

WORLD OUTLOOK

a labor press service

Pentagon - CIA Hand in Guevara's Capture

Vol. 6, No. 16

April 26, 1968



STUDENTS at Columbia University in New York stage a campus rally April 17 to demonstrate sympathy with Rudi Dutschke and the German antiwar movement. Elsewhere in the city vio-

lence flared when police interfered with pickets at an office of the Springer press in Rockefeller Plaza. Students conducted similar actions in many countries. See article on page 369.

Is U.S. Headed for Another Civil War?

The Debate Over Daley's Order to "Shoot to Kill"

50c

ANOTHER CIVIL WAR IN THE U.S.?

The feature article in the March issue of Esquire magazine is titled, "The Second Civil War." Its thesis is very simple: another "long, hot summer" is expected in the black ghettos of the United States and plans are well advanced to put down the blacks who engage in "riots."

The lengthy piece is written in sensational style for the readers of the slick, mass-circulation magazine, but it has been carefully documented by the author, Garry Wills, and should be read by all partisans of and participants in the black liberation struggle who want to know the real prevailing attitude of the powers that be toward the poor people in the U.S. and their problems.

The article was written before the assassination of Martin Luther King and the wave of rebellions which his tragic death touched off. The massive deployment of military force against those demonstrations simply underlined and confirmed some of the conclusions Wills drew on the basis of his evidence.

"If you live in any major city in America," he writes, "your home is mapped for defense from its own citizenry. There are elaborate arrangements being formed, codified, revised....All seventeen police divisions in New York City have separate plans, which outline such procedures as how to 'freeze' an area (stop the subways from entering it, etc.)....Staging areas, food sources, command centers are laid out, guarded, stocked with food. On the basis of this general planning, specific orders of the day are elaborated for expected trouble."

One example Wills gives is significant: "Police instructions for the Century Plaza demonstration in Los Angeles last summer ran to sixty-eight pages." That was the massive police attack on an antiwar demonstration of 20,000 during a visit by Lyndon Johnson.

These secret military plans, which are "jealously guarded," resemble operations in Vietnam. The National Guard, "following military procedure, uses classified code names for its programs. If you live in New York, the plan is Skyhawk, in Detroit, Sundown. In the District of Columbia, Goblet Glass....In Baltimore, it is Oscar."

The men in charge are conscious of the revolutionary potential they are determined to repress. Maryland's National Guard commander, Adjutant General Gelston, "a gracious Southerner," told Wills: "Riots like that in Detroit are not conventional police actions. This is guerilla warfare; these people have been

learning the lesson of Vietnam....The tactics against this kind of rioting are more like city-clearing operations than the old-style 'crowd control' -- except that when clearing an enemy city you don't worry much about who gets killed on the other side."

General Gelston, who had a chance to "clear" his own city of Baltimore shortly after this interview, declared himself opposed to "unnecessary" use of guns and clubs. "You won't find a greater proponent of gas than I am," he said.

His motivation -- which is common among ruling-class strategists of the war against blacks -- did not involve any considerations of humanity or the just demands of black people. He cited an incident in Cambridge where his men used nausea-tear gas instead of bullets: "And there were no dead people to embarrass us; none had any holes in them; no kid two blocks away got hit with a stray bullet."

In the name of so-called riot prevention, police are going into the spy business wholesale. Gelston told Esquire's man that "Operation Oscar" is constantly brought up to date. "Every week," he said, "we have a meeting of intelligence personnel from the Guard, city and county police, the state troopers, the Baltimore fire department and utilities companies to coordinate our plan and stay on top of what is happening."

Wills claims that police agree that once an outburst reaches a certain stage they can no longer stop it, but they "know of a hundred riots squelched for every one that gets out of hand and into the papers."

"So every day intelligence reports cross police chiefs' desks charting the movement of all militant leaders, pointing to suspect meetings....The reliance on informers, the placing of undercover men, the meshing of intelligence networks -- this task holds first priority in all cities where trouble is expected. 'We want to riddle the black movement with agents the way the American Communist Party is infiltrated with FBI men,' one department told me."

The Esquire article exposes the role of police "community relations" efforts in this process:

"When old-line departments were hesitant about adding Community Relations departments to the police force, on the grounds that policemen should not be social workers, an argument that brought some of them around was the ob-

ervation that these agencies are good for intelligence probes....forces like those in Los Angeles and New York -- and even in Chicago -- have planted undercover agents among black nationalists, paid them through cover channels like the welfare office, given them one 'contact' only, and kept the secret of their police ties even from their own families."

The treatment of America's black communities as occupied "enemy" territory is not the apocalyptic vision of the future. Wills describes some scenes during the ghetto rebellion in Detroit last summer that were not reported in the newspapers:

"Armored personnel carriers, two-ton trucks, jeeps with gun mounts, five Commando armored cars, built for Vietnam, loaned to the city police, cruised through crowds....Skeptics point out that so few died -- forty-three by the official count. But I did not talk to a single participant in the shooting who believes that figure. 'We got the forty-fourth,' one Guardsman told me. 'We had been harassed by a sniper in a building for two nights, and were under orders not to go into the building after him....The first night we sprayed the building with machine-gun fire, but he was still up there firing at us. So, on the second night, the building "accidentally" caught fire....' Needless to say, the death went unreported.

"The fact that deaths were not reported can be proved, even from the official statistics. One of the known victims was shot by police who drew up no report of the incident. Two other men shot by police were left to lie in a store -- other policemen found the bodies and arranged for their removal. Another was shot by a store owner, who left the scene and made no report....After the first deaths, few Guardsmen cared to report incidents. '....We just shot and forgot. When we killed a sniper or a looter, he either died in a burning building or we threw him into one. I saw at least six unreported deaths, and I was only on duty half the time in one little area.'

"A police observer told me he had heard informed estimates that ran as high as two or three hundred deaths, that the toll was certainly over a hundred. Many of those who disappeared would be unemployed, unregistered, not on welfare rolls."

The National Guard and police were not the only ones to take part in the killing:

"Establishments around the battle perimeter looked for anyone who was willing to carry a gun and protect the premises....I talked to one private guard who

shot a Negro in the stomach for refusing to raise his arms when he approached a hotel."

Last fall, after the military attack on Detroit's black community, the city's police chief Girardin asked Detroit's Common Council for nine million dollars' worth of "antiriot" equipment. This was to include armored vests, machine guns, and battle cars.

The police departments of the country, in addition to the secret operational schemes worked out with the army and National Guard, have established a general approach to outbursts in the black communities. "The police have an implicit orthodoxy on the basic response to riots. I met no police officials who doubted its two fundamental tenets. First, that the way to handle an incendiary situation is to blanket it, instantly, with blue; just pour the men in....The second tenet is that, once the violence starts, there should be no negotiating with ghetto leaders." In other words, black people and their leaders are to be regarded as enemies to be defeated militarily.

Police departments are setting up special units whose main or only job will be to suppress "riots." In Philadelphia, police commissioner Rizzo has "a hundred twenty-five trained sharpshooters" whose job is to "go hunting" during rebellions in the black community.

According to Wills, they are "now working on anti-sniper tactics, learning to shoot from helicopters; finding out which men can shoot from heights, from ladders; testing heavier guns and body armor."

Rizzo told Wills, "We have to use force just as the Army does. It's war.... We're becoming familiar with guerrilla tactics, and we have the weapons to fight a war. I consider myself an expert in city warfare, and I don't know of any problem we can't handle. We may have a riot here, but it will be the shortest riot in history."

Police departments across the country are building up their arsenals for future battles in their war on black people. One of the most popular items is chemical Mace, a tear-gas spray put out by Smith and Wesson, a division of Bangor Punta Corporation. More than 3,000 police departments already stock Mace. The spray breaks down "the oily protective coating of the skin to let the tear gas work directly on the nerve ends all over the face. This makes it feel as if one's face is on fire....a man hit with the mixture closes his eyes, puts his hands to his face, and suffers a group of psychological side effects -- disorientation, gasping, immobilization."

A wide variety of novel weapons are on order by police along with more standard war materiel:

"The old Roman shield has come back into use, to stop thrown bottles and bricks. Sound and light are being tested -- certain sound waves make men loose their bowels; other 'curdling' sounds drive men from their vicinity. Light dazzles. One man has even invented a 'non-lethal' flamethrower.

"The buying of war equipment is standard procedure now, limited only by the pinch of the city budget. Orders are being taken and filled for four armored cars; at least four others are in the development stage....One of the two vehicles already tested in riots was designed for the war in Vietnam....They are being surrealistically outfitted with all kinds of accessories -- fire-fighting equipment, gas dispensers, foam to wash Molotov cocktails off them, electric grids to repel those who try to tip them over...."

The Cadillac Gage Company, which also produces the Commando police "tank," has developed a gas-operated rifle called the Stoner 63A. This gun "spews a high-velocity bullet, barely stabilized, that tears into things with a tumbling action,

almost like a dum-dum bullet (the kind outlawed by the second Hague Conference). I fired the gun in Warren, Michigan, and was shown an inert block of clay into which one bullet had been sent. I could stick my fist in the hole. Imagine what such a bullet will do to a man's head (lift it off), or to his chest (clean it out).

"The government is still trying to decide whether the Stoner gun should be adopted in Vietnam. The Detroit police have decided. They want to carry a hundred of these out on the street next time there is a riot."

From the facts provided by Wills, it is clear that a sector of America's ruling class believes that a "new civil war" against the black people in the United States is on the agenda. The concrete steps they have already taken show that they are preparing to use violence -- violence on a scale not seen in America since the Civil War.

Whether they succeed any better than their predecessors, the Southern slaveholders, in maintaining their rule by such means is a question that will be settled by the American people -- both black and white.

THE DEBATE OVER DALEY'S ORDER TO "SHOOT TO KILL"

By Joseph Hansen

A curious point of difference is being debated in America's ruling circles. The topic is: "How can a rebellion in the ghettos be put down most effectively -- through use of the 'hard cop' or the 'soft cop' technique?"

The argument was precipitated by Mayor Richard J. Daley of Chicago, a national figure in the Democratic machine who will be host at the national convention of the Democratic party opening in Chicago August 28, when he announced April 15 that he had issued orders to his police department to "shoot to kill" when they spot "arsonists."

