the situation in Czechoslovakia.

The suggestion, again, is completely consistent. If such a glaring weakness has been uncovered, it would seem high time -- fifty-one years after the victory

of the Bolsheviks -- to find out what went wrong and what might be done to remedy it. If the main strength of communism no longer lies in the power of its ideas and its example, but simply in the number and quality of its bayonets, then it is in a very dangerous position. Suppose that the men wielding the bayonets are likewise attracted by capitalism and begin welcoming it instead of battling it?

Every revolutionary socialist, one can be sure, will back Fidel Castro in pressing for a thorough analysis of the causes of the situation in Czechoslovakia. One can be just as sure that the Soviet bureaucracy will not prove responsive. The last thing Stalin's heirs want is a profound study of the causes of the situation in Czechoslovakia.

Another reason can be written down for the cool reception they gave Castro's speech.

Castro states that "this is not the time to make or pretend to make that profound analysis, but we can cite some facts and ideas." He lists these as "bureaucratic methods in the leadership of the country, lack of contact with the masses...neglect of communist ideals."

He deals in particular with the neglect of communist ideals, beginning with internationalism. "The communist ideal cannot, for a single moment, exist without internationalism," he says.

"Sell Any Old Junk"

Communists who are in power must not forget the rest of the world. "They can never forget the suffering, underdevelopment, poverty, ignorance and exploitation that exist in a part of the world or how much poverty and destitution have accumulated there."

A truly internationalist outlook cannot be instilled in the people if they are allowed to forget these realities and the danger represented by imperialism. It is wrong to attempt to move the masses "through material incentives and the promises of more consumer goods alone."

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

What Castro has in mind, evidently, is the help which the better-off "socialist" countries should give to the poorer ones and to revolutionary movements still struggling to achieve power. Later he re-

veals some scandalous examples of Cuba's experiences in this field.

"On many occasions they sold us very outdated factories." They were eager to "sell any old junk..." The Novotny regime sold weapons to Cuba that were the "spoils of war seized from the Nazis, weapons for which we have been paying, and still today are paying for..." The Tito regime even refused to sell arms to revolutionary Cuba although it offered them to Batista.

This is a very telling point. The leaders of the Warsaw Pact must have squirmed a bit over the public exposure. Perhaps that was when they decided to throw the document in the wastebasket.

Was Castro Consulted on Invasion?

Castro could have said much more, however, under the heading of "internationalism." Even in its economic aspects he confines himself largely to the question of international solidarity in meeting the imperialist enemy and in dealing with underdeveloped countries. He leaves out completely how the parasitic economic interests of the bureaucracy affect international cooperation and interfere with correctly solving such problems as achieving the optimum ratios in the production of the various kinds of goods.

Castro's reticence on the political aspects of internationalism is even more striking. Where is internationalism best exemplified if not in trying to reach joint solutions to the common political problems facing the workers movement, particularly in confronting imperialism?

But what international body, set up in accordance with the rules of democratic centralism, took up the problem of the drift in Czechoslovakia toward an alleged counterrevolutionary situation? What international body, composed of representatives of all the socialist countries, decided that no other solution was possible save a surprise invasion consisting in the main of Soviet troops?

Was Castro, for instance, asked for his views or for suggestions as to possible alternatives? Was he even notified in advance? Or was he merely told about the action after it had occurred?

All the evidence indicates that the decision was reached secretly by top bureaucrats in Moscow who preferred to remain anonymous. To this day, it is not known if some of those participating behind closed doors in these secret councils were opposed or if the decision was unanimous. Everyone else in the "socialist camp" was required to step forward after the event and be counted publicly for or against, a position hardly in ac-

cord with the dignity of communist man. And criticisms were not given much of a hearing, as we can see from the way Castro's speech was received.

"Peaceful Coexistence"

Another practice of "certain socialist countries of Europe" which Castro condemns is "the preaching of peace." He, of course -- as he patiently explains -- is not advocating war. "We are not the enemies of peace; we are not in favor of wars; we do not advocate universal holocaust." But he thinks it is wrong to keep crying, peace, peace, when there is no peace. "And those realities cannot be changed by simply preaching, in one's own house, an excessive desire for peace."

If peace must be preached, let it be done in the enemy's camp and not in one's own camp.

What Castro is attacking here, without nailing it down, is the concept of "peaceful coexistence" peddled by the Kremlin which plays into the hands of imperialism and which has led to disaster after disaster for the working class internationally.

A free discussion on this policy and its consequences would be highly useful, particularly "in certain socialist countries in Europe," above all the Soviet Union. But free discussions in those countries on such topics is taboo. That is why Castro's speech seems not to have been cleared by the "socialist" censors.

What About the Soviet Union?