The mayor told a press conference that he had ordered his cops to "shoot to maim or cripple" in the case of "looters."

When asked by a reporter what he had ordered his men to do about young looters, some of them only children, the mayor said, "You wouldn't want to shoot them." In this instance, the mayor suggested that it would be best to gas them with the new chemical Mace.

Thus in a "riot" situation in the second biggest city in the United States,

a Chicago cop, looking down the barrel of his gun, is under orders to decide whether an individual is guilty or not guilty of being an "arsonist" or a "looter"; and, having weighed the evidence and reached a due decision, to pass sentence and execute that sentence on the spot.

If his decision is "arsonist," he will aim at the victim's head or heart or other vital organ.

If his decision is "looter," he will aim at a part of the victim's body where a bullet will only maim or cripple, without killing.

The cop is under orders to temper Daley's justice only if the victim appears to be under 21, in which case he will put down his rifle or pistol and pick up a tear-gas gun loaded with Mace.

As they say in the Chicago Democratic machine, "Justice grows out of the barrel of a gun."

In contrast to Daley's "hard cop" technique of protecting capitalist property rights, as against human rights, down to a pair of shoes or a pack of Coca Cola,



MAYOR RICHARD J. ("SHOOT TO KILL") DALEY

Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York prefers the "soft cop" approach.

On April 16, Lindsay answered Daley at a press conference of his own. "We happen to think that protection of life, particularly innocent life," he said, "is more important than protecting property or anything else....We are not going to turn disorder into chaos through the unprincipled use of armed force. In short, we are not going to shoot children in New York City."

These carefully chosen words sound very fine. In fact they stand in consider-

able contrast to the record of violence compiled by New York's trigger-happy force in keeping ghetto dwellers "in their place." But then the mayor is one of the leading "noncandidates" for the presidential nomination in the Republican party and he has paid unusual attention to constructing the liberal image of a "man of the people."

As between Daley's "hard cop" position and Lindsay's "soft cop" stance, various nuances can be found and there has been some shifting of views.

Thus the powerful New York Times declared editorially April 7 during the upheaval that followed the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., "There can be no hesitation, no timidity in protecting endangered cities. Burners and looters must be repressed by a massive show of police force and arrests." Ten days later, the same paper shifted. "How hard it will be," said the editors, "to walk the razor's edge between too much force and too little in the police response to urban riots has been underscored by the 'shoot to kill' orders against arsonists just issued by Mayor Daley of Chicago." They declared that the Times shared "Mayor Lindsay's conviction that adoption of the Daley prescription here or anywhere else would 'turn disorder into chaos.'"

In face of the nationwide outcry over his infamous orders, Mayor Daley himself said April 17 that he was "clarifying" what he had said. He had been "completely misunderstood," he complained. The order to his cops to shoot to kill applied, he specified emphatically, only to "obvious" arsonists.

There is more to the dispute, of course, than an exercise in semantics.

The ghetto explosions that swept the United States in protest over the assassination of Martin Luther King were so massive that the country's top ruling circles were afraid of losing control. Until the "dust settled," they felt that the wisest course was not to provoke the black communities any further.

Thus in many cities, the populace witnessed the extraordinary phenomenon -- extraordinary for the United States -- of cops ignoring people walking out of stores with samples of American affluence.

"This was a change of strategy from the sometimes trigger-happy responses that turned Detroit, Newark and other communities into battlegrounds last summer," explained Fred P. Graham, Washington correspondent of the New York Times, in an April 12 dispatch from America's capital.

He added that "probably the main reason for the decision by the police not

to use their guns to halt looting was that it might not have done any good and might have made things much worse."

In Trenton, the New Jersey National Guard was similarly restrained in contrast to the tactics the guardsmen were ordered to follow in Newark last summer. Maj. Gen. James F. Cantwell, the chief of staff of the New Jersey Department of Defense, told the press April 11: "One of the bitter lessons learned from Newark was that we can't treat our own citizens in the same military way you would operate against the Vietcong."

What "learned" the cops to decide on a tactic of restraint -- so against their entire past tradition and practice?

In a report from Washington in the April 14 New York Times, Ben A. Franklin indicated a strong reason in quoting an unidentified lawyer in the Justice Department on the policy change:

"We say that this is a matter of effectiveness as well as saving lives. There really is no alternative, and the people who are saying, 'Why didn't you shoot?' don't understand that yet."

"He added, 'the other side has guns.'

"Most officials were reluctant to discuss the implication that the police restraint was dictated in part by a new tactical capability of some rioters to shoot back.

"But one Defense Department official was frank about it.

"I would say," he said, "that it has taken a long time for some of us to recognize what the Black Power demonstrator means with his placard, 'I Am a Man.'"

"If you want to say that it took a lot of these people arming themselves to emphasize that they are human beings and cannot just be shot down even when they are terribly wrong, then you would be somewhere near the mark."

Another "informed official" in Washington told the Times reporter:

"That old stuff about 'looters will be shot on sight' is for the history books and maybe the movies. It's for people who don't know how it is to be in a riot where, if you shoot, they shoot back and you've got a lot of dead cops and troops along with the dead citizens.

"We have drawn back from all that the law allows because it is our duty to stop riots, not to kill rioters."

It is thus quite clear that such

"restraint" as the police, national guard, and federal troops exercised in the days following the murder of Martin Luther King was dictated by purely tactical considerations. The forces of repression in the U.S. have more respect for the blacks since they began arming themselves.

But something else is happening in the United States that can only be judged as ominous. Layers of the petty bourgeoisie, particularly the small businessmen most directly affected by losses in the uprisings, are becoming frantic and even hysterical. As Fred P. Graham put it in the dispatch cited above, "Perhaps no aspect of the recent wave of riots has done as much to enrage and confuse the public as the picture of looters staggering under loads of booty past policemen.

"These scenes [on TV] have brought complaints from Congressmen, merchants, housewives, editorial writers and others that the big-city police forces have gone soft on criminals and Negroes."

The merchants in particular are screaming. They are also organizing. Two aims are uppermost at the moment in their efforts. They want the government to compensate them for their losses and to provide insurance against future losses. They want the police departments to "crack down" on the blacks and put them "back in their place."

Mayor Daley and types like him are responsive to this clamor, voice it, and seek to whip it up.

Other forces, too, have been given fresh vigor by the rising tension. A sector of big business stands to reap enticing new profits from it. The "law-enforcement market" is now around \$2.5 billion a year and about 66 percent of the police forces in the United States are below the strength already authorized. The stocks of companies engaged in this field are running strong in Wall Street. The "crime protection" outfits, who furnish armed private guards, are also doing a boom business.

"Revenues of protection service companies alone," Leonard Sloane points out in the April 15 New York Times, "are said to be \$1.2 billion a year..." The prospects point to even "better business" in the coming summer.

Many companies, shouting about the need to stiffen up the forces of "law and order" are hiring mercenary thugs to staff private forces of their own.

These developments must be weighed by the black liberation movement -- and by the labor movement, too. The "soft cop -- hard cop" game is directed against both.

DEMETRIO VALLEJO ENDS HUNGER STRIKE

Mexico City

Demetrio Vallejo ended his hunger strike April 10, twelve days after he began it as a protest against the refusal of the Mexican authorities to respond to his application for "confinamiento" after serving nine years of a fourteen-year prison sentence. The leader of the railway workers was sentenced on charges of violating Article 133 of the Federal Penal Code, a vague law barring activities involving "social dissolution" [disolución social]. The courts interpreted Vallejo's leadership of a strike in 1959 as infringement of this law.

But under Mexican law, a prisoner is also entitled to being released from jail and "confined" to a specified town after serving a certain part of his sentence. Vallejo's hunger strike was intended to secure this right in his case.

There was no news from the prison of Santa Marta Acatitla as to Vallejo's physical condition after his long strike. His health in general was poor after the many years of imprisonment. It was not even known under what conditions Vallejo brought his fast to an end.

The press claimed that his family persuaded him. There were also ugly rumors of physical measures instituted by the prison authorities. Another rumor, evidently circulated by government officials, was that his appeal for "confinamiento" would be granted "but not under pressure."

Vallejo's case has been attracting more and more national attention. In the April 17 issue of Siempre, the most widely read political magazine in the country, the well-known critic and literary figure, Carlos Monsivais, devotes a full page to the case and to the plight of Mexico's mounting number of political prisoners. He holds that public indifference to this question is evidence of moral decay in Mexican society and the growth of political indifference.

Monsivais pays tribute to those in Mexico (students and other political prisoners) who have expressed solidarity with Vallejo by going on hunger strikes of longer or shorter duration. He maintains, however, that these can only be isolated actions. What is required is a rebirth of the nation. This should begin with condemnation of political repression and in particular the condemnation of the "criminal application of the law of social dissolution."

Demetrio Vallejo's protest action has not yet had time to attract wide at-



DEMETRIO VALLEJO

tion outside of Mexico. Nevertheless, the first indications of a response abroad are encouraging. In the United States, the U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin-American Political Prisoners has appealed for demonstrations of solidarity, particularly the sending of messages to Lic. Gustavo Díaz Ordaz, the president of Mexico [National Palace, Mexico City 1, D.F., Mexico].

Dave Dellinger, who is cochairman of the committee, sent a letter, asking the president "in the name of humane treatment" to "order an immediate answer to Vallejo's petition...Vallejo's crime was to have led workers in a strike and surely nine years of his life behind bars is sufficient punishment."

NEW ADMISSIONS ON PENTAGON-CIA INVOLVEMENT IN CAPTURE OF CHE GUEVARA

Writing from La Paz in an "exclusive" which was published in the April 11 Los Angeles Times from the Manchester Guardian, Richard Gott reveals new facts about the direct role played by the Pentagon and the CIA in suppressing the guerrilla movement headed by Ernesto Che Guevara in Bolivia.

When Guevara was assassinated last October 9, all the official spokesmen of the U.S. maintained that the American military involvement did not go beyond the "normal military assistance program" begun in 1958. It was categorically denied that any Americans were engaged in field operations.