Some of Castro's sharpest criticisms refer directly to the Soviet Union. He says, for instance: "We are against all those bourgeois liberal reforms within Czechoslovakia. But we are also against the liberal economic reforms...that have been taking place in other countries of the socialist camp, as well." Quoting from an article in Pravda, assailing an alleged tendency to introduce "mercantile relations" and "granting a broad field of action to private capital," Castro asks:

"Does this, by chance, mean that the Soviet Union is also going to curb certain currents in the field of economy that are in favor of putting increasingly greater emphasis on mercantile relations and on the effects of spontaneity in those relations, and those which have even been defending the desirability of the market and the beneficial effect of prices based on that market? Does it mean that the Soviet Union is becoming aware of the need to halt those currents? More than one article in the imperialist press has referred jubilantly to those currents that also exist within the Soviet Union."

This is not the place to debate whether the "economic reforms" in either Czechoslovakia or the Soviet Union point in the direction of a capitalist restoration. I think it can be shown that they do not transcend the limits of bureaucratic planning, whatever dangers that kind of planning may hold in general for the Soviet economy. What is to be noted here is Castro's consistency.

If the "liberal" economic reforms paved the way in Czechoslovakia for a counterrevolutionary situation, then the same holds true for the Soviet Union. And if the leaders of the Soviet Union are concerned about what happened in Czechoslovakia, they should be all the more concerned about what is happening under their noses in the Soviet Union.

Implicit in Castro's argumentation is the question: If the analysis of the trend in Czechoslovakia was accurate, then must it not be concluded that a counterrevolutionary situation is being fostered in the Soviet Union?

Moscow Fails to Name U.S. Imperialism

An even more cutting criticism concerns Moscow's relations with Washington.

"It disturbs us," he says, "that, so far, there has been no direct imputation against Yankee imperialism in any of the statements made by the countries that sent their divisions to Czechoslovakia, or in the explanation of the events. We have been informed exhaustively concerning all the preceding events, all the facts, all the deviations, all about that rightist group, all about that liberal group; we have been informed of their activities.

"The activities of the imperialists and the intrigues of the imperialists are known, and we are disturbed to see that neither the Communist Party nor the Government of the Soviet Union, nor the governments of the other countries that sent their troops to Czechoslovakia, have made any direct accusation against Yankee imperialism for its responsibility in the events in Czechoslovakia."

Castro emphasizes this important point:

"Certain vague references to world imperialism, to world imperialist circles, and some more concrete statements concerning the imperialist circles of West Germany have been made. But who doesn't know that West Germany is simply a pawn of Yankee imperialism in Europe, the most aggressive, the most obvious pawn -- that it is a pawn of the CIA, a pawn of the Pentagon and a pawn of the imperialist Government of the United States? And, certainly, we wish to express our concern

over the fact that in none of the statements is a direct imputation made against Yankee imperialism, which is the principal culprit in the world plot and conspiracy against the socialist camp. And it is necessary that we express this preoccupation."

Castro made his speech just two days after the invasion. Almost three months have passed; yet this telling criticism has not been met.

In fact, the Soviet leaders have followed the opposite course. They have gone out of their way to display their friendliness to Washington. State Department officials, invited to talk with the Soviet diplomats, have leaked to the press that the Brezhnev-Kosygin team were anxious to assure the Johnson administration that there was no reason for the events in Czechoslovakia to alter the present détente in relations, since the invasion was intended only to normalize a family matter in the Soviet sphere of influence. The State Department and the White House, no doubt having in mind the need to normalize some family problems in the Western Hemisphere, indicated how well they understood Moscow's position.

In light of the record, it would seem difficult to avoid reaching the following conclusions:

(1) There was no counterrevolutionary situation in Czechoslovakia engineered by the U.S., no matter what irons the CIA may have tried to heat in the fire.

(2) Due to domestic ferment, the country was heading toward a political revolution and the establishment of socialist democracy.

(3) Washington understood this and also understood the fear in Moscow, which it was not beyond sharing to some extent, over this perspective.

(4) Washington indicated in advance that it would not react in a genuinely hostile way to any action undertaken by Moscow to normalize the situation, whatever propaganda value the imperialist communications media might try to squeeze out of it or whatever declarations officials of the Johnson administration might have to make for the record.

(5) Castro's allusions to this subject irritated Moscow since they put in question its policy of maintaining "peaceful coexistence"; i.e., collaborating with U.S. imperialism to maintain the status quo. Hence the decision to give Castro's criticisms the silent treatment.

The Payoff in Latin America

At the conference of the Organization of Latin-American Solidarity in Havana

last year, Castro criticized the Soviet policy of dealing with the tyrannical governments of the oligarchies in Latin America in face of their participation in the U.S. blockade of revolutionary Cuba. He raises the question again in his speech on the events in Czechoslovakia.

"It is understandable," he declares, "that the countries of the Warsaw Pact sent their armies to destroy the imperialist conspiracy and the progress of the counterrevolution in Czechoslovakia. However, we have disagreed with, been displeased at, and protested against the fact that these same countries have been drawing closer economically, culturally and politically to the oligarchic governments of Latin America, which are not merely reactionary governments and exploiters of their peoples, but also shameless accomplices in the imperialist aggressions against Cuba and shameless accomplices in the economic blockade of Cuba. And these countries have been encouraged and emboldened by the fact that our friends, our natural allies, have ignored the vile and treacherous role enacted by those governments against a socialist country.

"And at the same time that we understand the need for the spirit of internationalism, and the need to go to the aid -- even with troops -- of a fraternal country to confront the schemes of the imperialists, we ask ourselves if that policy of economic, political and cultural rapprochement toward those oligarchic governments that are accomplices in the imperialist blockade against Cuba will come to an end."

To drive his point home, Castro quotes dispatches from various cities in Latin America indicating that all these reactionary governments and their press were extracting everything possible out of the events in Czechoslovakia and shaking their fists at the Soviet Union. In the case of Venezuela, what a contrast between the attitude of the reactionaries in the government when the U.S. invaded the Dominican Republic and their attitude in the case of Czechoslovakia. In the former instance, "No relations were broken, no business was shelved, no economic relations were disturbed -- nothing at all like this happened. And now they permit themselves the luxury of throwing in the face of the countries of the socialist camp this type of relations which the latter have actually been begging them for, this type of relations which they have been begging that government, which is one of the most reactionary and dyed-in-the-wool of the accomplices of Yankee imperialism. And now they throw it in the faces of the socialist countries.

"These are the results of such a policy when the chips are down, at the mo-

ment of truth."

One wonders what Castro's basic thinking is about the Soviet bureaucracy. Does he believe that it will really listen to reason, that it can be reformed by pointing out some of the disastrous consequences of its reactionary policies? In any case, he is consistent in maintaining that if they have turned over a new leaf in Czechoslovakia, then they ought to do likewise in a number of other areas, including their attempts to woo the Latin-American oligarchies.

The Right-Wing CP Leaderships

In passing, Castro lashes the Communist parties of Europe, caught up in "indecision" at the moment. "And we wonder whether possibly in the future the relations with Communist Parties will be based on principled positions or whether they will continue to maintain a spineless attitude, to be satellites, lackeys -- a situation in which only those that maintain a spineless attitude, say 'yes' to everything and never assume an independent position on anything, would be considered friendly."

He contrasts the principled attitude of the Cuban Communist party which backed the Venezuelan, Bolivian, and Guatemalan guerrillas when they were abandoned by a "rightist and treacherous leadership." "Yet we were accused of being adventurers, of interfering in the affairs of other countries, of interfering in the affairs of other Parties."

"I ask myself, in the light of the facts and in the light of the bitter reality that persuaded the nations of the Warsaw Pact to send their forces to crush the counterrevolution in Czechoslovakia, and -- according to their statement -- to back a minority in the face of a majority with rightist positions, if they will also cease to support these rightist, reformist, sold-out, submissive leaderships in Latin America that are enemies of the armed revolutionary struggle, that oppose the peoples' liberation struggle.

"And, with the example of this bitter experience before them, I wonder whether or not the Parties of those countries, in line with the decision made in Czechoslovakia, will cease to support those rightist groups that betray the revolutionary movement in Latin America."

It can be seen how logical Castro is. All kinds of accusations were leveled at the Cubans because they backed minority groups of revolutionary guerrillas against Communist party leaders who betrayed. The Cubans were even accused -- crime of crimes! -- of intervening in the internal affairs of other countries and other parties.

Yet, lo and behold, the Warsaw Pact

allies sent more than 600,000 troops to intervene in the internal affairs of another country and another Communist party, the reason being that a minority there had appealed for help. Isn't an apology due the Cubans? And if the apology is skipped, shouldn't the Warsaw Pact governments, in all consistency, change their line by about 180 degrees in Latin America?

A broad discussion in Czechoslovakia on this point would have helped a great deal to bring clarity into the situation there. But clarity is not exactly what Moscow wants in Czechoslovakia.

The Cost of Appeasing Imperialism

All this is preliminary to one of the sharpest juxtapositions yet to be made by Castro between the revolutionary principles on which the Cubans stand and the line of "peaceful coexistence" with imperialism followed by the Kremlin.

"Certainly," declares Castro, "we do not believe in the possibility of an improvement in relations between the socialist camp and imperialism under the present conditions, or under any conditions as long as that imperialism exists. We do not and cannot believe in the possibility of an improvement in relations between the socialist camp and the U.S. imperialist Government as long as that country performs the role of international gendarme, aggressor against the peoples and enemy and systematic opponent of revolutions everywhere in the world. Much less can we believe in any such improvement in the midst of an aggression as criminal and cowardly as that being waged against Vietnam.

"Our position on this is very clear: one is consistent with world realities and is truly internationalist and genuinely and decidedly supports the revolutionary movement throughout the world, in which case relations with the imperialist Government of the United States cannot be improved, or relations with the imperialist U.S. Government will improve, but only at the cost of withholding consistent support from the worldwide revolutionary movement."