Richard Gott quotes what an unidentified "U.S. military spokesman" told him recently in La Paz about this official lie. "Our whole point was to play down our role. Of course, if President René Barrientos' office chooses to put out statements saying that it was all done by the Bolivians, that's his affair. But we know what happened, and some of us wouldn't mind some credit for it. We only do what we're asked to, of course, but we do make suggestions."

The "suggestions" began a year ago, in March, after a local newspaper announced that guerrillas were operating in the Santa Cruz area. "Immediately, on March 11, four members of the U.S. military mission in Bolivia, accompanied by a Cuban exile working for the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency and using the name of Fernandez, flew to Santa Cruz to examine the reality of this report on the spot."

"At the same time," continues Gott, "the commander-in-chief of the armed forces, Gen. Alfredo Ovando, was in Washington discussing the guerrilla problem at the Pentagon. It was agreed by both the Bolivians and the Americans that as little publicity as possible should be given to the guerrilla outbreak, for fear of stirring up unrest not only in Bolivia but in the rest of the continent as well."

The guerrillas became the subject of world headlines, however, with the first major clash on March 23. "The army had known for some time that Guevara was with the guerrillas, and this information was confirmed by three deserters who left the guerrillas in the middle of March bringing photographs with them. Subsequently they led the army to the guerrilla encampment."

When Ovando returned from Washington to La Paz, he tried to play the matter down in accordance with the agreement reached with the Pentagon. But Barrientos

was already talking about both the guerrillas and the presence of Che Guevara. "After Ovando's return Barrientos changed his tune and said he thought Guevara was dead."

The Pentagon, however, was already putting its "emergency plans" into effect. "A high-level American team flew down early in April to La Paz to examine Bolivian requirements, and in the middle of the month the head of the military mission, Col. Joseph P. Rice, and Maj. Robert (Pappy) Shelton arrived in Santa Cruz. On April 19 it was announced that antiguerrilla training would begin at La Esperanza, with Maj. Shelton in charge. Appropriately enough, those who hastened to offer their lands for training purposes were those who had most benefited from the U.S. Agency for International Development program in the area."

With 600 raw Bolivian recruits, some 20 members of the U.S. Special Forces, "and an untold number of CIA-sponsored Cuban exiles, Shelton began the task of beating out an antiguerrilla force. They were ready by mid-September, within five months -- an impressive feat of training."

One of the reasons for the impressiveness of the feat, according to Gott, was that the Americans had as material to work with, the "worst army in Latin America." It is the worst, not only as a fighting machine, "but also because it is the most inefficient, corrupt, bureaucratic and nepotistic on the continent."

"Every officer," continues Gott, "has his price, and there appears to be no tradition of keeping prisoners alive in Bolivia. Most of the guerrillas killed by the army were shot after capture rather than in battle."

To make something out of this material required drastic measures. The training camp at La Esperanza was the answer, but this was "in no sense part of the mission's regular scheduled activity as journalists were led to believe last year."

Moreover, the U.S. had at its service counterrevolutionary Cuban exiles. At least two of them, "Eduardo Gonzales and Felix Ramos, employed by the CIA and normally dressed in khaki without military insignia, shuttled between La Esperanza and the shifting front line of the guerrilla zone. 'They proved very useful,' I was told, 'as, of course, they didn't exist.' And since they were Cubans, the United States could deny the presence of Americans in the field with a clear conscience."

"Eduardo Gonzales, though this was not necessarily his real name, reported back on the political aspects of the guerrilla movements. He was responsible for interrogating Régis Debray, the French Marxist who was captured in April after visiting the guerrillas. He also interrogated captured guerrillas who were later shot, including Guevara, and on at least one occasion in September, he flew from Santa Cruz to La Paz to interview members of the guerrilla urban network who had been betrayed. All this information was funneled back to the American base at La Esperanza.

"Felix Ramos operated with the troops out of Vallegrande, the front-line

headquarters of the Bolivian army. He followed in the footsteps of the guerrillas, visiting the places they had been to and reporting back on the military situation."

With Bolivia "quiet again," as Gott puts it, "the Americans are withdrawing as surreptitiously as they came in. Col. Rice is off to Vietnam. Shelton is on his way home, to retirement and 'a career in politics.'"

As for Ramos and Gonzales, they went to La Paz immediately after Guevara was murdered. "They left their hotel a few days later, doubtless for other areas where they can operate 'without existing.'"

BEHIND THE SHOOTING OF RUDI DUTSCHKE

By Gisela Mandel

The growth of the West German radical youth movement led by the SDS [Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund -- German Socialist Student League], which has mounted continuously for almost two years now, reached its highest point on the weekend of February 17-18 when, in response to the call of the Brussels Conference* and the leadership of the SDS, vanguard youth organizations from almost all the countries in Western Europe met in West Berlin to consider the problems of the Third World and to demonstrate for the victory of the NLF.

Both the conference and the demonstration were initially banned by the West Berlin city government. However, the rector of the Technical University refused to let the city authorities intrude in his sphere and ended by offering the Technical University hall to the delegates. Also, at the last minute a court decision forced the Berlin senate to permit the demonstration. It is quite likely that the pressure of the thousands of students who had already arrived brought about this ruling. They would not have let a ban prevent them from demonstrating in West Berlin, one of the Americans' chief strongholds in Europe.

This demonstration of some 20,000 youth and workers came off peacefully despite provocations by agents of the ultraright. However, it threw the West Berlin city government and the reaction-

ary, petty-bourgeois local population -- goaded by the gutter press of Axel Springer -- into an extraordinary hysteria. The leaderships of the political parties in the city were also caught up in this, above all the leaders of the ruling SPD [Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands -- Social Democratic party of Germany]. SPD members who participated in the demonstration were expelled and members of the SDS were declared fair game.

The Berlin senate called a counter-demonstration a week later under the slogan "For Freedom and Democracy!"

American flags dominated in this demonstration, and young people bearing even the slightest resemblance to students, although many were not students, especially not members of the SDS, were beaten up. In two instances virtual lynchings occurred. A photographer with a beard, mistaken for Dutschke -- who has no beard -- was gravely wounded. He just managed to escape into a police car in the nick of time and had to be immediately taken to the hospital.

What could have precipitated such a mood? One of the chief factors, which ultimately led to the attempted assassination of Rudi Dutschke, was the week-long, deliberate red-baiting campaign waged by the Springer press monopoly against the SDS. This campaign was likewise supported by the political parties, especially in West Berlin.

Since the SDS statements and speeches of its leaders made it impossible to cast the blame -- as they would so gladly have done -- simply on East Germany and "the Communists," they referred vaguely to an "international group of ringleaders." However, the blame was shifted more and

* The Brussels Conference of West European revolutionary youth organizations held at the time of a demonstration in solidarity with the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam in Liège, Belgium, on October 15, 1966. [See World Outlook November 4, 1966.]

more onto the most popular student in the SDS, Rudi Dutschke.

Neither the parties, nor the press in particular, paid any attention to what was on the minds of the students and a growing number of workers. They concerned themselves only with the disturbances as such arising from the discontent of the students studying in the big German universities.

Here are some sample headlines from the Springer press in recent weeks: "Put an End to Terror and Rioting!" "Stop the Young Reds' Terror Now!" "How Long Will You [the people] Let Our Young People Be Incited by Red Agitators, Our Laws Be Challenged?" "We Shouldn't Leave All the Dirty Work to the Police and Their Water Cannons."

Mayor Amrehn, the CDU [Christliche Demokratische Union -- Christian Democratic Union] caucus leader, added in the senate: "Put an end to this agitation once and for all!"

These appeals were aimed exclusively at the people. Bildzeitung [Picture Paper], Springer's mass organ with a circulation of 4,500,000 gave a reason for these appeals to the populace: "Are Our Judges Asleep? Are Our Political Leaders Asleep?"

They were by no means asleep. The judges had just released the policeman who on June 2, 1966, deliberately shot and killed a student in a demonstration involving some hundreds of persons against the Iranian Shah's visit to West Berlin.

And the politicians did not neglect to add their voices to the Springer press' hysteria campaign, stressing continually that it was high time to put an end to "radicalism," by which they meant primarily "left radicalism." They, like the press, went so far as to compare the SDS students with Hitler's SS troopers, against whom the people had no choice but to defend themselves.

Finally, the SPD had expressed its opinion already in 1961 when it adopted its so-called "Incompatibility Resolution," declaring that henceforth no SDS member could be a member of the SPD. And the SPD mayor of Berlin, Klaus Schütz, went a step further during the Vietnam conference in February when he called on the people of the city to "Get a good look at these characters, right in the eye."

Among others, "these characters" were Peter Weiss, the famous writer; Sebastian Haffner, well-known journalist; Ernest Mandel, the chief editor of the Belgian weekly La Gauche and widely known

in Europe as a Marxist scholar; a doctor who works for the West German government in South Vietnam; a representative of the American black people; and several professors and assistant professors from various German universities.

Bildzeitung's comment on the Vietnam conference was "Dutschke -- No. 1 Enemy of the People -- Throw the Gang Out!" However, they took the precaution of putting these words in the mouth of a "construction worker," because in the days of the Third Reich the Jews and other "sources of contamination" were called "the No. 1 enemy of the people." The same people use the same expressions.

To make this quite clear, here are some of the remarks made by older bystanders at the February 18 demonstration. "There's that dirty pack of students again; they should study the right way." "All students should be locked up." "They should all be liquidated." "You need a good dictatorship, then you would have to work instead of demonstrating." "Communists and students, it's the same thing!" "They should all be shot!" "The swine should be gassed, that's all!" "They missed you in the gassing!" "Drive the whole pack into the ovens!"

Thus indoctrinated about Rudi Dutschke and the growing left in West Germany and West Berlin, Herr Bachmann, a twice arrested ultrarightist, in whose home a portrait of Hitler was found which he himself had painted and who is an admirer of Napoleon besides, set out for the West Berlin headquarters of the SDS to lie in wait there for Comrade Dutschke. He carried a loaded revolver and an extra magazine of cartridges.