The Nuclear Monopolists

Castro's target is absolutely clear. However, he does not leave it at this abstract level. He gets down to cases.

He cites a dispatch from Washington dated August 22 reporting a declaration by Secretary of State Dean Rusk that the Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia compromises any improvement in relations between East and West and that the situation could block ratification of the Non-Proliferation Treaty by the U.S. Senate.

"This can hardly fail to delight us," Castro declares. "Our people know the position of the Cuban delegation regarding this famous Non-Proliferation Treaty, which virtually gives a permanent concession to the large powers for the monopoly of nuclear weapons and the monopoly of technology in a field of energy that is going to be indispensable to the future of mankind. We were concerned, above all, by the fact that many countries of the world, including our own, would be obliged to accept the U.S. imperialist Government's monopoly on those weapons, which could be used at any moment against any people, particularly in view of the fact that the proposed treaty was also accompanied by an astonishing declaration concerning the defense of the signatory nations that might be threatened with nuclear weapons. Such countries as Vietnam, countries such as Cuba, that did not choose to accept that type of treaty, and much less sign it in a situation in which the aggression against Vietnam is being constantly intensified, are left outside the realm of any protection, and thus fall into the category in which the imperialists would theoretically have the right to attack us with nuclear arms. And, of course, everyone knows our position."

The final reference here, no doubt, is to the famous 1962 Caribbean crisis in which the Cubans accepted the placement of defensive nuclear weapons in order to deter Washington from attempting another Bay of Pigs invasion. Khrushchev's withdrawal of the weapons without consultation was bitterly resented by the Cuban government.

Since the Non-Proliferation Treaty was directed primarily against China, Castro's remarks on this point were undoubtedly read with interest in Peking. In fact, the following paragraph in Castro's speech coincides quite closely with Peking's position:

"In view of the facts, in the face of an imperialism that is always plotting, always conspiring against the socialist camp, we ask ourselves whether or not the idyllic hopes of an improvement in relations with the imperialist Government of the United States will continue to be maintained. We ask ourselves if, consistent with events in Czechoslovakia, a position may be adopted that will imply a renunciation of such idyllic hopes in relation to Yankee imperialism. And the dispatch states that an improvement in relations will be compromised and that there is the danger of nonratification of the treaty. In our opinion, that would be the best thing that could happen."

This is a stinging slap at Moscow's policy of trying to placate U.S. imperialism at the expense of the overall interests of the "socialist camp." However, it should not be concluded from this that Castro is preparing to join the cult of Mao. He is voicing independent, revolutionary opposi-

tion to the joint efforts of Moscow and Washington to maintain the status quo.

What About Help for Vietnam?

Castro scores even more directly and tellingly on the question of supporting the Vietnamese revolution against the U.S. aggression:

"The TASS statement explaining the decision of the Warsaw Pact governments states in its concluding paragraph: 'The fraternal countries firmly and resolutely offer their unbreakable solidarity against any outside threat. They will never permit anyone to tear away even one link of the community of socialist States.' And we ask ourselves: 'Does that declaration include Vietnam? Does that statement include Korea? Does that statement include Cuba? Do they or do they not consider Vietnam, Korea and Cuba links of the socialist camp to be safeguarded against the imperialists?'

"In accordance with that declaration, Warsaw Pact divisions were sent into Czechoslovakia. And we ask ourselves: 'Will Warsaw Pact divisions also be sent to Vietnam if the Yankee imperialists step up their aggression against that country and the people of Vietnam request that aid?! Will they send the divisions of the Warsaw Pact to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea if the Yankee imperialists attack that country? Will they send the divisions of the Warsaw Pact to Cuba if the Yankee imperialists attack our country, or even in the case of the threat of a Yankee imperialist attack on our country, if our country requests it?'"

When Johnson first escalated the war in Vietnam, Castro, it will be recalled, appealed at once for a massive response to the imperialist aggression. His appeal was not heeded by either Moscow or Peking.

The Cubans themselves redoubled their efforts to help Vietnam by opening up new revolutionary fronts in Latin America. This was one of Che Guevara's declared aims in starting a guerrilla struggle in Bolivia. Through the right-wing Communist party leaders under its control, the Kremlin blocked these attempts.

But in Czechoslovakia, seeming to become alert all at once to a counterrevolutionary danger, the Kremlin, with extraordinary haste, mobilized and sent into immediate action 600,000 or more troops.

"We acknowledge the bitter necessity that called for the sending of those forces into Czechoslovakia; we do not condemn the socialist countries that made that decision," Castro declares. "But we, as revolutionaries, and proceeding from positions of principle, do have the right

to demand that they adopt a consistent position with regard to all the other questions that affect the world revolutionary movement."

Castro sounds almost ironic. The irony, however, is probably unintentional. He is convinced that basically the Kremlin is motivated by revolutionary aims. He hopes that it will respond to the power of reason and undertake to reform itself.

However, this hope is not realistic. It is a mistake to think that the basic flaw in the Kremlin's policies is inconsistency. Something more difficult to rectify sets the Kremlin's course. This something is the material interests of the Soviet bureaucracy as a parasitic caste. The needs of the bureaucracy do not happen to be the same as the needs of the world revolution. In fact, most often they are antagonistic to those needs.

National Sovereignty and World Revolution

That Castro seeks to subordinate all other political considerations to the needs of the world revolution is shown by the fashion in which he weighs the relative importance of Czechoslovakia's national sovereignty.

For Cubans, the question is especially important, he says. They have had to face the problem of intervention throughout their history. Thus "it is logical that many would react emotionally in the face of the fact that armies from outside the nation's borders had to come in to prevent a catastrophe." Castro is referring here to the widespread sympathy in Cuba for the Czechoslovaks.

"And since, logically, for various reasons," he continues, "our conscience [consciousness] has been shaped by the concept of repudiating such deeds, only the development of the political awareness of our people will make it possible for them to determine when such an action becomes necessary and when it is necessary to accept it even in spite of the fact that it violates rights such as the right of sovereignty which -- in this case, in our opinion -- must give way before the most important interests of the world revolutionary movement and the struggle of the peoples against the imperialists, which, as we see it, is the basic question. And, undoubtedly, the breaking away of Czechoslovakia and its falling into the arms of imperialism would have been a rude blow, an even harder blow to the interests of the worldwide revolutionary movement."

He concludes this point with the general assertion: "We must learn to analyze these truths and to determine when one interest must give way before other interests in order not to fall into romantic or

idealistic positions that are out of touch with reality."

This is the source of Castro's consistency -- he subordinates all other interests to the interest of the world revolution. Paradoxically this also happens to point directly to the weakest point in Castro's position. Where does the question of socialist democracy stand in relation to the interests of the world revolution?

Does Socialism Reject Democracy in General?

Castro deals hardly at all with democracy in his speech. As for socialist democracy, the blunt fact is that he does not even mention it.

If anything, he indicates a bias against democracy. Thus he states that in Czechoslovakia a "real liberal fury was unleashed; a whole series of political slogans in favor of the formation of opposition parties began to develop, in favor of openly anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist theses..." He states again: "A series of slogans began to be put forward, and in fact certain measures were taken, such as the establishment of a bourgeois form of 'freedom' of the press. This means that the counterrevolution and the exploiters, the very enemies of socialism, were granted the right to speak and write freely against socialism."

What was really developing in Czechoslovakia, all the weight of the evidence shows, was a powerful proletarian current demanding the right to speak out against a stifling bureaucratic regime, the right to form independent communist political groupings as in Lenin's time, and the right to institute socialist democracy in Czechoslovakia. This is not the same as a "bourgeois form" of democracy.

One wonders if it was not on this question that Castro was led into misjudging what was happening in Czechoslovakia. In the opening of his speech, he says:

"A process of what was termed democratization began. The imperialist press invented another word, the word 'liberalization,' and began to differentiate between progressives and conservatives -- calling progressive those who supported a whole series of political reforms, and conservatives the supporters of the former leadership. It was evident -- and we must give our opinion about both: the conservatives and the liberalsIt rather reminds us of the past history of Cuba, that division between conservatives and liberals, a situation which, of course, was not to be expected in the political processes of socialist revolutions."

If we have understood Castro cor-

rectly, he believes that the aim of the democratizers in Czechoslovakia was to introduce dirty machine politics and petty "politicking" such as Cuba knew before the revolution. And, if we are not mistaken, he considers shallow, miserable politics of this type to be the "bourgeois form" of democracy.

Now there is absolutely no doubt about the mean, trivial and fraudulent nature of bourgeois democracy in the political arena in prerevolutionary Cuba, and, for that matter, throughout the rest of the capitalist world today. But the question of "bourgeois forms" of democracy is not exhausted by this fact.

The question is much broader. In reality it involves some of the profoundest theoretical and political problems of the world revolution today and the connection of these problems with the heritage of previous revolutions.

Marxism does not reject the conquests of previous revolutions, such as the winning of democracy by the bourgeois revolution against feudalism. Marxism defends these conquests, seeks to deepen and develop them, to supersede, not do away with them.

Thus the Marxist appreciation of bourgeois democracy is that it represented an enormous gain for humanity, one of the great achievements of the revolutions of the past. The Marxist criticism of bourgeois democracy is that it remained limited; it did not go far enough.

One of the main charges leveled by the revolutionary Marxist movement against the capitalist system today concerns its tendency, as it exhausts all the progressive features of its earlier stages, to narrow down, pinch off and reduce democracy in the political arena as well as elsewhere to an empty shell.

The culmination of this tendency is fascism; that is, a reversion to utter barbarism. As against fascism, revolutionists are duty bound -- independently and with their own methods -- to defend bourgeois democracy with all their strength. Not to do so is suicidal.