When Dutschke left the SDS headquarters in the afternoon, Bachmann fired at him five times. Afterwards, Bachmann barricaded himself in a cellar and shot it out with the police as they broke in. Both Dutschke and Bachmann were taken to the hospital gravely wounded.

Bachmann, who declared that he had been inspired by Martin Luther King's murder, seemed astonished at the vigor of the police pursuit. He had after all only carried out the wish so close to the hearts of "the people." He had after all only tried to "get rid" of "the No. 1 enemy of the people," since the "judges and political leaders were asleep."

The students struck back. That same evening there were mass demonstrations in front of the press buildings of Axel Springer in Frankfurt and Berlin. Ten thousand students gathered in Berlin and did not let attempts at mediation divert them from breaking the windows of the Springer central building overlook-

ing the Berlin wall and from setting fire to the Springer press trucks. That evening, 1,000 students occupied a theater in Frankfurt during a performance, turning it into chaos.

The next day, demonstrations spread throughout all the large cities of West Germany. The youth marched into churches crowded for Good Friday, sat down at hundreds of busy corners, and blocked traffic for hours in the big West German cities.

The main action, however, was aimed at preventing the delivery of the Springer papers in the various West German cities. The students erected barricades and the police brought in water cannon, horses, and dogs. The upshot of this was innumerable injuries and a total of almost 2,000 arrests. Only in Munich was Axel Springer able to get out a few sacks of his gutter press over the rooftops to be dumped on the market. Springer himself had little to say -- he was naturally in a frenzy -- except that once again, according to him, "the free-

dom of the press is being threatened."

In Essen, one of the big cities of the Ruhr, where there is no university, it was the workers who built barricades in front of the Springer buildings and blocked the delivery of the Springer press. The leadership of IG-Metall [Industrie-Gewerkschaft-Metall -- the Metal Workers Union] had to issue an immediate denial that there was any collaboration of the union in the actions of the youth -- who are now no longer called "a little radical left group" but put under the general rubric of "extraparliamentary forces."

The demonstrations did not die down even on Saturday and Easter Sunday. The Springer press was again besieged. The traditional Easter peace march, in which 400,000 took part, declared itself in solidarity with the demands and aims of the SDS; and in this march, for the first time, workers carried signs with the slogan, "Today the Students -- Tomorrow the Workers."

AMERICAN INDIAN YOUTHS DEMAND STUDENT RIGHTS

The movement for student rights in the United States, which has seen free-speech fights and antiwar struggles by white students and the formation of black student organizations on many campuses, reached out to another section of the population recently. A group of eleven Indian youths walked into the office of the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs in Los Angeles, California, April 8, demanding the adoption of a student bill of rights.

According to the Los Angeles Times, "All agreed it was something of a historic event. Never before in Los Angeles, and only once before in another city, had migrants from reservations broken with traditional Indian silence and voiced their grievances in a body."

The proposed bill of rights voiced strong dissatisfaction with counseling, job placement, housing, subsistence allowances and social-recreational activities provided by the government.

The document was signed by about 100 of the more than 200 Indians between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six enrolled in vocational training schools in the Los Angeles area.

The Indian students have formed an organization called the Indian Student Action Council to coordinate the protest.

The director of the government relocation center put off the militant

youths, claiming that he would have to study their demands before taking a position. He agreed to meet once a month with the Student Action Council, but a number of the Indians reportedly felt little had been accomplished.

The Rev. William Ng, director of the Indian Welcome House and a supporter of the protest told the Times, "Many counselors have a low image of the American Indian and have set very low goals for him. The BIA is geared toward six- and nine-month vocational training courses rather than two- and four-year colleges."

Most young Indians are "encouraged" to take training in manual skills, such as welding and auto repair, rather than more advanced or professional training. The institutionalization of this discrimination was testified to by the director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs himself, who told the Times that his relocation center is "limited by law to offering the type of vocational training it makes available."

The Indian youths also demanded that they be assigned to schools located close together instead of scattered throughout the county, and that they be allowed to follow the same course schedules as those of non-Indian students. Some students have had their school days lengthened to compensate for shortened course schedules.

RUSSELL APPEALS TO GOMULKA TO RELEASE NINA KARSOV

[An unidentified group of Polish intellectuals addressed an "Open Letter" to Bertrand Russell in the latter part of March, appealing to him to intervene with the Polish government in behalf of Nina Karsov, a former victim of the Nazis who is serving a three-year sentence in Poland because of statements critical of the Gomulka regime which she had written in private notes and in her diary.

[In response, Lord Russell cabled Wladyslaw Gomulka, the first secretary of the Polish Communist party, asking for clemency "for this victim of nazism."

[Russell said: "It is evident that Nina Karsov has suffered miserably since early childhood. The demands of mercy and humanity require that she be released from prison immediately."

[The "Open Letter" sent to Bertrand Russell was published in the March 22 issue of the London Guardian. The text is as follows:]

* * *

We are writing to you from Poland, the home of a proud nation, a nation which has developed a greater love for freedom than any other people in the world. A nation which has inscribed the words "for our freedom and yours" on its banners.

And which many times has shed its blood for the freedom of other nations -- which, during the last war, was named "the inspiration of the world"; which suffered the heaviest losses in that war and the greatest number of wrongs, not only, unfortunately, from its enemies, but also from its allies -- not only from those who hated it for having been the first to thwart their criminal schemes, but also from those for whom it had been a model and an example in the struggle for a better future for all humanity.

You are the citizen of a country which has firmly established the principles of civic freedom, a country which can boast of full freedom of thought and expression, in which there is no preventive censorship. It is fitting for us Poles, addressing an Englishman in an open letter, to recall that there was a time when our Fatherland was a model of civic freedom to all the nations of the world.

The legal act guaranteeing personal freedom to every citizen of Poland, known as the privilege granted by King Wladyslaw Jagiello under the title "Neminem Captivabimus Nisi Jure Vietum," preceded the English "Habeas Corpus Act" by

nearly 250 years, and in the days when peace treaties between civilised European States advocated the heinous principle of "Cuius Regio Eius Religio," when in England the fate and professed religion of



WLADYSLAW GOMULKA

representatives of the nation's upper classes depended on whose bed the ruling monarch was conceived in, and when the instrument of religious propaganda was the sword -- when the streets of Paris shuddered under the abominable atrocities of the night of St Bartholomew and when the concept of religious freedom did not exist and seemed unthinkable in Russia, Spain, Italy, or Scandinavia -- in Poland, the ideal of tolerance was in full bloom.

Pawel Wlodkowic cried out to the whole world that no person can forcibly be compelled to profess any religion -- persons adhering to a different faith than the monarch occupied the highest offices in the State -- and the social system, although by no means perfect, guaran-

teed political rights in the sixteenth century to a far greater section of the people than did England in the early nineteenth century, or France towards the end of the eighteenth century. In Europe and in the whole world, Poland was a veritable oasis of freedom.

This love of freedom, which has enabled Poles to survive the long period when their country was deprived of its statehood and partitioned between aggressor Powers, is so strongly rooted among the Polish people that any existing political system must reckon with it. The people will not reconcile themselves to the curtailment of freedom imposed on them; they want Poland to become once again, as in past centuries, one of the most progressive countries in all the world in this respect.

In October, 1956, the eyes of the world were focused on Poland as the country which nourished the hope that the principle of freedom can become reality also in a system based on the economic and political premises which prevail within our frontiers. Since that time many things have unfortunately taken a different course than that desired by the vast majority of Poles. Many deterrents have emerged and in many respects we have more than once regressed on a very broad scale. But, none the less, many of the acquisitions of the "Polish October" have survived to this day, and no one has so far dared question them officially.

Freedom, whatever its nature, is born of free thought. And that is why we are approaching you today in connection with a person who is fighting for freedom of thought and who, for this very reason, has been subjected to retaliatory measures and has been confined to gaol for a year and several months now.

Nina Karsov, a 27-year-old girl whose health became ruined due to her tragic fate at the time of the Nazi occupation in Poland, is now bearing the undeserved consequences of her profound love of freedom.

Her observation of reality and of the ideological ferment among university youth, her disapproval of certain methods of political life, her criticism of important and influential persons -- although all of this was reflected solely in her private notes and her diary which she had been compiling as material for a novel based on personal reminiscences, the dough from which she wished to mould her literary work; a diary which was not to be published until after the lapse of 25 years; all this nevertheless became the reason why she was deprived of freedom and sentenced, by a court of the first instance, to three years' imprisonment.

Although the Polish court based itself on the prosecution's demand for a five-year sentence even three years could lead to tragic and irrevocable consequences in view of the health of this victim of the Nazi occupation.

For Nina Karsov is ill. Thrown out from the window of a moving train as a 3-year-old child -- a train whose destination was the extermination camp -- she was saved from instant death by soldiers of the Polish underground, participants in the resistance movement. A Polish family took the child in and raised it as its own.

Yet she emerged from the terrible experiences under the occupation with severe frost bite, injured and crippled arms, injured and crippled spine, and the Basedow ailment. She emerged from all this with poor health and vulnerability to all kinds of sickness, even though loving care and nursing enabled her to survive to finish high school and graduate from college. Yet the organism of a human being who had literally been torn from the grip of death in early childhood and burdened with lasting injuries calls for incessant care and solicitude.

The confinement to prison and the lack of proper, specialised medical care could become for Nina Karsov a continuation of her wartime tragedy and, even if she should survive physically, could rob her of any prospect of vocational work as well as the normal family life of a woman and mother, reduce her to the state of the cripples that are the bitter heritage of the most cruel of wars and the most cruel of occupations that ever oppressed our Polish land.

Your voice is often heard in the world in the defence of the right to national freedom; in the defence of racial, social, religious, and political equality; in combatting human injustice whatever it may be; and in the defence of the principles of true humanitarianism. It is a voice that the Polish court in its higher instance, which will pass the final decision concerning the fate of Nina Karsov, would undoubtedly also have to take into account.

Let this voice be heard now in the defence of a young woman who has had the temerity to think independently and who wants full freedom of thought for her people. For all the ideals you have fought for in your life can only be achieved if the freedom of man's independent thought is preserved.

A Group of Intellectuals

IN REPLY TO MAURICE DUVERGER

[The following is the full text of a letter which appeared in part in the February 15 issue of the Paris daily Le Monde.]