Even more than this is involved. Taking bourgeois democracy as a conquest of previous revolutions, the program of Marxism calls for expanding it into proletarian democracy, spreading democracy from its limited area of application under the bourgeoisie in their best days to the entire economic and social system, right down to the factory level. This is the key thought developed by Lenin in State and Revolution, where he also considers the problem of how this is to be accomplished.

As we can see from his speech, Castro is well aware of the significance and

importance of national sovereignty. What is national sovereignty but one of the forms of bourgeois democracy? As soon as we view national sovereignty from this angle, we at once see the limitations of the bourgeoisie of today as either a revolutionary or progressive force. In the underdeveloped regions, the bourgeoisie are no longer capable of achieving it in a genuine sense. They came on the scene too late. In the advanced sectors, the bourgeoisie, having reached the imperialist stage, systematically violate it. The dialectic of history has thus conferred on the proletariat the achievement or defense of national sovereignty. The situation in Vietnam today offers an almost perfect example.

Lenin was the first to grasp the political importance of this and to inscribe the right of self-determination in the program of the Bolsheviks.

The victory of the Bolshevik revolution did not settle the question even for the workers state established under Lenin. The right of self-determination includes the right to secede from a federation like the Soviet Union. For a socialist state to stand outside this federation does not necessarily signify a catastrophe. This is shown in the cases of China, Korea, Vietnam, and...Cuba. In principle, why shouldn't any of the East European countries feel free to stand as independently of the Soviet Union as say Cuba? Why shouldn't this likewise hold for any of the republics of the USSR?

The truth is that exercising this democratic right would greatly strengthen the socialist camp. The experience with Cuba is living proof of this.

However, the question was not posed on this level in Czechoslovakia. There is no evidence that the workers, or the ranks of the Communist party, or the bulk of Novotny's Communist opponents in the government wanted to sever relations with the Soviet Union, or the Warsaw Pact, or even to stand as independently as Cuba. What they wanted, concretely, was socialist democracy inside the country.

We come to the decisive question: Was it not in the interests of the world revolution to establish socialist democracy in Czechoslovakia?

Socialist Democracy and World Revolution

Castro speaks depreciatively of people who are preoccupied over intellectual and artistic freedom and similar issues although he grants that they have a point and that there have been abuses. But such interests are not of great concern to the masses of humanity living under imperialist oppression and neocolonialism.

nialism.

"And for the thousands of millions of human beings who, for all intents and purposes, are living without hope under conditions of starvation and extreme want," he says, "there are questions in which they are more interested than the problem of whether or not to let their hair grow. This might be a very controversial issue, but these are not the things that are worrying people who are faced with the problem of whether or not they will have the possibility or hope of eating."

This is very true. People faced with starvation are not inclined to be concerned about abstract democratic rights. This, however, hardly disposes of the problem. These same people may become highly interested in national independence, in a radical agrarian reform, in social equality, free education and similar issues that belong historically to the bourgeois revolution and its democratic tasks.

It is true, moreover, that in seeking a way out of the abyss of misery and hunger to which they have been sentenced, they have accepted the models provided by the Soviet Union, China, and now Cuba. They know they do not need to follow the slow path of development charted by the highly developed capitalist countries. Instead of centuries, industrialization can be achieved in decades under a planned economy. If this requires foregoing democracy, they are prepared to pay the price, a decision reached all the easier in view of its virtual non-existence anyway in their part of the world.

However, things are altogether different in the imperialist sector -- which is also involved in the world revolution. The imperialist sector, if we may state an elementary truth, is of crucial importance in the development of the world revolution. Great as the victories have been elsewhere up to now, the final, and we may believe the biggest and most bitterly contested battles will be fought there. Consequently, in weighing the interests of the world revolution, it is absolutely essential to take into account the problems faced by the revolutionary Marxists in the heartlands of the capitalist system. The ultimate victory hinges on this.

In the imperialist sector, the issue of democratic rights is of key significance. Having won these rights in immense and often bloody battles in the past, the masses are not inclined to give them up readily. They are inclined instead to defend them. They can easily understand the virtue of deepening and extending them or trying to win them where they have not already been gained. The current student struggles in various imperialist countries and the black freedom struggle in the United States are cases in point.

The problem for revolutionary Marxists in these countries is to find ways and means of converting these struggles into struggles for socialism. This cannot possibly be done if the masses believe that socialism signifies taking away what they have already achieved.

The greatest single obstacle to a socialist victory in Western Europe and the United States for decades has been the treacherous role played by leaderships committed to Stalinism; and, in particular, the totalitarian image conferred on socialism and communism by the practices of Stalin and his heirs.

The purges, the frame-up trials, the forced confessions, the deportations, the labor camps, the liquidation of all political opposition, the suppression of all free thought in politics, the schools, art, and even some of the sciences -- horrors such as these, which became common knowledge in the West despite Stalin's censorship and the dithyrambs of his retainers, dupes and sycophants, made the task of building a revolutionary socialist movement in the advanced capitalist sectors almost insuperable up to recent years.