* * *

Editor:

In his article "Ends and Means," published in the January 14-15 issue of your paper, Maurice Duverger justly condemned the Ginzburg trial; and he correctly pointed out that such a trial could do more harm to the USSR than anything the CIA could do.

But in this article, he more or less explicitly accepted the notion that this trial, like the all too well-known Moscow trials of the thirties, had in mind "the future of an endangered revolution." He considered that "the methods employed today against Ginzburg" were "understandable thirty years ago," because at that time these methods were "necessary to safeguard the conquests of October."

Since I have no other information on the Ginzburg trial than what has appeared in the press, I do not know whether or not the accused were linked to the anti-Soviet organization NTS [Natsional'no-Trudovoi Soyuz -- National Workers Alliance]. The scandalous form of this trial, however, tends very much to support the declarations in the Litvinov-Bogoraz appeal to world public opinion; i.e., that this trial was only a fabrication.

But on what basis does Duverger presume to write that the trials of the thirties were designed to "safeguard the conquests of October"? I never thought that it would be necessary to explain to a law professor the difference between a struggle to overthrow a social order and one to change a government or a form of government.

Those condemned in the trials of the thirties were, unlike the prosecutor, Vishinsky, among the chief leaders of the October revolution. There was no proof that they were agents of Hitler, the Mikado, exponents of capitalist restoration, etc., other than the "confessions"; and today everyone knows what must be thought of them. Since the twentieth party congress, moreover, official Soviet documents have not dared to repeat these infamous accusations.

Trotsky, Zinoviev, Bukharin, Kamenov, Rakovsky, etc., did not endanger the "conquests of October"; they endangered the privileges of the bureaucracy. The Ginzburg trial is accounted for today by this bureaucracy's resistance to anything that might challenge its hold over Soviet society. It attacks the nonconformist writers, who express to one degree or another, Soviet society's aspirations for a "return to Lenin," for the restoration of Soviet democracy.

Soviet society is still suffering from the traumas of the thirties, in particular the Moscow trials. The Litvinov-Bogoraz appeal evokes this today as did Solzhenitsyn's letter to the writers congress not long ago.

You cannot condemn the Ginzburg trial while explaining the trials of the thirties as a historical necessity. There was no more historical necessity for those trials than for the Ginzburg trial today -- unless, of course, you confuse the interests of the Thermidorian bureaucracy with the conquests of October.

Sincerely yours,

Pierre Frank

Former Secretary to Leon Trotsky

Member of the United Secretariat
of the Fourth International

FRENCH AND GERMAN REVOLUTIONARY YOUTH GROUPS CALL JOINT MEETING

The second national conference of the French Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire [Revolutionary Communist Youth], which was held in Paris on April 13-15 and attended by 350 delegates representing thirty-seven cities, projected a program of solidarity with the embattled German socialist youth and its gravely wounded leader Rudi Dutschke.

After receiving a delegation from the SDS [Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentenbund -- German Socialist Student

League], the conference voted to hold a joint meeting with the SDS in Paris on May 9 to consider the revolutionary struggle of European youth. The speakers slated for this meeting are the leaders of the SDS group in Berlin, as well as Ernest Mandel, Peter Brandt, and Massimo Gorla.

The conference also issued an appeal for "demonstrations of solidarity with Rudi Dutschke and the courageous struggle of the German students."

THE CANADIAN MAOISTS "ANALYZE" THE CUBAN REVOLUTION

By Phil Courneyeur

The Progressive Workers' Movement (PWM, Canada's Maoist group) have come out with the startling revelation that Cuba all this time has only been "masquerading" as a socialist revolution but is really only "a bourgeois democratic revolution."

Worse, "Castro aims at no more than a patching up of the capitalist system" and "Fidel and his colleagues...are not socialists and are only intrinsically [sic] anti-imperialist." In short, Cuba is capitalist!

These choice slanders of the Cuban revolution stick out like bandaged thumbs in what purports to be a review of Debray's Revolution in the Revolution, published in the February issue of the Progressive Worker. According to the editors of this official PWM publication, the article represents "a systematic presentation of the Progressive Workers Movement's position" based on a "critical examination" of Debray's pamphlet.

The review has no merit aside from the light it casts upon the present attitude of Maoism towards the Cuban revolution. Summing up the whole experience of the insurrectional struggle against Batista by the July 26 Movement, the editors declare:

"Batista's regime was on an extremely shaky foundation from the very moment he seized power and it grew rapidly weaker with each passing day....Finally the U.S. imperialists refused any longer to subsidize Batista with loans and his regime staggered to its doom, to be replaced by the Castro-led rebels in the mountains who enjoyed a wide measure of popular support for no other reason than that they opposed Batista with arms." [Emphasis added.]

The next paragraph goes on to accuse Castro of declaring "the establishment of 'Socialism' by decree" -- implying that this was enacted only to get aid from the "revisionists" in the Soviet Union.

On top of this, the editors assert that "the Cuban revolution held few lessons for Marxist-Leninists but many illusions for the unwary."

This assertion is probably intended to help cover up the silence maintained by the Maoist leadership in China on the death of Che Guevara and the revolutionary positions stated by him in his message published in Tricontinental magazine. The Maoist leadership has main-

tained a similar silence on the historic decisions taken by the conference of the Organization of Latin-American Solidarity insisting on the road of armed struggle for the socialist revolution across Latin America.

Following suit, Canada's Maoist grouping, the PWM, have dummed up. They failed even to carry commemorative mention of Che in their press.

The growing hostility of the Maoists towards the Cuban revolution can be traced to a dispute around the 1965 rice deal and Castro's charges of economic pressure from China. The roots of the disagreements, however, go much deeper than trade problems. The most fundamental questions of revolutionary strategy in our epoch have come up between the Cuban and Chinese leaders, just as they have between the Cubans and the Russians. The most immediate and pressing question is the defense of Vietnam from the imperialist aggression.

The Maoists were stung by Che's moving appeal for real solidarity with Vietnam and by his call for a genuine united front at the state level between China and the Soviet Union. His daring to criticize the Chinese sectarian attitude on this question placed him beyond the Maoist pale and outside the ranks of the faithful.

Also galling to the Maoists were Che's conclusions on the socialist character of the Latin-American revolution with his now famous statement: "either a socialist revolution or a make-believe revolution." The OLAS conference marked a parting of ways with the old theory of alliances with the so-called progressive bourgeoisie.

Canadian Maoists -- like most of their strain throughout the world -- are arch nationalists and uphold the "bloc of four classes" program. This policy, enacted so tragically in Indonesia by Aidit's pro-Peking Communist party, is becoming more and more discredited among revolutionary currents in the colonial world.

Nevertheless, the whole program of the PWM for Canada has been to graft this nationalist program onto working-class politics in this country. They advocate an all-inclusive, multiclass "United Front" to drive out U.S. imperialist investment, repatriate the economy and free Canada from U.S. domination. Even "independent Canadian capitalists" will have a place in what PWM calls the "great

movement of national resurgence." But we are assured that the resurgence would leave no place for "capitalism of the old style."

What the new style "national resurgence" has in store for the workers is left to the imagination except for statements such as the following: "We reject the contention that Canadians will not be prepared to make any initial sacrifices that may be necessary in the way of foregoing any unessential comforts and luxuries, so as to establish our national independence on a firm footing." (Quoted from March 1966 Progressive Worker, "U.S. Control of Canada's Economy," p. 4.)

It seems ludicrous to even point to the abyss between the arrant nationalism of the PWM and the socialist internationalism of the Cuban revolution and the vanguard revolutionists in Latin America.

But the price for failing to ad-

here to Mao's thought is very severe. Overnight you can be changed from a socialist to a fascist, from a revolutionist to a reactionary. Overnight a workers state can become capitalist. The Cuban revolution can, by PWM decree, cease to be socialist and become, as they put it, a "bourgeois democratic state masquerading as socialism."

The criterion for determining the class character of a given party, program, or state is no longer rooted in the real world, but in the omniscient, omnipresent and omnipotent thoughts of Chairman Mao, as interpreted by faithful clerics like the editors of Progressive Worker.

Strangely enough, the imperialist strategists on Wall Street and their hirelings in the Pentagon haven't noticed the revelation about Cuba being capitalist. Neither have the Cuban people, nor the revolutionary vanguard in Latin America.

LIFE IN EL FRONTON

The imprisoned Peruvian revolutionist Hugo Blanco remains in great danger under the conditions prevailing in the island fortress of El Frontón.

The following items, taken from the March issue of Solidarité Pérou [Solidarity with Peru], the bulletin of the French Committee of Solidarity with the Victims of Repression in Peru, bears testimony both to the horrors practiced under the "parliamentary" regime of President Belaunde Terry and to the venality of the Peruvian press.

The first item is the account given in Correo, a Lima newspaper, of an atrocity committed in El Frontón, where a number of political prisoners are held.

The second is a letter from a correspondent of the committee in Lima reporting the truth about the incident.

* * *

Correo: "A guard on the island penitentiary, El Frontón, machine-gunned the prisoner Alberto Gamarra Eyzaguirre, known as 'The Lunatic,' who jumped him armed with a stick. Gamarra was struck by five bullets and fell dead in the main yard of El Frontón.

"Several prisoners present tried to stir up a riot but the guards kept the

crowd in order by firing into the air.

"There was no mutiny, nor any attempt at mass escape; it was only a slight incident," an official assured us.

"Gamarra attacked one of the guards, whose name was not revealed. The sound of machine-gun fire awakened the whole prison population. The prisoners started a ruckus and made menacing gestures at the policeman who had killed their companion. The policeman had to be protected by his colleagues...."

* * *

Our Lima correspondent, March 31:

"The story was quite different. The prisoner was an insane person who wandered into a forbidden zone to answer the call of nature. He was riddled with bullets in front of everybody. He didn't do anything or say anything.

"You can imagine the atmosphere of terror reigning in El Frontón. The papers published only a few totally false lines.

"If those in command in El Frontón want to liquidate Hugo Blanco, they can do so without any scruple and no one could interfere...His situation is very, very dangerous..."