The reversion of the Soviet Union to a precapitalist level so far as democratic rights were concerned was pictured by the bourgeois spokesmen as synonymous with socialism. And this propaganda -- ably assisted by the cult of Stalin and the dictator's claim to be the incarnation of socialist wisdom -- gained widespread acceptance among the masses.

If there is one thing needed to counteract this lie of socialism and Stalinism being one and the same thing, it is an example of socialist democracy in practice.

Signs in That Direction

The Twentieth Congress of the Communist party of the Soviet Union aroused hopes among some circles that this marked the beginning of a process that would soon lead to the reestablishment of socialist democracy in the Soviet Union itself. The hope proved illusory because the bureaucratic caste which Stalin represented still remained in power. The "de-Stalinization" consisted of concessions designed to relieve social tensions the better to maintain the rule of the parasitic bureaucracy. The bureaucrats have not hesitated to tighten the screws again when they deemed this advisable.

The proletarian upsurge in Poland in 1956 gave hopes of the appearance of socialist democracy there. The upsurge

was contained and its energy drained away and the hopes died.

The proletarian uprising in Hungary in 1956 was even more promising. It was crushed with tanks.

One of the reasons for the great response to the Cuban revolution, particularly among the youth in the United States, was precisely the impression that it favored the development of socialist democracy. The way Havana became a crossroads for all kinds of revolutionary tendencies, the free reign given to artists, the welcome extended to intellectuals of many hues, the rebuff given the bureaucratic tendency headed by Escalante -- all this gave an immensely favorable impression not only of revolutionary Cuba but of socialism in general.

It must be said, however, that the development of this tendency in the political and governmental arena has not flowered and this has prevented Cuba from serving as a model of socialist democracy.

Could Czechoslovakia have moved into this position? There is every reason to believe that this would have been possible if the Kremlin had kept its hands off. That, of course, was precisely why the Kremlin ordered the invasion. The example of a working socialist democracy in Czechoslovakia would have been altogether too contagious for the workers of the East European countries and the Soviet Union. The fate of the bureaucratic ruling caste was at stake.

But from the viewpoint of the interests of the world revolution, the establishment of socialist democracy in Czechoslovakia would most likely have marked a point of qualitative change for the advance of the socialist revolution in the imperialist sectors.

That is why, so far as the world revolution is concerned, the invasion of Czechoslovakia was one of the worst crimes ever committed by the Stalinist bureaucracy.

It is to be regretted that Castro does not see this. Perhaps he will come to this view as more facts accumulate and it becomes increasingly difficult for the Kremlin to cover up the real reasons for the invasion and occupation.

At the same time, Fidel Castro's criticisms of the policies of the Kremlin deserve the closest attention. Every revolutionist will surely do everything possible to help circulate them where they will do the most good.

STAND OF THE AUSTRIAN COMMUNIST PARTY ON CZECHOSLOVAKIA

[The following article was published in the September issue of the theoretical magazine of the Austrian Communist party, Weg und Ziel. Entitled "Reasons for Greetings," it was originally written as a message to the special Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist party scheduled to open on September 9. Although this congress, which was to consolidate the democratization in Czechoslovakia, was prevented from being held by the Soviet invasion on August 20-21, the editors of Weg und Ziel decided to publish this message anyway as a comment on the hopes that had been theirs in the democratic development of a Communist party with close traditional links to the Austrian workers movement. They explain their reasons in their introduction to the article.]

* * *

Weg und Ziel was scheduled to go to press on August 21. The lead article, written ten days before that, has been outdated by the events. We are publishing it anyway, because our opinion, as expressed in it, has not changed. The military intervention of the five Warsaw Pact states under the pretext of "bringing aid" against a purported "counterrevolutionary danger" was in reality aimed against the democratic renewal of socialism in Czechoslovakia in which we had placed such great hopes. Naturally, we cannot foresee how things will have developed by the time this issue reaches our readers' hands. In any case, the demand made by the Political Bureau of the KPO [Kommunistische Partei Oesterreichs -- Communist party of Austria] in its declaration of August 21 remains valid: that "everything be done to facilitate a political solution under no military pressure and based on the full sovereignty of the CSSR [Czechoslovak Socialist Republic] and freedom of decision for the CPC [Communist party of Czechoslovakia] in order to assure the continued development of socialist democracy.

* * *

We greet the congress of the Czechoslovak Communists.

Since the January plenum of their Central Committee, which introduced an important turn in the history of our neighbor republic, we have shared in their worries and difficulties and in their hopes and successes. And this was not only because of the traditional bonds between the workers movement in our countries, which have been referred to often in the past. What fascinated us was the policy which miraculously combined a sense of proportion, boldness, and sobriety. What inspired us was the impetus of a democratization whose aims came closest to the

concepts we have of a socialist order in this part of the world.