THE BELGIAN ELECTIONS

By Ernest Mandel

[The following article has been translated by World Outlook from the April 6 issue of the Brussels weekly La Gauche. The original title is "Les plus mauvaises élections depuis l'instauration du suffrage universel" (The worst election since the establishment of universal suffrage). The subtitles appear in the original.]

* * *

We entitled our analysis of the elections of May 23, 1965, "The Most Serious Defeat in the History of Belgian Socialism." The outcome of the elections of March 31, 1968, was, in fact, still worse than that of May 23, 1965. The workers movement is continuing to lose both votes and seats in parliament. Indeed, the elections of March 31, 1968, were the worst for the workers movement since universal suffrage was established in Belgium.

The Continuing Decline in the Workers Movement

Without going back to the period before the war -- in which the peak Socialist vote of 1925 was never equaled and the worst outcome was in the elections of 1939 -- the regular decline in the percentage of the vote won by the workers movement after the "peak" in 1954 is apparent:

1954	40.91%
1958	37.68%
1961	39.80%
1965	33.04%
1968	31.59%

This result is obtained by adding to the 1965 vote of the CP [Communist party] and the PSB [Parti Socialiste Belge -- Belgian Socialist party] the vote of the blocs of the CP-UGS [Union de la Gauche Socialiste -- Left Socialist Union] and the CP-PWT [Parti Wallon des Travailleurs -- Walloon Workers party], the Huysmans* slate in Anvers, the Grippists,** and the PWT vote in Liège -- which was cast for a slate grouped around the program of "federalism and anticapitalist structural reforms" which was clearly a part of the workers movement at the time.

Even if one wanted to deduct the PWT vote in Liège as a purely "Perinist"* vote -- which it certainly was not in 1965 -- the 1965 figure becomes 32.99% and the decline from 1965 to 1968, while a little less clear, remains pronounced.

In this regard, account must obviously be taken of the fact that the 1965 results already represented a historical low point, that they were the fruit of four years of disastrous collaboration in the government [of the PSB in a bourgeois government], and that they followed an almost complete break between an important part of the Walloon trade-union movement and the parties claiming to base themselves on the workers movement.

This time, the elections followed two years of conservative government and they were preceded by a spectacular reconciliation between the Walloon FGFB [Fédération Générale des Travailleurs de Belgique -- General Workers Federation of Belgium] and the PSB. The results are all the worse because of this.

The Breakthrough of the "Language" Parties

The key fact in the 1968 elections was obviously the breakthrough of the so-called "language" parties in Flanders, the Walloon area, and Brussels. The FDF [Front Démocratique des Francophones -- French Speakers' Democratic Front] and Rassemblement Wallon [Walloon Rally] doubled their vote. Volksunie [the National Union (Flemish)] gained by 50%.

It can be considered that there is a fundamental difference between the first two formations and the third, the latter being much more clearly oriented toward the right by its origins and its social composition than the first two. However, this observation is not sufficient. It is one thing to note that the FDF and Rassemblement Wallon drew the major part of their vote from sectors which traditionally vote "left" (also including Christian Democratic sectors, however); but it is another matter to estimate the direction in which these voters are moving.

On this score no doubt is possible.

* A list headed by Camille Huysmans, the well-known, old-time Flemish left socialist.

** The pro-Chinese Communist party led by Jacques Grippa.

* François Perin, originally split from the PSB as a left socialist in 1965 and participated in the formation of the PWT. He split away from the PWT shortly thereafter to form the petty-bourgeois nationalist party, the Parti Wallon [Walloon party].

Excepting the former Christian Democrats who voted for Rassemblement Wallon -- I will return to this later on -- a former Socialist, Communist, or PWT voter who voted in 1968 for Rassemblement Wallon or the FDF, considering the program of these parties, is a voter moving away from the left toward the right.

Is any reminder necessary that to hustle votes François Perin spectacularly:

(1) Abandoned the program of anti-capitalist structural reforms.

(2) Put under wraps the demand for federalism (which was originally the raison d'être of his formation).

(3) Accepted the Atlantic alliance.

(4) Preferred linking up with clearly conservative bourgeois Catholics of the Duvieusart stripe instead of holding on to his trade-union base in Charleroi.

All of this fell clearly to the right of the PSB in this election campaign. Considering his election propaganda, which was centered on "an understanding among all Walloons of good will," his slide from a class position toward a petty-bourgeois or even bourgeois nationalist position is evident.

I do not at all dispute the fact that many workers, and above all white-collar workers, let themselves be taken in by this demagogy; I simply note that in so doing they evolved toward the right. The future will bring us not a few surprises on this score, above all when the class struggle reasserts itself as it inevitably will in the Walloon area.

The Sociology of the Breakthrough

This said, it must be noted that the social base of Volksunie is fundamentally different from that of the FDF and Rassemblement Wallon. The self-employed are the backbone of Volksunie -- above all the liberal professions (in some areas Volksunie is the "doctors' party") and sometimes the farmers. Its base is stronger among salaried workers than among wage workers, where it has not yet made a breakthrough.

The FDF's base is essentially among public-service employees and salaried workers in the "tertiary" sector [commerce and services] who feel their livelihood threatened by Flemish pressure for reinstating equality between French and Flemish in the Brussels public administration.

This fear of losing their liveli-

hood obviously intertwines with many-sided and often less "social" motives (notably, the desire to win the right to speculate freely in real estate in the extensive Brussels suburbs along with the "freedom of parents"). The confusion which reigns in this milieu around the concept of "freedom" shows moreover that even when these voters voted socialist their socialism was of a very peculiar variety.

As for Rassemblement Wallon, there is little doubt that it cut into both the traditional "left" electorate (including even Communist voters, notably in Liège) and into the Social-Christian vote. Let me illustrate this by a few examples:

● In the Namur district, the CP-(RW) bloc obtained 15,055 votes in 1965; of this total some 3,000 to 4,000 votes could be considered Communist votes. This time Rassemblement Wallon got 20,643 votes, or a gain of 9,000 to 10,000 votes. But the PSC [Parti Social-Chrétien -- Social-Christian party -- the Christian Democratic party in Belgium] lost 10,000 votes; the PLP [Parti de Liberté et du Progrès -- Liberty and Progress party -- a liberal party in the old-line capitalist sense of the term] gained 5,600; and the PSB lost 2,500 votes. Logically it must be supposed that at least 4,000 and doubtless 5,000 Social-Christian votes went over to Rassemblement Wallon.

● In the Charleroi district, the two big bourgeois parties -- the PSC and the PLP -- both lost votes: 4,000 for the PLP and 6,000 for the PSC. The PSB remained stationary. However, the Communists (the CP and the Grippist CP) lost 9,500 votes (nearly one-third of their 1965 votes!). The PWT, which was in a bloc with the CP in 1965, kept only 700 votes; the Grippists got 395.

But the Rassemblement Wallon gained 17,000 as against those which the Front Wallon [Walloon Front] won in 1965. Again the conclusion which must be drawn is that the RW won votes from the PSC, the Communists, and the Socialists, while the PSB doubtless compensated for its losses to the Perinists by a gain at the expense of the CP and the PLP.

● Finally, a typical case was that of the Canton of Seraing. The CP lost 2,000 votes in addition to the 300 lost by the Grippists. The PSB kept 1,200 votes, the PWT gained 200, and Rassemblement Wallon gained 1,300 votes. Of these 1,300 votes, 900 seem to have been Communist votes (or Socialist, these losses having been compensated for by PSB gains at the

* Freedom of the parent to decide on the language instruction his child receives in the public schools.

expense of the CP); the 400 others can only have come from the PSC. The latter, it is true, lost only 250 votes. But since the PLP lost the 700 votes it gained in 1965 to the PSC, the PSC gained from this side and at the same time lost part of its following to Rassemblement Wallon.

The Evolution in Flanders and the Walloon Area

The absolute figures must obviously be mistrusted in judging the election results in Flanders and the Walloon area because these figures reflect, among other things, a divergent demographic movement in the two parts of the country: an increase in the number of Flemish voters and stagnation or even decline in the number of Walloon voters.

Thus in Flanders, the PSB gained 44,000 votes (to which were added 4,000 Communist votes and 2,000 votes for the SBV [Socialistische Beweging Vlaanderen -- Socialist Movement of Flanders]). But deducting the 14,000 votes of the Huysmans slate in 1965 reduces these gains to 36,000 votes, or barely 1% of the electorate. That is very little and it does not seem to reflect the well-known "Evalenko law" of correspondence between the FGVB's gains in the social elections and the gains of parties claiming to base themselves on the workers movement.

In the Walloon area, the PSB lost 23,000 votes, losses which are obviously less serious once the decrease in the number of voters is taken into account. The PSB's big defeat came in Brussels with a loss of 40,000 votes on top of the very serious losses suffered in 1965. In seven years time, from 1961 to 1968, the PSB vote dropped from 336,667 to 173,096, that is the PSB lost half its vote.

These slight differences between the behavior of the Flemish and Walloon electorates obviously also apply to the PLP. It is continuing its advance in the Walloon area, although at a slower pace (it gained a little less than 20,000 votes); it lost in Flanders, less in absolute votes (5,000 votes) than in percentage. Those much touted "moderate Flemings" whom it had hoped to rally around its standard did not exist outside its own followers.

It must also be remarked that in the Walloon area, the PSB is holding its own in the best way where it has best "made a left turn" in its style if not its program -- above all in Liège and Charleroi, where it regained a little of the ground it lost in 1965.

What is serious is that in Flanders the Volksunie is continuing to nibble away at the PSB. Thus in Anvers, the

three slates in 1965 -- the PSB, the Huysmans slate, and the CP -- exceeded the PSB-CP-SBV 1968 total by 6,500 votes. Since the PSC and the PLP both lost, it is logical to suppose that at least part of the 30,000 votes won by Volksunie were Socialist votes (even if there was a compensating movement between the PSB and the PLP, with the first recouping part of the votes it lost in 1965 at the expense of the second).