At the same time we by no means overlooked the fact that the sudden change in the leadership team and the abrupt break with the past necessarily created a kind of vacuum in many areas of public life which could be abused and has been abused. But we had confidence in a leadership that made it clear that these difficulties could not be overcome by bureaucratic methods but only through continuing democratization, and which wrote these words in the context of a difficult polemic:

"The Communist party depends on the willing support of the people. It fulfills its leading role not by ruling over society but by promoting free, progressive, socialist development. It cannot achieve its authority through force but must continually win this authority by its deeds. It cannot impose its line by giving orders but only through the work of its members and the credibility of their ideals."

Your difficulties did not disturb us. Revolutionists feel disturbed only when they see no way out of the difficulties, no opening for positive development. We were disturbed before, when we had to argue with our countrymen about why, despite the fact that it started out on a level more or less the same as Austria's, the living standard in the CSSR lagged so far behind.

We were disturbed before in the face of the hesitant, inadequate, and furtive way in which the rehabilitation of innocent victims of arbitrary measures was carried out. We were disturbed before when we saw one of the most valuable resources of the Czechoslovak workers movement -- the commitment of the best intellectuals to socialism -- carelessly and frivolously squandered.

Now we are confident. Now we have a living example of the model that we have advocated for some years. In the developed capitalist countries, socialism can only win the masses if it promises to add new gains and freedoms to the existing ones, involving the people as much as possible in administration and economic management through overcoming the profit economy. We cannot get by with easy assumptions that socialism automatically means maximum democracy. It is indisputable that states where the means of production have been socialized can also be the scene of dreadful arbitrary acts.

Let us take an example -- freedom of the press. This is the pride of bourgeois democracy. But it is often forgot-

ten that formal freedom to say anything does not mean you have anything to say and that financially powerful groups can misuse freedom of the press since the advertising business assures them a privileged position.

There are no formal limits on freedom of the press in the CSSR either. But there is no chance for a press lord, a soap company, a mill owner, or an Axel Springer to monopolize this freedom, to pervert it. Therefore, we would venture to say that the CSSR is the country where freedom of the press is most extensive.

Are we getting lyrical? Are we ex-

aggerating? And is it by chance that the West European Communist parties have considered it so important to declare their solidarity with the democratization process in the CSSR? Was it in a light moment that the organ of the ruling party in Austria, the Volksblatt, wrote July 24:

"If Prague wins, this democratized Communism -- it cannot be stressed too often -- will become the greatest danger yet to the established order in the so-called free countries whose social contradictions urgently demand a solution."

We greet the congress of the Czechoslovak Communists.

JAPAN COMMUNIST PARTY REAFFIRMS CRITICISM OF CZECH INVASION

The Japan Communist party's sharp criticism of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia drew a charge in the October 25 Pravda that it was conducting an "anti-Soviet campaign." The JCP issued a statement the following day accusing Pravda of big-nation chauvinism, reiterating its stand that the invasion was a betrayal of the trust of the peoples of the world, and

saying, "Socialist countries do not invade."

The Japan Communist party statement compared the Soviet attitude with that of the Chinese leadership who call the JCP leaders "counterrevolutionaries" because they refused to follow the "erroneous line" of Mao Tse-tung.

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
DRAWING: Major General Pyotr G. Grigorenko	1,033
FNL and Alliance Hold Joint Meeting "Somewhere in South Vietnam"	1,036
Hanoi Appeals to People of Saigon to Demand New Government	1,036
Witch-Hunt Continues in Indonesia	1,036
Czech Students Occupy Schools	1,037
Ernest Mandel Reports Impressions of the United States	1,038
Mohammed Harbi, Five Others, Released by Boumedienne	1,040
New Organization Seeks to Reach U.S. Servicemen with Antiwar Views	1,041
Mobutu Sends Troops Against Followers of Pierre Mulele	1,042
Sato Government "Shocked" by Socialist Victory in Okinawa	1,043
West Berlin Students Support Lawyer with Demonstration	1,044
Student Revolt Flares in Pakistan	1,044
12,000,000 Workers Stage General Strike in Italy	1,045
Grigorenko Speaks Out for Socialist Democracy in Soviet Union	1,046
Guerrilla Skirmishes in Venezuela	1,047
Students in Puebla Battle Police	1,047
Mexico City Daily Assails U.S. Committee for Aid to Political Prisoners	
-- by Ricardo Ochoa	1,048
Serious Problems for South Korean Agriculture	1,050
Fidel Castro and the Events in Czechoslovakia -- by Joseph Hansen	1,051
Documents:	
The Stand of the National Liberation Front on the Bombing "Halt"	1,034
Stand of the Austrian Communist Party on Czechoslovakia	1,063
Japan Communist Party Reaffirms Criticism of Czech Invasion	1,064

INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS

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

New York, N. Y. 10010



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

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