In Ghent, where the PSB conducted a campaign slightly more to the left, the situation was a little better: The PSB-CP vote in 1965 exceeded the 1968 PSB-CP-SBV vote by only 2,000 votes. At Alost, where its campaign was still more dynamic, the PSB gained 4,000 votes. But, in general, its gains in Flanders were more substantial in semirural than in urban areas. It gained 6.7% in Torhout; 4% in Passendale, Wervicq, and Ypres; 4% in Haecht, Nederbrakel, and Horebeke-Sainte-Marie; 3% in Neerpelt, Landen, and Glabbeek, etc. Here the effect of industrialization must be seen and of passage into opposition.

Finally, it must be noted that in the Brussels district the Socialists in the Flemish-speaking cantons resisted the "language" lure much better than those in the French-speaking cantons. The PSB (the Flemish and Brussels units) even increased its percentage over 1965 in the cantons of Vilvorde and Asse.

A Searching of Conscience Is Required

What factors explain the slide of a not inconsiderable fraction of those traditionally voting for the workers parties toward the so-called "language" slates? Conscience searching is clearly demanded in this regard.

Two opposing theses exist. One group claims that the workers movement played the part of the apprentice sorcerer in "raising the Walloon question," that it is its own child today that is turning against it. In campaigning on the Walloon question, labor is supposed essentially to have nourished an evil in its bosom which would devour it. The advocates of this thesis see a compelling parallel here with the relationship between the Christian workers movement and Flemish nationalism; and those who hold this view are found, moreover, among both the most moderate Flemish Social Democrats and the Walloon and Brussels "leftists."

The other thesis asserts to the contrary that the workers movement did not go far enough in pushing the Walloon line. If it had more or less completely adopted Perin's strategy, they say -- that is, if it had centered on Walloon demands and sacrificed its class language and, if necessary, its class demands -- it would

have been able to avoid this breach; and it would instead have been able to achieve a breakthrough in still more substantial Christian Democratic sectors than Rassemblement Wallon did this time.

In my opinion, both these interpretations are too simplistic and extrapolate too much. They both try to comprehend a situation in movement by means of a fixed criterion. It is hard to dispute the fact, however, that the situation has changed considerably over the course of the last ten years. What must be explained is why it changed and why this change went in one direction and not in another.

Let me say at the outset that it is absurd to claim that the MPW [Mouvement Populaire Wallon -- Walloon Peoples Movement], André Renard, or the Communist and Socialist left "invented" the Walloon malaise. This malaise exists; no "agitation" could have artificially provoked tremors as extensive as those we have experienced in the course of these last years.

The roots of this malaise moreover are well known. I will cite their three principal aspects simply by way of reminder: the economic decline (the coal crisis, the drop in employment, threats to the steel industry, etc.); political frustration (for forty years the Walloons cast a majority of their votes for the Communists and Socialists without being able to enforce their will in the Walloon area and still less in the framework of Belgium as a whole); the fear of becoming a minority (both in the state and in all "unitary" organizations).

Did the workers movement commit an error in picking up these demands and not leaving them from the beginning to some kind of bourgeois demagogy? I think not. I think that, instructed by the example of Flemish nationalism, the workers movement was one hundred percent right in understanding that there was a chance of a breakthrough on the basis of Walloon demands, if it integrated them into its general program. I think also that these demands were, in general, democratic and progressive, that one cannot at the same time recognize the right of peoples to self-determination and condemn the Walloon people's demands as "reactionary."

Two conditions, however, were required for the success of this historic operation of integrating national demands into the program of the workers movement, which (let us recall) failed lamentably in Flanders. First it was necessary that there be real integration, that is that the socialist goal never drop to second place, neither with respect to its organizational form nor the demands. Hence our continual insistence on a combination

of federalism and anticapitalist structural reforms. A program of national demands separated from socialist aims would threaten to degenerate into petty-bourgeois nationalism. Secondly, the workers movement and the working class had to remain on the offensive, the Walloon thrust had to appear clearly as the expression of a thrust by the workers; it had to keep a very clear class meaning.

The decisive years were 1961-64. The PSB's participation in the government, coming right after the general strike, profoundly shook the Walloon masses' confidence in the workers movement. Added to lamentable tactical blunders like the Fouron affair, the PSB's turn to the right forced it to put its Walloon demands under wraps at the precise time when these needs were beginning to become exacerbated.

Thus a double break occurred. The radical Walloon current began at once to break away from the organized workers movement and to pursue purely Walloon objectives apart from class objectives. Its basic aim became more and more to constitute an essentially anti-Flemish pressure group -- the equivalent in the Walloon area of Volksunie; the Louvain affair showed this well.

The 1965 elections disclosed the beginning of this transformation. Then, however, it was still possible to reverse it, if the workers movement had reacted quickly in deeds. Instead, the situation deteriorated both on the economic and political levels. But there was no convincing action by the workers which could have brought along the hesitant elements. The April 6 demonstration, the first attempt to turn to action, is set for -- it is symbolic! -- six days after the March 31 elections.

In these circumstances, the masses sensitized by the Walloon national question had a choice only among speeches and promises; they voted for those who went furthest in radical Walloon language. Thus they again moved away from the workers movement, weakened it, and set off a new deterioration in the class relationship of forces.

This brings me to those who censure us for not being "Walloon" enough and for having missed an opportunity for an electoral breakthrough as a result. To these I say that a revolutionary socialist's goal in participating in elections is not to amass votes by any and all means but to amass those votes which bring him nearer the realization of his goal.

Perin quit the PSB as a left socialist; he collected votes as a petty-bourgeois nationalist. Tomorrow he will become a strikebreaker when a strike threatens the "union of all the Walloons."

Such an example is scarcely tempting; it is only the repetition on a smaller scale of the Social Democracy's electoral "successes." Only contempt can be held for those who sacrifice their principles for hustling votes. As for those who have no principles at all and simply seek "power," history has shown that they become the unconscious instruments of social forces hostile to the working people. We have nothing in common with adventurers of this type.

Our Own Results

The Confederation Socialiste des Travailleurs [Socialist Workers Confederation], which consists of the Parti Wallon des Travailleurs, the Socialistische Beweging Vlaanderen, and the Union de la Gauche Socialiste of Brussels, received 9,000 votes in the March 31 elections. These votes were distributed as follows:

2,698 votes in Brussels
1,825 in Liège
1,027 in Ghent
895 in Anvers
611 in Mouscron-Ath-Tournai
484 in Soignies
700 in Charleroi
289 in Thuin
289 in Nivelles

The least bad results by canton were in La Louvière, 1.03%; Mouscron, 0.7%; Seraing, 0.55%; Grivignée, 0.51%; Uccle, 0.5%; Seneffe, 0.49%; Eecloo, 0.48%; Roeulx, 0.48%; Templeuve, 0.48%; Ledeborg, 0.44%.

We are not electoralists. We participate in elections to spread our program. We did this on a scale never equaled in the past (700,000 brochures were distributed throughout the country). We had slim hope of winning a seat in parliament. However, this very modest outcome was disappointing. We had expected about double the votes we received.

A number of factors must be taken into account to explain this very low vote. First of all, although we are hardly responsible for it, we suffered the effect of the decline in the workers movement (above all in Brussels). The vote of the far left in Brussels was cut about in half (from 41,000 votes to 24,000 votes). The loss from what we had hoped to get is partially explained by this general decline.

Secondly, a curtain of silence worked to our detriment. In 1965, as a result of the split in the PSB, the newspapers talked about us. This time, the first time we faced the voters alone in the main population centers of the country, no one mentioned us. What did us immense harm above all was the fact that we were denied access to TV as a result of

the dishonest maneuver of which our readers are aware. Our organization is little known, above all in Flanders and certain areas of Hainaut. TV could have made us known but it was unjustly denied us.

Finally, there was the fact that we are a small party which is barely off the ground nationally (the Confédération Socialiste des Travailleurs has existed for only two years). Our significant trade-union base in certain regions (above all in Liège) and in certain branches of industry does not amount to a local political base, or only to a small extent. The workers can put their trust and confidence in union delegates without necessarily thereby voting for their party, if they are not yet familiar with it and if they have not yet been able to see it in action.

All this said, the crucial fact remains that sectors which clearly sympathize with us and which act shoulder to shoulder with the Confédération Socialiste des Travailleurs, both in union work and in action for the defense of the Vietnamese revolution, voted for the FDF in Brussels and the Rassemblement Wallon in the Walloon area. This means one thing: in the elections "linguistic" or "national" responses disoriented the class consciousness and reflexes of a part of the workers vanguard.

We regret this but we will not yield to this pressure any more than we yielded to the reformist pressure. Our duty is to offer the workers a class program; it is to tirelessly reiterate and prove to them that their problems cannot be solved without the overthrow of the capitalist system.

We held to this language during the election campaign. On this program we won a little more than 10,000 voters in the country (taking account of some districts like Mons, Huy-Waremme, Verriers, and Louvain, which we did not contest for technical reasons and where we would have gotten the same percentage of the vote as elsewhere. This is the base for beginning to build a revolutionary-socialist party, one thoroughly convinced of the need for federalism, but revolutionary-socialist first of all.

This base is modest but it is real. Let us start from this sober estimate of our forces and organize ourselves, improve our base in the plants and locally, improve our press and propaganda. Above all, we will build a party which more and more will become the striking force of the workers vanguard in this country, which will play a growing role in working-class action; this alone is what counts in changing the destinies of Belgium in the direction of socialism.

PIRATED EDITIONS OF "CANCER WARD" SLIP BY SOVIET CENSOR

By George Saunders

In a letter last December, Soviet novelist Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn demanded immediate publication of his most recent novel The Cancer Ward. He warned that the Writers Union officials who had withheld authorization for its publication for over a year would have to hurry if they wanted it published in Russian first. [For the text of the letter, see World Outlook, February 16, p. 129.]

The novel was already well known to the Soviet reading public, Solzhenitsyn's letter stated: it had circulated in hundreds of typed copies "through the desire of its readers." In such circumstances, he suggested, the text could easily fall into foreign hands and be published in the West "without our permission."

"If this happens," said the novelist, "it will be the fault (or the secret desire?) of the secretariat" of the Soviet Writers Union. He disclaimed responsibility.

Solzhenitsyn's warnings have proved well founded. An Italian publisher, Alberto Mondadori of Milan, recently printed a Russian text in Switzerland. A London publishing house, The Bodley Head, plans to put out an English translation this summer. And the London Times Literary Supplement, April 11, ran extracts obtained "from a special correspondent in Europe"; the extracts were said to be retranslated into English from a previous translation from Russian into an unspecified language.

Thus the race of the publishing vultures is on. What is it about Solzhenitsyn's novel that makes the Soviet bureaucrats so reluctant to print it? Why would they rather suppress it, and undergo another international sensation, with cash registers jumping to the tune of "Banned in Moscow"?

A look at the extracts as printed in the Times Literary Supplement suggests the answer, at least in part. Here again, in the tradition of One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich and For the Good of the Cause, is a candid and effective description of resurgent forces representing proletarian democracy, in conflict with brutal, deadening Stalinism and bureaucratism. Short as these excerpts are, they already tell why the censors wished to blunt the pen of this gifted writer.

* * *

The protagonist of The Cancer Ward

is Oleg Filimonovich Kostoglotov, whose last name might be freely translated "Bone in the Throat." And indeed, that is what Oleg symbolizes vis-à-vis the bureaucratic regime.

"All through my life I have suffered most for professing democracy," Oleg relates. (He has been released from a penal labor camp because he is dying of cancer. His seven-year imprisonment had been imposed because he was "not exactly enthusiastic" about Stalin.)

"I tried to get democracy accepted in the army," he explains. "In fact, I thought a lot about it. Because of that, in 1939 they didn't send me to the military college and I remained in the ranks. In 1940 I managed to get to the college, but I was so insolent to my superiors that they expelled me. In 1941 I just managed to get through the course for non-commissioned officers in the Far East. I must tell you frankly that it annoyed me very much that I did not become an officer. All my friends became officers. When you're young these things are difficult to bear, but justice meant more to me."

The circumstances of Kostoglotov's release from the labor camp show de-Stalinization in a poor light. Solzhenitsyn paints a grim picture of petty harassment, official arrogance, and endless red tape, spawned by the unrestrained bureaucratism at every level.

Released from the camp, Kostoglotov arrived after dark in a Soviet Asian town, location of the hospital he was to enter. He planned to look up an address he had in the old part of town, but others dissuaded him: "Don't go there. They'll kill you. Since the amnesty of 1953, all the criminal riffraff have been roaming around there."

Trying the hotels, he found their entrance halls "so elegant that I was ashamed to go there as I was. Some of them had room, but when instead of the normal citizen's passport I gave my exile's one, 'Impossible. Impossible.'"

He went to the militia (police) station and was told to spend the night at the tavern. ("They don't check documents there.") Unable to find it, he returned to the militia station, but was not allowed to sleep there. "The militia man kept on coming round and stopping me."

In the morning, after a long wait in line at the hospital, he was told,

"You must go to bed at once." But first he had to get his document stamped -- at the Commandant's Office on the other side of town.

"Throughout the Soviet Union the working hours are the same, but the Commandant had gone away and didn't care a hoot about anything. And because I was an exile they wouldn't tell me when he was expected."

Because of various regulations and bureaucratic complications, his effort to "go to bed at once" put him through a seemingly endless round of red tape. "I spent ten roubles on trams alone. Then I had to walk about another mile in the mud, and I was in such pain that I could hardly drag myself along. I had to lug my case with me all the time."

At last, the Commandant showed up. "I gave him the permit from the Commandant's Office in my region and I showed him the admission certificate from the Outpatients Department. He stamped it. I could go lie down."

* * *

Another excerpt describes a nightmare dreamed by a character named Pavel Rusanov, who held a high party office, "controller of cadres." Rusanov had forged his career by denouncing people to the secret police in the Stalin era.

In the nightmare, one of the uglier episodes in this "successful" career comes back to haunt its maker.

Rusanov had informed against a fellow worker, Yelchansky. "He only did it because he was asked to do so by Chukhnenko, whom Yelchansky was hindering in his work," so goes the dream apologia.

Later, the victim's wife, Grusha Yelchanskaya, was also imprisoned "because she gossiped against the Leader." Rusanov's role in this is hinted at in another piece of self-justification. He dreams he has been called before the post-Stalin Supreme Court to answer for his Stalin-era crimes. He imagines what he would say in his own defense:

"I have never been a judge, I have never even conducted an investigation. I've only notified [of] suspicion. If I find a newspaper cutting in the latrines with a picture of the Leader torn in pieces, it's my duty to send up the cutting and report it. The organs of investigation are there to investigate the matter. Perhaps it's a coincidence, perhaps it isn't. The investigating organs are there to establish the truth. I have only discharged my simple duties as a citizen." (Emphasis added.)

Such was life under Stalin's terror.

Rusanov did not stop with the husband and wife. He also threatened to prosecute the daughter, apparently a teen-age girl, "for not having filled in [a] questionnaire properly."

In desperation, she poisoned herself. The figure of the dead girl haunts his dream.

In his guilt and fear, Rusanov especially dreads the workers of the post-Stalin era ("All young men and unknown to him"). "They knew everything -- how did they know it?"

He dreams that he asks one young welder for a match (so that he can burn the document in which he had denounced Yelchanskaya -- before the workers discover it). The welder looks at him and, to his horror, quotes the following sentence from the very document he had hoped to burn:

"From the fact that Yelchanskaya promised me her daughter, I draw the conclusion that she feels guilty and is waiting to be arrested." (Emphasis added.)

* * *

In the third extract, Kostoglotov gives a humorous satirical description for his nurse friend, Zoya, of a "tremendous event" that occurred in the cancer ward that day. "The head doctor Nizamuddin Bachramovich himself came on an inspection."

"At once we had fifteen white coats, even the head of the department, the senior doctors as well as the doctors on duty, even some I have never seen before. The head doctor threw himself on the night tables like a tiger, but we had all heard that he was coming and had got things ready.

"There was nothing for him to get his teeth into. He was bad-tempered and dissatisfied. And just then they told him about me." Inadvertently, it came out that Kostoglotov was from Kazakhstan.

"'What!' said Nizamuddin. 'From another Republic? We have very few beds. Do you have to treat foreigners? Discharge him at once!...I can go now to the Outpatients Department and bring you five patients as ill as he is. Discharge him.'"

Kostoglotov thought quickly. "I put my elbows on my knees, gave a good cough, and asked calmly: 'But how can you discharge me like that when I come from the virgin lands?' 'From the virgin lands?' said Nizamuddin in some fear (he

had come close to making a political mistake!) 'For the virgin lands Russia will do anything.' And he went on to the next patient." (The "virgin lands" was an arid region of Kazakhstan that Khrushchev in the 1950's ordered plowed up in a much-publicized but not very successful campaign to increase wheat production.)

When Zoya remarked on Kostoglov's cunning in this encounter, he replied, "I became cunning in the camp... I never used to be. In general I have many features now which are quite foreign to me and which I only acquired in the

camp."

"But what about your gaiety. Surely you didn't get that there?"

"Why not? I am gay because I am used to losing everything."

* * *

These extracts are but a taste of Solzhenitsyn's new work. This tough, clear-sighted antiauthoritarian writer is continuing in the best traditions of Russian literature and of the Russian revolution.

BALTIMORE CLERGYMEN CONVICTED FOR PROTESTING VIETNAM WAR

Four Vietnam war protesters were convicted April 16 in Baltimore, Maryland, of "mutilating and destroying government records and interfering with the Selective Service program." They poured animal blood on draft records.

The four were the Rev. Philip E. Berrigan, 44, curate of St. Peter Claver Church; David Eberhardt, 26, secretary of the Baltimore Interfaith Peace Mission; the Rev. James L. Mengel, 38; and Thomas Lewis, 27, a Baltimore artist.

Father Berrigan testified that he and the others were "tormented by anger"

over the death and destruction caused by American intervention in Vietnam.

The defendants freely admitted having participated in the demonstration last October 27. They said the blood was used to dramatically symbolize "a distaste for the war and the suffering it has caused."

Their attorney, Fred E. Weisgal, said after the verdict that he would file a motion for a new trial on the grounds that the defendants had acted in "the best traditions of American democracy." Sentencing was deferred to a later date.

In this issue

	<u>Page</u>
PHOTO: Student rally at Columbia University in Solidarity with Rudi Dutschke	361
Another Civil War in the U.S.?	362
The Debate Over Daley's Order to "Shoot to Kill" -- by Joseph Hansen	364
DRAWING; Mayor Richard J. ("Shoot to Kill") Daley	365
Demetrio Vallejo Ends Hunger Strike	367
DRAWING: Demetrio Vallejo	367
New Admissions on Pentagon-CIO Intervention in Capture of Che Guevara	368
Behind the Shooting of Rudi Dutschke -- by Gisela Mandel	369
American Indian Youths Demand Student Rights	371
Russell Appeals to Gomulka to Release Nina Karsov	372
DRAWING: Wladyslaw Gomulka	372
In Reply to Maurice Duverger -- by Pierre Frank	374
French and German Revolutionary Youth Groups Call Joint Meeting	374
The Canadian Maoists "Analyze" the Cuban Revolution -- by Phil Courneyeur	375
Hugo Blanco Case:	
Life in El Frontón	376
The Belgian Elections -- by Ernest Mandel	377
Pirated Editions of "Cancer Ward" Slip by Soviet Censors -- by George Saunders	382
Baltimore Clergymen Convicted for Protesting Vietnam War	384

Reba Hansen, Business Manager

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

New York, N.Y. 10010



EDITOR: Joseph Hansen. **CONTRIBUTING EDITORS:** Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, George Novack. **WORLD OUTLOOK** specializes in weekly political analysis and interpretation of events for publications of the labor, socialist, colonial independence and black liberation movements. Signed articles represent the view of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of World Outlook. Insofar as it re-

fects editorial opinion, unsigned material expresses the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. **TO SUBSCRIBE:** For 26 issues send \$7.50 or £3.2.6d or 37.50 francs to: World Outlook, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010. Write for rates on airmail or first-class subscriptions. **PARIS OFFICE:** Pierre Frank, 95 rue du Faubourg Saint-Martin, Paris 10, France.